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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The process by which we establish judgments and opinions about other individuals is relevant to the field of psychology. In fact one of the research trends in personality assessment is an attempt to adequately measure and determine the attributes of the judges of other persons. The importance of judging others is crucial to the applied aspects of psychology. The clinician, the industrial psychologist, and the counselor can use profitably any research concerning the process of judging others.

Many of the studies which have been conducted have considered the subject of judging others and self as an aspect of perception. Although there is certainly a relationship of perception to judging self and others, they are not historically equivalent. In the early stages of perceptual psychology, perception was narrowly conceived as the mechanism of space perception. With the development of the academic schools, the field of perception was broadened to include the study of sets, habits, and attitudes. Contemporary social psychologists and neo-Freudians extended the concept of perception and emphasized goal perception and self-perception in relation to the individual life goal. Thus, perception came to involve seeing or judging the self of others. As a result of the varied historical development of the concept of perception, there is also an ambiguity which is not advantageous to the adequate use of the term. To alleviate this ambiguity and to clarify the mean-
ing of the process of judging others, the conceptions involved in this process will be discussed.

The process of judging others or self involves a knowing and a judging of persons. These judged persons are the objects of the judgment of the judges. Since both the agent judging and the object that is judged are both persons, the term of personal judgment seems to refer adequately to the process. From a practical point of view the most fundamental aspect of the process of judging others is the expression of what a person has experienced of another person. Judging the personality of another is different from judging a non-personal object. Of these two types of judgment there are certain aspects which are common and certain aspects which are not common. The basic difference lies in the personal material which enables the judge to make an accurate judgment.

An important factor in a person's experience and behavior is the person's set of values, as is concluded in a number of studies. Since a person's values are supposed to have an effect on his experience and behavior, it is relevant in the determination of the process of judging others to demonstrate what effect values have on this process. The concern of this thesis will be the investigation of the influence of the judge's values on personal judgment of another. In particular it seems practical to investigate the significance of the value patterns of the accurate judge of others. This is a feasible approach since accuracy in judgment can be distinguished in personal judgment.

While some researchers have found that environmental and personality factors may influence personal judgment, relatively little attention has been paid to the effect of values on judging others. There is a need to clarify what effect the judge's values have on the accuracy of his personal judgment.
One way to answer this research need is to investigate with the Study of Value Test the relationship of personal judgment to values. This thesis will investigate what experimental effect a judge's values have on his accuracy in judging others.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The related literature is extensive, and the specific emphasis of this review will be determined by the general concept that a number of factors can be distinguished in the process of judging others. In this review the aspects concerned with the judge as a source of variance in judgment will be the primary subject of discussion. The subject of the judgment will receive secondary emphasis.

Several major topics will be considered in this review. They will be orientated toward the task of finding the influence of values on personal judgment. The topics are: the ability of judging as a complex organization of information, the characteristics of the accurate judge, the characteristics of the subject, the kind of relationship between the subject and the judge, the ways of organizing the information, the methodology of assessing accurate judgment, and a summary.

A. The ability of judging as a complex organization.

The question of whether the process of judging others is a simple one or a complex organization of information has been considered by a few researchers. Some have concluded that there is one central factor in the accuracy of judging others. They have suggested that similarity between the subject and judge can account for most of the accuracy (3) (35) (14). Lambin states that
if the subjects are homogeneous, the judges will be able to evaluate the differentiating features more accurately (43).

Other studies have more directly considered the problem of accounting for accuracy of judgment on the basis of more than one factor. Bieri (10) has contradicted the conclusion of those who account for accuracy in judging merely on the basis of similarity. He found that the complexity of one's cognitive systems for perceiving others is effectively related to one's ability to accurately judge the behavior of others. Thus, a system of constructs which differentiates highly among persons is needed even if you only account for the cognitive aspect of judging. From an assessment viewpoint Rimoldi (58) found that similarity of the personality of the judge and the subject is not related to accuracy.

The most adequate treatment of this topic has been done by Cline and Richard (16). They were especially concerned with the relationship between accuracy of perception of others which was derived from two or more different instruments or procedures. They found that there was a generality of ability to judge others, and that this ability cannot be explained on the basis of real similarity. They also found that this generality of ability to judge others was composed of a number of factors.

The conclusion that there are a number of factors which make the process of judging others a complex one is consistent with practically all approaches to the problem in the current literature. As a result of the cogent studies previously considered, the process of judging others is viewed as one in which a number of aspects can be distinguished.
B. The characteristics of the accurate judge.

The topic concerns itself with the characteristics of the accurate judge which may affect his judgment. The social acceptability of the judge as a trait has been investigated (44) (52) (43), and the studies generally confirm a positive relation between social acceptability and ability to judge group members. In one of these studies Taft found that although good judges were found to be socially acceptable to others, this did not significantly account for the accuracy in judgment. (67) It is concluded that the accurate judge is more socially acceptable, but this alone does not determine accuracy (9).

It has been suggested that the effect of training and education has bearing on the judge's accuracy (41) (25) (65). Most of these studies noted quantitative differences but no statistically significant ones were reported. An example is Cline who reports considerable differences in ability to judge among persons with varied acquaintance with psychology (15). The influence of this can be reduced if the subjects have the same amount of training and education. In general this factor in the judge needs more experimental verification in order to clarify its effect.

The problem of sex differences has been investigated as a factor in the judge. G. Allport observed that women are slightly superior to men in judging others (3). Cline found women consistently higher than men in accuracy (15). Lambin cites a number of contradictory findings in his review (43). There is some weak but conflicting evidence for female superiority. The influence of this condition can be overcome by using the members of the same sex as the judges.

The age of the judge might be a factor in his accuracy. Using Ruckmick
pictures, Gage (31) found an increase from the ages three to fourteen in ability to judge intended emotional expression. Dymond, Hughes, and Rasbe (24) found a marked increase in ability to judge others between ages seven and eleven. However, they found that from the ages eighteen to late thirty this ability does not increase in their sample. There seems to be no necessity for accounting for age as a factor in adults.

The attitudes of the judge were studied by Estes (25) who found that the good judge was an individual able to maintain a social distance between himself and the subject. According to G. Allport (3), the good judge is a person somewhat detached and asocial in his attitudes. Two studies found that the ability to judge others correlated with the absence of ethnocentric and authoritarian attitudes (15) (39), and support the influence of attitude. The general attitudes of judges was studied by Schiederman (60) who concluded that people perceive each other in terms of their general attitudes. Attitudes are often expressions of the values of the judge. This suggests that the area of values should be considered.

Emotional characteristics of the judge have been the center of attention of some research. A study was conducted on the emotional characteristics of judges as seen by their peers. (1) It found that the good judges of others were described by their peers as touchy, lacking in courage, working for the present, independent, egocentric, and talkative.

To obtain some indication of what good and poor judges considered to be their emotional characteristics, one study (67) gave them the Gough Adjective Check List. The good judges described themselves as organized, reasonable, intelligent, conservative in crises, alert, calm, capable, cautious, clear-
thinking, efficient, honest, logical, persevering, playful, practical, quiet, realistic, reliable, reserved, serious, sincere, thorough. The poor judges checked these traits: noisy, show-off, egotistical, emotional, affectionate, clever and careless. It seems that the poor judges are social-orientated, but not socially adjusted. The good judge describes himself as a serious and organized person who apparently relies upon the use of his intelligence and conservatism in meeting successfully the hazards of life. It is to be noted that these adjectives express a certain outlook on life which might be called a value system. The judges are using a frame of reference in their behavior which might reflect their values. Since these aspects are reported by the judges themselves telling something about the way that they are basing their behavior, it seems significant to determine whether they bear up experimentally.

Another of the emotional characteristics of the judge which has been investigated is that of his personal adjustment. A number of studies found a positive correlation between accuracy of judgments and various tests and ratings of personal adjustment (41) (22) (37) (1). The studies indicate that the poor judge of others is usually less adequately adjusted emotionally. In reference to other findings previously considered, the poor judge seems to be unable to differentiate between his personal feelings and the objective demands of the task.

Since insight is considered to be related to the personal adjustment of the person by many of researchers, they suggested that this aspect of adjustment be investigated in more detail. Concerning self-insight and judgment, it was found that there was a positive correlation between this trait and the ability to judge others as long as the study was confined to a single trait.
Unfortunately, measures of insight are not based just on one trait. Vernon (70) found no relation between various measures of the ability to judge and poor ratings on insight. Taft (63) did not find a significant correlation between judge's scores on the over-all index of ability to judge others and the index of ability to judge self. The relevance of this factor in the judge will have to be clarified by future research.

Several investigators have considered the effect of special abilities on personal judgment. A group of studies have been conducted employing aesthetic abilities and sensitivity (3) (2) (70) (68). According to the general tenor of these studies, there is a slight relation between judgmental ability and interest in art and drama. This would suggest that there might be a relation between artistic or aesthetic value and personal judgment. However, little conclusive evidence was found of artistic ability being related to personal judgment.

Another special ability which might have a definite effect on the ability to judge is that of intelligence. G. Allport summarized the literature to 1937, and found some relation between accuracy of judgment and high intelligence. More current positive findings were later found (1) (70) (67) (23). Also, a number of negative findings were reported in current research (45) (40) (10) (41) (31). The contradictory findings in the recent literature make a position on this aspect somewhat tenuous at this time. In part they may be due to the differences in the various measures of intelligence used.

The ability to empathize with another person has been considered as an attribute in the accurate judge. In fact Lipps (47) speaks of knowledge of others as empathy which comes from imitating the external manifestations of the
Arnold considers this only one aspect of empathy (5). The similarity of judging others and empathy as defined by Siegel, (61) Tymond (22), Duane (21), and Luchins (49) is to be noted. They consider empathy to be the ability to put oneself in the other person's position, to establish rapport and to anticipate the reactions, feelings and behaviors of the other. Tymond (22) suggests that those with good empathic ability are better judges than those with low ability, although the number of judges in his study is too small for this evidence to be conclusive.

In some studies of empathy subjects are required to predict the rating behavior of others. Others do not assess empathy in this manner. Halpern (34) on the measurement of empathy had his subjects predict the rating of others on an inventory, and correlated the accuracy with the Study of Values. The results consisted of the following correlations which are of interest: .355 Social, .203 Religious, .108 Economic, .06 Political, -.086 Theoretical, -.333 Esthetic. Although none of these correlations are high, Halpern concludes that there is some slight evidence for a relation between values and predictive rating.

The fact that empathy is an ambiguous concept even for those advancing this viewpoint leads one to avoid unnecessary comparisons. The similarity of the process of judging others to the concept of empathy does not justify an assumption of practical equivalence (5). Indeed, the most nature of the literature on empathy is not the specific concern of this paper.

Of the various studies reviewed concerning the characteristics of factors in the judge, only a few have been found to have generally accepted significance. Sex differences may have to be taken into consideration in a
study which used a mixed group. Also, the educational level of the judges should be approximately the same. The studies on the attitudes of the judges and on their emotional characteristics seem to suggest the possible influence of values on the judge. The general tenor of the research findings show that these are some factors or aspects of the judge which are related to personal judgment.

C. The characteristics of the subject.

In the development of research on judging others, some of the investigators realized that accuracy of judgment is also influenced by the characteristics of the subject. Estes (35) reported that some subjects were easier to judge. The basis of this conclusion was that all judges evaluated these subjects more accurately than others. Other studies observed that certain individuals tend to be judged accurately by most judges (32) (15). Wittich (71) concludes that the capacity to be accurately rated by others may be regarded as a trait, since there is a positive relation between personal adjustment of the subject and the success with which others understand him.

Several of the investigators noted that the characteristics of the subject might be taken into consideration in the appraisal of the accuracy of the judge. It might be inferred that maladjusted subjects are more difficult to judge accurately. Since none of the studies showed statistically significant relationships, their inferences need to be further verified before being taken into account.

D. The kind of relation between the judge and subject.

A difference in judgmental accuracy based primarily on how well the participants know each other might be operative in any study of personal
judgment. The relevance of the circumstances of the acquaintanceship of those used in a study is considered here. One might infer that particular friendships will contaminate the data. Those who are close friends of the subject will know the subject to a degree that places the other judges at a disadvantage in judgment.

That friendship will give some advantage or be seriously detrimental is merely a logical inference. Friendship can be a hindrance to accurate judgment by destroying objectivity.

It might be helpful to consider briefly some studies concerned with the properties of friendship which are pertinent. In evaluating others, a greater degree of acquaintanceship makes for more favorable ratings if accompanied by intensification of affection (42) (50) (63) (27). Judges assume greater similarity between themselves and positive sociometric choices than between themselves and negative sociometric choices (20) (30). However, in a later study HefTel (37) found that individuals rated their best friends just as threatening or more threatening than their least liked choices.

Friendships are often made on the basis of personal needs which are not necessarily recognized by the individual (55) (46). Thus, it is seen that accurate knowledge of a friend is not necessarily the dominant feature of friendship. It is concluded that there is no need to determine friendships as a factor in judgment.

E. Ways of organizing the information.

The observations of the judge are considered to be organized into the resulting expression of judgment. The factors which determine the general organization are of interest. For some the self has been considered as an
important reference for judgment. Taft in his many studies on judges (68)
holds that one must explore the way an individual knows himself, because one can
only know something about another's inner experience only by some comparison
with his own. His viewpoint asserts that the self is a major referent in one's
knowledge of others, and therefore in one's judgment of them. The belief that
the self in the human being was an important factor in human behavior was
considered by Locke (48) and later by William James (38). A contemporary,
Rogers, (59) holds that the self-structure is an organised configuration of
perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. This self-structure
has as one of its elements the valued qualities which are perceived as associ-
ated with experiences and objects. Values are an important part of the self.
The values of the self have a significant influence on what the self as the
director of behavior does. This suggests that the self as a determinator of
judgment could be verified through noting a relationship of values to personal
judgment.

Some evidence has been gathered on the self as an organizer of perceptions
of others. Renzaglia (56) found that the individual's reported perceptions
and feeling tone about the self are qualitatively and directionally similar to
those he holds toward others. Another study (61) concluded that the consistent-
ly high negative correlations found in insightful groups between the amount of
trait possessed and the amount attributed to others suggests the presence of a
dynamic process which operates in the opposite direction. Thus, the self
concepts of others may be perceived in contrast to the individual's own self.

There is some evidence to suggest that the self and its qualities are used
as reference in the judgment of others. It is open to research to find out
whether the values of the self which are expressed are related to personal judgment.

Another major way of organizing information into a personal judgment is through the influence of values. Recently the relationship of behavior and value has changed from a subject of traditional and philosophic curiosity to a focal point in empirically oriented studies of human behavior. In a sense this has been the result of a tendency to look for the effectors of perception for help in the understanding and prediction of behavior.

The assumptions underlying this approach are that an individual's behavior depends on his perception of the world and that the way the individual perceives the world depends upon his values. This viewpoint would also conclude that the individual's perception of judgment of others is dependent on his values.

Empirically, the relation of value orientation and perception selectivity was investigated by Postman, Bruner, and McGinnies. They determined the relation of time recognition and words representing six values of the Study of Values, and found a significant one. One of their conclusions was that value orientation keeps the person responding in terms of objects valuable to him even when such objects are absent. A number of other studies found relations between various kinds of perception and a person's stated values (39) (11) (73) (26). There is sufficient evidence to consider the values of the person as influencing various kinds of perception. This suggests that a person's values might be related to the way that he perceives others.

Some have held that the value system of the individual is synonymous with the ideal self. Bills, Vance, and McLean (11) found that the social
maladjustment results from a conflict of the values of the individual with the values of his society. They asserted that the concept of self is the traits and values which the individual has accepted as definitions of himself. They concluded that the philosophy of life, the value system of the individual, and the concept of the ideal self are synonymous. On this topic, Jones and Morris (39) found substantial relationships between the domain of temperament and that of value.

Whether an individual's value system may influence his judgment of people was investigated. This study hypothesized that an individual's value system may be a frame of reference for the judgments and may be projected upon the stimulus figure (26). The subjects made judgments of portrait-type photographs and rated them on the value most descriptive the least descriptive of the person. These were related to their own values. They concluded that an individual's high values are not used as anchoring points in his judgment of others, but rather his lower ones. The use of photographs seems too esoteric for making a personal judgment of another. The artifact limits the similarity of the relationship between actual persons.

In general the previous studies have shown that values have been related to various types of perception. There is some suggestion of a relationship between a person's stated values and his judgment of other people. None of the studies have considered personal judgment of others in a group which has some actual experience of one another. This area should be investigated for more conclusive evidence of such a relationship.
F. Methodology of assessing accurate judgment.

Recent studies of "social perception" or judgment of others have been chiefly concerned with differences among judges. They have been concerned with differences among judges in accuracy as a result of their tendency to view others as similar to themselves. These studies have usually been built around a particular operation in which a judge predicts how another person will respond. The extent to which the prediction agrees with the actual response is taken as a measure of accuracy.

Numerous studies were conducted in which judges and subjects rated themselves on different kinds of scales. They ranged from a simple yes or no type of construction to six-point scales. The early critical observations pointed to the nature of the error made by the judges in rating the subjects. Bronfenbrenner and Dempsey (12) concluded that there were four errors postulated. The judge could error in estimating the level at which the other person is responding, the range within which the other person may express himself, the differences among persons, or finally within persons.

Numerous other methodological studies and criticisms came from a group at the University of Illinois. Osgood and Suci (53) developed a method for analysis of rating profiles used for judgment called $D$. $D$ is the quantitative distance on the rating scale of the judge's prediction from the subject's rating. Fiedler (28) used $D$ to measure the assumed similarity and found that the measure made large scale computations of accuracy more workable.

An extensive summary of the methodological problems that have confronted researchers was made by Gage and Cronbach. (31) They distinguished four major components in the experimental situation: the judge, the other, input,
and out-take. Their methodology accounted for such factors in determining accuracy as warranted assumed similarity and unwarranted assumed similarity. Another kind of methodology tried to account for stereotyping (16). The so-called "halo effect" was suggested as a factor to be accounted for. (33). Cronbach the main advocate of the distinctions in assessment of accuracy, later rescinded the usefulness of these procedures (19). More recently Cline and Richards (16) conclusively showed that these complex differentiations are not justified nor desirable.

In the light of these studies attempts at highly complex methods for determining accuracy are not justified. A simple quantitative comparison of the difference of the subject's judgment and the prediction is more practical and realistic than an attempt at determining an absolute sort of accuracy.

G. Summary

From the literature, we see that the ability to judge others has been shown to be ascertainable and composed of several factors. There seems to be sufficient evidence to support the viewpoint that it can not be assumed to stem from real or projected similarity between the judge and the subject. In the current literature, there is no one outstanding aspect of the judging process or situation that can explain the accuracy of judgment. Those relevant to the design of this experiment have been evaluated and accounted for.

There have been a number of descriptions of what the accurate judge happens to be like. These descriptions have been taken from the judge himself and from others around him. How accurate and inaccurate judges have described themselves suggests that there may be a value system which orientates their behavior and therefore may effect their personal judgment.
The number of studies which seem to differ in their findings and conclusions makes the literature very difficult to assimilate and clarify. Unfortunately, the cryptic form of the reports often makes evaluation difficult and sometimes leaves the reader only with suggestive tendencies. Some of the difficulty arises from the complexity of the judging process. There are numerous aspects to the process from an operational point of view let alone from a conceptual one.

The dynamic complexity of the personalities and situations are very involved. However elaborate techniques of assessment have not proven to be consistently efficient. A simple quantitative method is recommended, and will be followed. The usual criterion for accuracy of judgment of others was how close the judge's prediction is to the subject's judgment of himself. No basic improvement has been made on this criterion.

The investigation of the relationship between the values of a judge and his accuracy in personal judgment is suggested in several areas by the literature. That the judge's values may significantly effect his ability to judge others accurately has been asserted from several theoretical viewpoints. The values of the judge may serve as a reference on which he bases his judgment. This aspect of the judge's personality or self should be experimentally investigated. This can be readily done in terms of his directly expressed values.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

The formal aspect of this thesis is the judge as a variable in the process of judging others. The particular approach is the investigation of motivational or value patterns of the judge. Since accuracy in personal judgment can be distinguished empirically, it is proper that the procedure be concerned with the determination of this accuracy. The usual criterion for accuracy of perception or personal judgment is: How close is the judge's estimate to the subject's judgment of himself?

A simple approach is recommended, since each technique has certain advantages and limitations, and since this thesis is more properly concerned with the effect of values on the accuracy of judges. If a judge's rating is compared with the subject's self-rating there is sufficient basis for determining accuracy in personal judgment. In this method there is a prediction of an outcome. A judgment is compared to a criterion judgment to which quantitative distance can be applied. This quantitative distance is the basis for a distinction of accuracy. With this quantitative score, a statistical analysis and description of the results is possible.

The procedure used in this experimental design for determining an accuracy score is the deviation method based on a simple scale. There are twenty-four items on the scale and four subjects, both of which are the source
of any external heterogeneity in judgment assessed by this method. No elaborate attempt is made to account for similarity between judge and subject since it is not the specific concern of this thesis, and since there is no method completely adequate to this problem as here related.

The characteristics of the rating blank used furnished a basis for the accuracy of judgment (See Appendix I). An example of one of the 24 traits included in the rating scale is the following:

**Friendly** ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！

The subjects who were the class officers and whose self-judgment was the criterion judgment were told to rate themselves as they really are by placing an X in one of the cells. By placing an X in one of the cells which represent a pseudo-continuum of a trait, they rated or judged themselves on this particular trait. They did so for each of the 24 traits.

The judges were told to rate the subjects or class officers on these traits, as they, the judges and class members, estimated the subjects would rate themselves. The judges had to pick the particular cell which the subject or class officer picked as a self-rating or self-judgment.

In using a circle (O) for the predictive rating of a possible judge A, and a (*) of judge B, and an (X) for the self-rating of the class officer, an example of the determination of accuracy will be demonstrated in the following:

**Friendly** ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！ ！

The cell chosen by the class officer is the mean or zero point for the determination of accuracy. If a judge has placed his prediction in the same call as the subject, then there is a deviation score of 0 indicating a perfect judgment. Since judge A placed his prediction in the cell next to the cell of
the class officer, using the class officer's placement as a mean, judge A has deviation score of 1. Since judge B has placed his prediction two cells away from the chosen cell of the subject, judge B has a deviation score of 2. Within this method of accuracy for an individual trait there are deviation scores from 0 to 5 possible. An aggregate score of accuracy for one judge of one subject is obtained by a summation of the deviations scores of all the traits for that subject. The range of possible deviation scores for any one judge for any one subject is from 0 to 120. Total accuracy score for one judge of all the four subjects is obtained by summing all the aggregate deviation scores for each of the four subjects into one accuracy score for one judge. The range for possible total deviation scores of one judge is from 0 to 480. This method has some similarities with that used by Fiedler (23) in his studies.

The second aspect of procedure was the standard administration of the Study of Values at a second meeting. The scoring of the Study of Values was done in the standard manner by the experimenter, and rechecked to avoid any possible errors. A raw score is obtained for each of the six Values of the Study of Values.

Since this thesis is using the Study of Values as an instrument for the assessment of the value system of the judges, it is proper to discuss the Study of Values in a brief manner. The test is designed to determine the relative importance of six Values — Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political, and Religious value. The classification is based directly upon Spranger's Types of Men (3) which defends the view that the personalities of men are best known through a study of their values or evaluative attitudes. The scale is primarily for use with college students, or with adults who have had some
college or equivalent education. The test consists of a number of questions, based upon a variety of familiar situations to which two alternative answers are posed in Part I and four alternative answers in Part II. No time limits are set, and the test is essentially self-administering.

There are a total of 120 alternatives, twenty for each of the six values. The weights given by the subject are transcribed onto a separate score sheet. The scores from both parts are assumed to give the score for each value. The total scores for the six columns must be corrected by making slight additions or subtractions as indicated on the score sheet in order to equalize the popularity of the six values. On the basis of the total adjusted scores for each value a profile can be drawn or the scores can be converted into percentile ranks. The authors strongly urged that the results be interpreted as indicating only the relative importance or prominence of each of the values in any personality and not as a manifestation of the total amount of drive (3).

The Study of Values has been briefly considered, and in general the test is adequate to the research project of this thesis. Significant differences on individual values and also in distinctive profiles can be obtained, distinguishing the individual whose pattern being considered into a characteristic group.

The statistical relationship of the total deviation score for accuracy with the raw score of each of the six Values of the Study of Values will be tested by rank correlation in order that the results may be compared. The rank correlations will be tested for significance.

Since the purpose of this thesis is a description of the accurate judge of others in relation to the Study of Values, the groups of accurate judges
will be compared with the less accurate judges. One method of comparison will be to divide the total of judges into two groups, approximately halving the group. One group will be called accurate judges and the other less-accurate judges. With these groups, there can be a test of the significance of mean differences. The second method of comparison will be to compare the means of the Values of the upper and lower quartiles for significance of difference. These comparisons will give profile descriptions of the accurate and less-accurate judges on the Study of Values. Thus a profile comparison of the accurate and less-accurate judges will be shown. Also a profile comparison of the officers and the groups will be made to offer supplementary information.

The group used in this study is the 1961 senior class of Barat College, a liberal arts college for women. Most of the students have known each other for at least a year. They are residents in the college dormitory which affords a basis for a significant degree of contact. Examples of the types of personal contact are weekly class meetings, extra-curricular activities, and particular friendships. The four class officers — the president, vice-president, treasurer, and the secretary — are the subjects who furnish the self-ratings which are the criterion for judgmental accuracy. The class members, 39 of whom participated in this study, are the judges who predict the subject's or class officer's self-judgment.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

There are two main forms of data for each individual class member: the accuracy score which was explained in the experimental procedure and the value scores on the Study of Values. For the class officers the data is their scores on the rating scale. These are the main sources of statistical descriptions and inferences with regard to the null hypothesis that the accurate judges do not differ in values from the less-accurate judges.

The statistical relationship of the total deviation score for accuracy with the raw score of each of the six Values of the Study of Values is shown by a rank correlation. The rank correlations are: Theoretical, .21 (Significant only at the .10 level); Economic, .16; Social, -.23 (Significant only at the .10 level); Aesthetic, -.12; Political, .09; and Religious .01. There is no high correlation indicating that there is no evidence of a high degree of relationship.

The first method of statistical description of the accurate and less-accurate judges is a median division of the total group of 39 judges into a group of 20 accurate judges and a group of 19 less-accurate judges. A .01 level of confidence is to be considered as adequate for statistical significance. The resulting profiles of the means of each of the Values for each group annotated with their degree of significance is presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1 shows that there is only a significant difference at the .10 level between the groups selected by the median division. This is on the Theoretical Value and on the Social Value. The profiles of Figure 1 do not show any predictive value, but only describe the accurate judges as tending to have more of an expression of Theoretical Value and to have less of an expression of the Social Value.

The second method of statistical description of the Accurate and Less-accurate judges is to use the extremes of the upper and lower quartile. These quartiles consist of an n of 10 each. The resulting profiles of the mean of each of the Values annotated with their degree of significance of difference is presented in Figure 2. Figure 2 shows that there is a difference between the means of the upper and lower quartiles of judges on the Economic Value statistically significant only at the .05 level. It also shows a significant difference between the means of the Social and Aesthetic Values at the .10 level. The profile in Figure 2 does not show statistical difference at the .01 level of confidence. The profile of Figure 2 describes the Accurate judges as having more of an Economic Value, and as having less of a Social and Aesthetic Values.

The profile of the class officers, profile A, and the class members, profile B, is shown in Figure 3. There are no statistically significant differences. The class officers are a standard deviation from the mean of the class members on the Political Value. It is noteworthy that the difference might come from a lower Aesthetic and Religious Values based on the interrelationship caused by the forced choice technique in the Study of Values. In the Study of Values Manual the senior class from Barat College compares
Fig. 1. Comparison of the value profiles of accurate and inaccurate judges above and below the median.
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Fig. 2. Comparison of the value profiles of accurate and inaccurate judge in the upper and lower quartiles.
differently from other Women's Colleges (See Table I).

**TABLE I**

Comparison of the Class Members and Female Norms on the Study of Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Religious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Norms</strong></td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>42.78</td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>38.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barat Norms</strong></td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>40.77</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>49.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that every one of the standard deviations of the Barat Norms is less than those of the Female Norms. This shows less dispersion in the Barat Norms than in the Female Norms.
Theoretical Aesthetic Social

Fig. 3. Comparison of the value profiles of the officers and class members.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to investigate the influence of the value of the judges of others on the accuracy of their personal judgment. The first consideration of the data and their statistical analysis is that of the meaning of the rank correlations of judgmental accuracy. None of these rank correlations, although they are significant, are evidence of a relationship of notable magnitude. It must be concluded that the Values of the judges do not influence the judgmental accuracy to a degree which would explain fully the accuracy of personal judgment. This does not mean that values that are different from the Values of the Study of Values do not significantly effect the accuracy of personal judgment. Furthermore, the lack of a relationship found in this study does not negate the possibility that human values in general effect the accuracy of personal judgment. These are aspects which have to be investigated in another study.

Another possible reason for the lack of a relationship might be that the personal judgment of another as assessed in this study is only one part of the process which is involved in personal judgment. It is also possible that the process of expressing the personal judgment on the rating scale adds factors which lessen the effect of values. This would have to be confirmed and verified by future research.

It is interesting and pertinent to relate the correlations obtained in this study with the various findings reviewed in the literature. Fensterheim
and Tresselt (26) found that subjects most often use their own low values to describe the subject. This is also true for this group in that the lower Values in terms of group means have the higher correlations with predictive accuracy. Taft (68) and Allport (3) found that good judges of others are socially detached. The -.23 correlation of predictive accuracy with the Social Value may be an indication of this for the group. In Halpern's study (34) he obtained a .35 correlation with Social Value indicating that this may have been an expression of social orientation but not social dependency for his group.

There seems to be some evidence of a difference of meaning in the Social Value for different groups. The .21 correlation with the Theoretical Value is supported in a general way by the various studies in the Review of the Literature, especially Adams (1). An intellectual frame has a positive but slight relation to judgmental accuracy.

Halpern's study (34) contained a -.338 correlation with Aesthetic Value, and this present study contained a -.12 correlation with Aesthetic Value. Halpern mentioned that this contradicts other studies in that accurate predictors who are psychologists are known to have artistic interests. Bender (7) found that accurate judges were interested in literature but did not excel on the Meier-Seashore Art Judgment Test. Taft (68) also found that accurate judges were artistically sensitive in that they would follow the traditional rules of aesthetic judgment. The Study of Values may not be a measure of this particular interest, being negatively related to accuracy.

The median division of accurate and less-accurate judges shows that only two notable differences are evident (See Figure 1.). They are the Theoretical and Social Values. The difference on the Theoretical Value is
consistent with Taft's (68) description of the good judge as a serious, organized, and reasonable person relying on intelligence and conservatism. The lower Social Value for the accurate judges is consistent with Vernon's finding (70) that the good judge is less sociable.

The quartile division of accurate and less-accurate judges in Figure 2, show notable differences on the Economic, Aesthetic, and Social Values. The less-accurate judges are more Aesthetic which corresponds to Halpern's finding (34), and they are also more Social. The accurate judges are more Economically orientated. This difference is not as great in the median division.

The profile difference in Figure 3, suggests what might be expected in differences of the class member from the class officer. It may be that this peaking by the Political Value may be due to a negative compensation in the lower Religious and Aesthetic Values. It is suggested that in this type of study the forced choice technique of the Study of Values results in an assessment of the relative degree to which various pairs of values are associated. It thus tends to mitigate any absolute comparison of values. An example of this is the fact that a score of 1 on the Political Value is not possible because of the structuring of the Second Part of the Study of Values. This part requires a minimal score of 1 for each of the 15 items, the smallest total being 15 for a Value. There is an inherent limiting of the range of scores which mitigates possible differences. As a result it is difficult to attain significant differences of groups since there would be a natural tendency to normality. To empirically corroborate this, one can inspect the Manual of the Study of Values for any highly significant differences among the groups cited.
The relationship between accuracy in judging others and the Values of the Study of Values was investigated. Thirty-nine members of the senior class at a Catholic College were used as the judges, and the class officers were used as the subjects, or rather, those judged. A rating scale which has its origin in a study conducted by Fiedler (29) was used. There were twenty-four personality traits, each having a six point scale. The class members were told to rate the class officers on these traits, as they estimated the officers would rate themselves. The judges had to pick the particular cell which the subject selected as a self-rating. The cell chosen by the subject is the basis for the determination of accuracy for a particular trait. The deviation for each of the traits is added and the sums of each of the subjects is totaled, giving a total accuracy score. The lower the total accuracy score is the less the deviation from the subject's self-rating, and the more accurate is the judge ranked. The class members or judges also completed the Study of Values on another occasion.

The statistical relationship of the total deviation score for accuracy with the raw score of each of the six Values of the Study of Values was tested by rank correlation. The results in terms of these correlations show significant correlations which are generally low and not indicative of a close relationship. The negative correlation with Social Value as found in this present study is consistent with Vernon (70), as an expression of less sociability, or with Taft,
(68) as an expression of social orientation without social dependency.

The first method of the statistical description of the accurate and less-accurate judges was a median division of the total group of judges. The median division of the accurate and less-accurate judges shows that only two notable differences on the Theoretical Value and Social Value are evident. The differences on the Theoretical Value are consistent with Taft's (68) description of the good judge as a serious, organized person, relying on intelligence and conservatism. The lower Social Value for the accurate judges is consistent with Vernon's finding (70) that the good judge is less sociable.

Secondly, the quartile division of accurate and less-accurate judges shows notable differences on the Economic, Aesthetic, and Social Values. The less-accurate judges are more Aesthetic which corresponds to Halpern's finding (34). They are also more Social which has been previously discussed. The accurate judges are more Economically orientated. This same degree of difference does not show in the median division.

The various significances on the Values of the quartile and median groups do not reach the acceptable level of .01. The groups only give tentative descriptions of what the accurate judges have tended toward in terms of values. They do not mark statistically significant characteristics of the accurate judges. This does not mean that other values which are not measured by the Study of Values have not a significant effect on judgmental accuracy. The predictive efficiency of the Study of Values is very limited. It is suggested that more favorable results might be attained if some other means of the assessment of values were utilized.
The comparison of the profiles of the class officers with the class members supports the general expectation that the class officers as a group are noticeably higher on the Political Value. In spite of this noticeable difference, there is not a statistical significance to the difference. This leads to a questioning of the value of the Study of Values for predictive significance. In general it can be said that there is no evidence in this study for a significant relationship of values to accuracy in judging others.
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# APPENDIX I

## RATING BLANK 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating #</th>
<th>Describe</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Sociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Timid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungrateful</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Grateful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softhearted</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Hardhearted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meek</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Quick-tempered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Impractical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boastful</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>![Rating Scale]</td>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Underpendable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX II

**SCORES OF STUDY OF VALUES OF THE CLASS OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theo</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Aest</th>
<th>Soci</th>
<th>Poli</th>
<th>Reli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX III

## Accuracy of Judgment and Study of Values Scores

For the Twenty Most Accurate Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Theo</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Aest</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Poli</th>
<th>Reli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Theo</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Aest</th>
<th>Soci</th>
<th>Poll</th>
<th>Reli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX IV

**Accuracy of Judgment and Values Scores**

For Nineteen Less Accurate Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Accuracy Score</th>
<th>Theo</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Asst</th>
<th>Soci</th>
<th>Poli</th>
<th>Reli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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