PERSON PERCEPTION AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE OF SOCIAL DELINQUENTS

by Raymond J. Parthun

Thesis presented to the School of Psychology and Education of the University of Ottawa as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree

Ottawa, Canada, 1963

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the direction of Professor Maurice Chagnon, Ph.D., of the School of Psychology and Education of the University of Ottawa.

The writer would also like to express his appreciation and indebtedness to the staff of the University of Ottawa Computing Centre who were so helpful; to the Department of Reform Institutions of Ontario, particularly Mr. J.M. Marsland, Superintendent of the Ontario Reformatory, Millbrook, and his staff, for granting working time and their whole-hearted support in the research project and, lastly, to the inmates at Millbrook who offered their earnest cooperation.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Raymond J. Parthun was born May 29, 1936, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He obtained the Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Marquette University in 1959.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter page

Appendix

LIST OF TABLES

Table page

INTRODUCTION

The general area of person perception in social psychology is composed of many smaller areas each with its own problems and questions to be answered. The particular aspect of person perception to be investigated in this study is the perception of personality traits of others, with particular regard to the contribution of social intelligence to this aspect.

Neither perception of personality traits of others, nor social intelligence has been studied with respect to social delinquents. The term, social delinquent, as defined in this study refers to an adult incarcerated offender. At the same time, social delinquents would appear to provide fertile ground for study of these aspects, since, en groupe, social delinquents can be approached as a kind of social phenomenon. This leads one to speculate about their ability, both in terms of social intelligence and their perception of other persons. For example, it might be questioned whether a lack of acuity in perceiving others is operating in their behavior. On the other hand, one might consider the opposing viewpoint that social delinquents abound in interpersonal sensitivity but because of their extreme egocentrism use this ability in a socially unacceptable or destructive manner. Still, another approach might be that

social delinquents possess a considerable interpersonal facility and acuity, which becomes obscured by the emphasis society places instead on their antisocial tendencies and behavior.

This study does not purport to investigate these speculations. They serve, rather, to highlight the general need for research in this area and the timeliness of this study. The present investigation also makes use of several procedural controls not found in past research methodology in this area, i.e., a multivariate type design and a somewhat more objective method of measuring person perception which, although far from being perfect, seems to offer better chances for experimental reproducibility.

Chapter one is in three sections, the first of which provides a general orientation to the study. This is followed by a review of the single study related to this research problem. In conclusion, the formal statement of the hypothesis to be tested is stated.

The experimental design is set forth in chapter two. A review of the literature on the test of social intelligence used is followed by a description of the procedures adopted for the measurement of personality trait perception. The description of the sample population and the statistical procedures employed conclude the chapter.

In the third chapter, the results are presented and discussed, followed by the summary and conclusions with implications for future research.

CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

1. Background.

Person perception has been studied within a theoretical framework only for the past several decades. Prior to this, the field of study was referred to as character judgment. This latter approach was characterized by studies in methodology, e.g., showing the efficacy of rating techniques in personality assessment generally, statistical procedures applicable to ratings primarily in establishing reliability measures, and an emphasis on attempting to measure accuracy of judgments, most often using group opinion as the criterion of accuracy. Generally, much of this work has remained of historical interest only.

The most recent phase of study, now called person perception, impression formation or interpersonal perception, has taken on a more acceptable dimension in that it has been linked with perceptual theory. The thinking of Asch,[1] Wolff,[2]

---

1 S. Asch, "Forming Impressions of People", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 47, No. 3, 1946, p. 258-290.

2 W. Wolff, The Expression of Personality: Experimental Depth Psychology, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1943, 334 p.

Brunswick,[3] Bruner,[4] and Heider[5] was approached with more or less stated or implied perceptual theory which can, perhaps, be specifically called hypothesis theory, making use of the concepts of set, expectation, or cognitive predisposition as focal points. A short resume of this kind of theorizing might clarify what is meant. As Asch[6] stated:

> We look at a person and immediately a certain impression of his character forms itself in us. This remarkable capacity (...) is a precondition of social life. Our impression is unified, it is of one person.

After a series of experiments, he concluded that in forming impressions the individual relates trait concepts, which can be related to specific behavior and therefore the unified impression depends upon the relationship of the concepts, and not merely their summated characteristics. This emphasis of the unified impression and the total impression being more than the sum total of the parts can be classified as a Gestalt approach.

---

3 E. Brunswick, "Remarks on Functionalism in Perception", Perception and Personality: A Symposium, Edited by J.S. Bruner, D. Krech, Duke University Press, 1950, p. 56-65.

4 J.S. Bruner, "Personality Dynamics and Perceiving", Perception An Approach to Personality, Edited by R. Blake and G. Ramsey, Ronald Press Co., New York, p. viii-442.

5 F. Heider, The Psychology of Interpersonal Relationships, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1958, p. ix-322.

6 Asch, Op. Cit., p. 258.

Others have thought that in forming impressions of other persons one starts with partial information. These shreds of evidence are the bases of inferences about other persons, as Bruner, Shapiro and Taguiri have said: "One knows more about a person than what seems to be immediately connoted by the acts one has witnessed or the information one has gained about him".[7] According to this approach, whatever was inferred about others from these bits of information was based upon a set of expectations about the nature of persons which proceeds from one's experience with behavior. The expectations are justified by the apparent consistencies and inconsistencies of persons who have become part of one's experience. This view is not essentially any different than Hilgard's[8] thinking except that he postulated perceptual purposefulness in that the goal of perception is fundamentally to keep the world stable and meaningful and to achieve clarity and definiteness in apprehension of objects even though the cues furnished might be ambiguous.

---

7 J.S. Bruner, D. Shapiro and R. Taguiri, "The Meaning of Traits in Isolation and in Combination", in Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Edited by R. Taguiri and L. Petrullo, Standford University Press, 1958, p. 277-288.

8 E. Hilgard, "Role of Learning in Perception", in Perception an Approach to Personality, Edited by R. Blake and G. Ramsay, Ronald Press Co., New York, 1951, p. 95-120.

Emphasizing more basic considerations, the person perception theorist considers that social interaction takes up a good portion of a person's life and that among the many possible modes of behavior in situations only a few are appropriate. The appropriateness must be learned and depends upon experience. To choose the appropriate mode of behavior in a given situation one must "size up the situation" so to speak. This appropriateness of behavior is much akin to concepts of social intelligence as mentioned by Allport[9] and Thorndike.[10] From this arises the consideration that perhaps the theoretical tenet of choosing the appropriate mode of behavior in a social situation, and all that it implies from a perceptual point of view, can be investigated by the measurement of social intelligence. Of interest, also, is that Allport[11] considers social intelligence to be one of eight requisites for accuracy in judging other persons' personality characteristics. However, little research has been reported to substantiate this supposition.

A problem to be investigated, then, is whether social intelligence is associated with trait perception. On the basis of past research literature, it could formally be hypothesized that theoretically it should be. Trait perception, as defined in this study, refers to the ability

---

9 G.W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation, Henry Holt Co., New York, 1937, p. xiv-588.

10 E.L. Thorndike, "Intelligence and Its Uses", Harpers Magazine, Vol. 140, No. 836, 1920, p. 227-235.

11 Allport, Op. Cit., p. 516.

of social delinquents to perceive personality traits of others, to the degree that the other persons say they possess these traits. Categorically, this is an operational definition which does not imply that the traits under consideration are realities, and the true personality characteristics of the persons perceived. Accordingly, the experimental hypothesis will necessarily test the relationship obtained between social intelligence and specific personality traits rather than global impressions, in order to determine the contributory value of social intelligence in trait perception. Before stating the hypothesis formally, perhaps it would be beneficial to note the past research related to the problem.

2. Review of the Literature.

The problem of social intelligence and its association with ability to perceive personality traits of other persons was investigated by Vernon[12] as part of a larger study. Since that time, further studies have not been reported.

Vernon's study was concerned with twenty measures obtained on forty-eight subjects, and the correlations of

---

12 P.E. Vernon, "Some Characteristics of the Good Judge of Personality", Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1933, p. 42-58.

the twenty measures with judgments of personality traits of friends, selves, and strangers. Among the twenty measures were four Rorschach scoring categories, two measures of general intelligence, the Moss-Hunt Social Intelligence Test subtests, 1929 edition, and various inter-subject ratings. Intercorrelations between these variables were found to be high.

Specific to this study, were the intercorrelations between judgments of strangers and Moss-Hunt Test performance.

The correlations obtained between judgments and the Judgment in Social Situations subtest was .36, with Judging Emotions from Literary Quotations .25, with Observation of Human behavior -.32, with Memory for Names and Faces .44, and with Sense of Humor .05. Judgments were also found to be related to abstract intelligence to the extent of .31 which was of interest since abstract intelligence test performance was highly correlated with Moss-Hunt Test performance.[13] This suggested that the obtained correlations were not pure enough to substantiate the conclusions of the study by reason of the mutual influence of the variables upon one another without an attempt to control the interaction.

---

13 Vernon, Op. Cit., p. 54.

Another criticism of Vernon's study was the method of combining scores used as the judgment score. An elaborate method of summation of various scores was described without any statistical basis for combining, i.e., significance of differences between scores was not checked prior to summating and combining them. The question, then, was whether or not the composite scores were appropriate. Perhaps equally important, the reliability of the scores, instruments, and judgment scores were not mentioned and therefore it might be assumed that this was not investigated.

Finally, the sample was selected according to a criterion which consisted of having each of the forty-eight subjects well acquainted with at least six other members of the sample. This might have introduced sample biases, the influence of which could have produced biased results. Neither was there mentioned that a control group was used or at least investigating the differences in judgment scores between the subjects who knew each other and those whom they did not know.

Accordingly, the obtained correlation between the Moss-Hunt Test and judgments of personality characteristics as measured in Vernon's study were not considered conclusive. He[14] also noted that a

---

14 Vernon, Op. Cit., p. 56.

multivariate design should be used to control variable interaction effects on the correlations but intimates that his sample size was not sufficient for such elaborate techniques.

The present study will investigate social intelligence, controlling for general intelligence, and its relationship to perception of personality traits of others, using a multivariate design as suggested by Vernon. Another variable to be assessed as an independent variable is educational level, since Cattell[15] suggested that educational level could be a second source for a noted relationship between general intelligence and tact in social situations. Age was thought to be another variable which could be justifiably assessed in relation to perception of another's personality traits, as it was noted by the writer that the social delinquents used in the study differed in social adroitness, the older inmates being more socially facile and the younger inmates being more socially gauche. Intelligence will also be assessed in this study since the previously noted relationship between performance scores on tests of abstract intelligence and performance on the Moss-Hunt Test could be considered a contaminating variable

---

15 R.B. Cattell, Personality - A Systematic Theoretical and Factual Study, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1950, p. 22.

in terms of statistical inference. Bruner and Taguiri[16] have presented an excellent review of the studies investigating the relationship between general or abstract intelligence and ability to perceive personality traits of other persons. To review these studies here would be a repetition of their work. However, the conclusion they have drawn from these studies has indicated that there is a slight positive relationship between general intelligence and accuracy of judging personality traits of others.

3. Hypothesis.

Because of the complexity, often bordering on complete ambiguity, of past research findings, the hypothesis tested in this study was out of necessity stated in the null form, since these studies did not lend much support for stating a directional hypothesis. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that social intelligence is not a contributing variable to personality trait perception. As noted previously, this hypothesis will be tested for each trait singly, on the basis of the number of traits found to be reliable in the ratings. The methods and design used to test the hypothesis will follow in the next chapter.

---

16 J.S. Bruner and R. Taguiri, "Perception of People", Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2, Addison Wesley Co., Cambridge, 1954, p. 634-654.

CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This chapter is a presentation of the procedures and methods used in testing the hypothesis. Section one will consist of a short review of the literature concerned with the measurement of social intelligence and especially that of the Moss-Hunt-Omwake Test. Sections two and three will deal with the methods used in obtaining the data, photographing the persons which were used as the person stimuli for personality trait perception, constructing a personality trait rating scale, and obtaining the data on age, intelligence test performance, and educational level of the inmate sample. Lastly, section four will describe the sample of inmates used in the study, testing conditions, and procedures. Section five deals with reliability statistics and the last section will describe the statistical methods used in analyzing the data.

1. The Moss-Hunt-Omwake Test.

One of the specific intellectual abilities cited by E.L. Thorndike[1] in 1920, was social intelligence. This he

---

1 E.L. Thorndike, "Intelligence and Its Uses", Harper's Magazine, Vol. 140, No. 836, 1920, p. 227-237.

defined as, "the ability to understand and manage men, women, boys and girls, i.e., to act wisely in human relationships".[2]

Following this, many attempts have been made to construct tests intended to measure the social aspect of intelligence. On the one hand, methods in which social interests, attitudes and adjustment were assayed; on the other, the measurement of acquired social information was undertaken. Thorndike and Stein[3] and Jackson[4] have prepared excellent reviews of these methods.

One of the earliest attempts to measure social intelligence with some degree of precision was by F.A. Moss and T. Hunt in 1926. Their effort resulted in the Moss-Hunt Social Intelligence Test[5] published by George Washington University. This test has been revised twice, most recently in 1949.

The Moss-Hunt Test consists of five subtests entitled Judgment in Social Situations, Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker, Memory for Names

---

2 Thorndike, Op. Cit., p. 228.

3 R.L. Thorndike and S. Stein, "An Evaluation of the Attempts to Measure Social Intelligence", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 5, 1937, p. 275-285.

4 V.D. Jackson, "Social Proficiency", Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1940, p. 422-474.

5 Hereafter referred to as the Moss-Hunt Test.

and Faces, Observation of Human Behavior, and Sense of Humor. Reported reliabilities[6] for this test range from a corrected split-half of .72 to a .89 test-retest coefficient. Hunt reported the .89 when the test was administered to a group of one hundred sophomores a second time after a lapse of four months.[7] Other reported reliabilities have been listed in the test manual.[8]

On the basis of these reported reliabilities, the assumption can be made that if the Moss-Hunt Test has measured social intelligence, it has done so reliably. However, it was noted that the reliabilities were obtained for samples of above average educational level, i.e., college students, high school seniors, and adults who had finished high school.

Several types of evidence have been accumulated on the validity of the Moss-Hunt Test. Hunt[9] noted marked occupational differences in test scores; e.g., executive salesmen and teachers made higher scores while clerks and

---

6 T. Hunt, "The Measurement of Social Intelligence", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1928, p. 317-334.

7 Ibid., p. 323.

8 F.A. Moss, T. Hung, W. Omwake, and J. Woodward, Social Intelligence Test Manual, George Washington University Centre for Psychological Services, Washington, D.C., 1949.

9 Hunt, Op. Cit., p. 324.

unskilled laborers made low scores. This might be evidence if one were to assume that executive salesmen and teachers were more concerned with getting along with people. However, as was pointed out subsequently by other investigators, no effort was made to study the effects of verbal or abstract intelligence as related to Moss-Hunt Test performance.

Strang's[10] data on 311 graduate students resulted in no significant relationship between the Moss-Hunt Test scores and participation in club activities. Thorndike and Stein,[11] in examining the distribution of the activity scores in Strang's data, noted a marked skewness and thus questioned the correlation technique used and thus her interpretation of the data also.

Broom[12] found a coefficient equal to .86 between the Moss-Hunt Test and the Thorndike Intelligence Examination. In the discussion of the results he suggested the possibility that reading ability was the common factor which might have accounted for the high correlation. In a further study designed to partial out the effects of reading ability, Broom concluded:

---

10 R. Strang, "Relation of Social Intelligence to Certain Other Factors", School and Society, Vol. 32, No. 820, 1930, p. 268-272.

11 Thorndike and Stein, Op. Cit., p. 279.

12 E. Broom, "A Note on the Validity of a Test of Social Intelligence", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1928, p. 426-428.

> (...) that the marked correlation between Social Intelligence Test Scores and academic intelligence as measured by the Thorndike Intelligence Examination is really a self correlation of reading comprehension as measured in the two tests. Reading then is the common factor as suggested in the earlier study.[13]

Thorndike, after a factor analysis of the Moss-Hunt Test, using the 1927 edition, concluded:

> (...) that although the Moss-Hunt Test may tap slightly some unique measure of ability, it measures primarily the ability to understand and work with words which bulk so large in an abstract intelligence test.[14]

Woodrow[15] in a factor analytic study of fifty-two mental tests, one of which was the Moss-Hunt Test, found three of the subtests to correlate highly with a verbal factor, one with a visual-spatial factor, and one with a social factor. Kaess and Witryol[16] compared the Memory for Names and Faces subtest scores with memory for names and faces in a life situation. They found a correlation of

---

13 E. Broom, "A Further Study of the Validity of a Test of Social Intelligence", Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 22, No. 5, 1930, p. 405.

14 R.L. Thorndike, "Factor Analysis of Social and Abstract Intelligence", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 27, No. 3, 1936, p. 233.

15 H. Woodrow, "The Common Factors of Fifty-Two Mental Tests", Psychometrica, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1939, p. 98-108.

16 W. Kaess and S. Witryol, "Memory for Names and Faces: A Characteristic of Social Intelligence", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 39, No. 6, 1955, p. 457-462.

.27 for 111 males and a .25 for ninety-nine females between the two scores. Both of these correlations were significant at the .01 level.

The outstanding criticisms resulting from validation studies of the Moss-Hunt Test have been: a noted positive correlation with tests of abstract and verbal intelligence, and with verbal factors in factor analytic studies. However, the samples used were invariably skewed in the direction of better than average verbal skills and it might be conceivable that this was another common factor accounting for the obtained positive relationships.

In spite of these criticisms, the use of the Moss-Hunt Test as the measure of social intelligence needed for this study was justified by Allport's statement that:

> These charges are not altogether relevant. General intelligence must be expected to influence the formation of this trait and a moderate overlap is not injurious to this concept of social intelligence.[17]

Another weighty consideration in the decision to use the Moss-Hunt Test for this study was the availability of five subtests each measuring an ability thought to be related to social intelligence. The Memory for Names and Faces subtest as well as the Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest have been found to be associated with

---

17 G.W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation, Henry Holt, New York, 1937, p. 427.

social factors, whereas the other three seem to be related to verbal factors. Accordingly, assessment of each subtest might act as a further validation of the two subtests related to social factors, as well as allowing assessment of the other three subtests while controlling verbal influence as measured by abstract intelligence test scores. It was thought possible that independent assessment of each of the Moss-Hunt Test subtests might result in certain subtests being more valid for personality trait ratings than a single score made up of the five subtests.

Applying a readability index[18] to the Moss-Hunt Test indicated that a seventh grade comprehension level was necessary to understand the items of the test. The inmate sample participating in this study averaged 7.46 school grades completed which was the only measure of comprehension obtained. The assumption was that individuals attaining a grade level of seven also are at this level of comprehension. This was not considered a serious drawback in sampling since the individuals making up a reformatory population often are of higher intellectual capacity than indicated by their school records. For this sample, the descriptive statistics in Table I indicate that the mean Moss-Hunt Test total score was 79.87 with a standard deviation of 26.00 and a

---

18 R. Flesch, The Art of Plain Talk, Harper and Bros., New York, 1946, p. 195-205.

Table I.-

Descriptive Statistics of the Moss-Hunt Test Subtest Scores as Obtained from the Samples Used in This Study.

Test	Mean	Standard Deviation
Judgment in Social Situations	16.26	4.87
Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker	24.21	5.79
Memory for Names and Faces	10.16	6.17
Observation of Human Behavior	19.14	8.62
Sense of Humor	9.94	4.65
Total Test Score	79.87	26.01

range of 116 points. The mean subtest scores ranged from 9.94 to 24.21 with a standard deviation range from 4.65 to 8.62.

2. Person Perception Stimuli.

The persons to be photographed were selected on the basis of test-retest consistency of their personality factor scores as measured by Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Test, Forms A and B.[16]

The 16 P.F was administered to forty male students of an introductory laboratory course in psychology. The time interval of the test-retest was one week. Since the forty individuals of this group were of French, English, and bilingual French-English origin, a time limit of fifty minutes was imposed assuming that those of the group not completing the test within this time, would be those with difficulty in reading English.

Sixteen of the forty individuals finished the test. These sixteen were able to converse, read, and write the English language fluently. Two methods were used to determine the amount of consistency between each of the sixteen individual's scores on Forms A and B of the 16 P.F test. A *t* test for correlated mean scores for each individual resulted in no significant differences for any of the

---

16 Hereafter referred to as the 16 P.F. Test.

sixteen individuals. The greatest mean raw score difference between Forms A and B was 1.50 and with 15df a *t* equal to 1.75 was necessary for significance at the .05 level. A *t* of 1.08 was obtained which was significant only at the .15 level. The least mean raw score difference was .00 which was significant at greater than the .50 level. Thus, no individual in the group responded significantly differently on Forms A and B of the test. The final choice of the individuals to be photographed was made after the application of the second method of determining consistency.

The second method consisted in determining the absolute differences between raw scores on each factor for each individual. The individuals responding the least differently in terms of absolute difference were four in number. Their scores ranged from thirty-three to forty-nine, these being the least absolute difference scores of the total sixteen scores. These four individuals were then photographed.

The photographic equipment consisted of a Leica 3F camera with a 50 mm lens set at 1/25 of a second with an f stop of 3.5, four 375 watt Westinghouse photomedium beams, two Westinghouse No. 1 three hour fotoflood lights, a Ziess-Ikon Ikophat Photometer, a cream colored, porous window shade thirty-six inches in width as the backdrop and Kodak Ectochrome type F indoor film with an ASA rating of 16.

The photomedium beams were set at a distance of sixty-five inches from the backdrop with the beams directed at the photographee. The fotoflood lights were placed to the right and left of the photographee at a distance of thirty-five inches slightly below the level of the face cutting down the shadows of the photomedium beams. This lighting arrangement resulted in an Icophat photometric reading of eleven with the lens speed and aperture as stated above.

The camera was not mounted but a distance of twelve inches between the camera lens and face of the photographee remained constant. The distance between the photographee's head and backdrop was eleven inches. Three negatives were obtained for each of the four individuals in order to rule out gross facial inconsistencies and bet er ascertain facial constancy through a time dimension.

The four individuals possessed no characteristic facial marks such as scars, mustache, or facial muscular distortions. If they wore glasses, these were removed during the photographing. Each wore the same clothing which extended from the neck downward assuring constancy of the clothing parts shown in the full face photographs. It was clearly understood by each individual that they were not to assume any pose such as smiling or rigidity of the face.

In short, expressionlessness was sought, second only to natural facial characteristics.

The resulting photonegatives were made up into slides which could be projected onto a screen as the person stimuli for personality trait rating.

3. Person Perception Rating Scale.

The method of measuring personality trait perception consisted of a rating scale derived from the 16 P.F. test of Cattell.[17] The sixteen traits were presented as descriptive adjectives, i.e., instead of Schizothymia versus Cyclothymia, the words Sociable versus Unsociable were used. These sixteen traits were arranged in bipolar pairs, e.g., Aggressive versus Submissive and Dependent versus Independent, et cetera. In addition, each descriptive trait was further defined by more popular terms such as "easy going" and "friendly" for Sociable.[18] Using this method of presentation the trait meaning was made constant, controlling somewhat, any gross attributive differences in trait meaning between the raters.

The rating categories were five in number, wherein either one of each pair of traits could be indicated as

---

17 R.B. Cattell, Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Champaign, 1957, ii-54 p.

18 See Appendix XIV, p. 67-75.

being possessed by the photographed person "very much", "more of one than the other", or "sometimes both". The following example illustrates one factor with its trait descriptions, their definitions as suggested by Cattell[19] and the categories as used in this study:

A. Sociable - easy going, cooperative, warm hearted toward others.

B. Unsociable - hostile, indifferent toward others.

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very Much B

Accordingly, the rater would circle either A or B, i.e., Sociable or Unsociable and, secondly, one of the categories corresponding to the trait circled as shown above. Further, each of the categories was defined and printed on the instruction sheet of the rating scale.[20] The five categories roughly corresponded to an arbitrary division of the personality Trait Profile sten scores of the 16 P.F. test; i.e., "very much A" included sten scores 9 to 11; "more A than B", sten scores 7 to 9; "sometimes A sometimes B", sten scores 5 to 7; "more B than A", sten scores 3 to 5; and "very much B", sten scores 1 to 3. It was thought that the advantage of this type of rating scale provided for a comparison of rating scores with the

---

19 Cattell, Op. Cit., p. 11-19.

20 See Appendix XIV, p. 67-75 for rating scale instructions.

obtained profile scores of the photographed persons. Also, the two circle method, i.e., circling a trait and a category was thought to make the trait rating more meaningful and reduce the chance of rating errors often found in rating methods.

The ratings were scored on the basis of position error. For example, if the photographed person's profile score for factor A (Sociable - Unsociable) was sten 3, and the rating was circled Sociable and category "very much A", this represented a deviation of position and, in this instance, an overrating, i.e., the person located himself on the Unsociable end of the scale while the rater placed him on the Sociable end.

A scoring system was devised whereby the score was a representation of amount of position deviation. This consisted in numbering the categories, from right to left, 0 to 4. Accordingly, in the example above the rating score for a single factor can be shown as follows:

A Sociable
B Unsociable

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very Much B
4	3	2	1	0

The person located himself at "X" and the rater locates the person at the circle, the score would be one minus 4 which equals a score of 3.

Having obtained a deviation score for each of the pairs of traits, the final rating score for a single picture was the absolute sum of the deviations, i.e., the pluses minus the minuses. Accordingly, each rater received four rating scores, one for each photograph and a total score which consisted of an absolute sum of the four scores. For example, one rater obtained the following four scores: 10, 8, -6, -2, which would result in a total score of 10. This total score was used as the measure of personality trait rating error for each of the raters. Using this method, personality trait rating has been defined as an amount of error as suggested by Woodworth.[21]

Four forms of the rating scale were devised so that each form consisted of a different order of trait presentation. It was thought that this would counterbalance any rating bias due to trait sequence, attribution of meaning of traits due to constant proximity and general learning effects. The four forms were checked for comparability before using them as a single group of ratings. This will be discussed in the section on reliability measures to follow. However, the mean rating scores and standard deviations are shown in Appendix 1 for each trait.

---

21 R.S. Woodworth, Experimental Psychology, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1939, p. 249.

4. The Description of the Sample.

The inmates participating in this study were from the population of the Ontario Maximum Security Reformatory located in Millbrook, Ontario. Individuals at this reformatory have been convicted of indictable offenses, their range of sentence ranging from several months to several years. The population can be classified as comprising three types of social delinquency. The first group are incorrigible individuals whose offenses range from simple assault, theft, conversion, and arson, to rape, violent assault, and fraud. Included also in this first group are offenders sent to Millbrook from other reform institutions because of their non-conformity. The second group include all individuals convicted of sex offenses involving girls and boys who are not sexually mature, homosexuals convicted of gross indecency and other sex offense categories. The third group are drug addicts convicted of addiction, possession or marketing of drugs. The total institution population at the time of the study was 151 inmates. The average age of the final sample was 29.04 years with an age range of 40 years and a standard deviation of 7.43 years. The mean I.Q. as measured by the Otis Quick Scoring Intelligence Examination-Beta Form A for grades four to nine was 89.51 with a range of 68 points and a standard deviation of 14.56 points. The

mean educational level was 7.46 grades with a range of 10 and a standard deviation of 2.01 grades.

Initially, the entire institutional population was contacted for participation in the study. Of the total potential sample of 151 men, 39 refused to participate which was further broken down to 30 drug addicts, 5 incorrigibles, and 4 sex offenders. In addition to this drop out, seven were above the age of fifty-nine years, the maximum age set for this study; 8 had language problems,severe enough to eliminate them immediately; 17 were released before the study was completed and 3 became physically ill while the study was in progress. Of the remaining seventy-seven who did participate in the study, 25 were incorrigibles, 37 were sex offenders, and 15 were drug addicts.

5. Procedure.

Individuals of the sample were assembled in groups of seven on a random basis, i.e., numbers were assigned to each individual and the table of random numbers was used for grouping. The choice of seven in a group was dictated by reason of the maximum security regulations of the reformatory and also the nature of the procedures used in obtaining personality trait ratings, i.e., seven individuals could be grouped equidistant from the photograph's projection on a screen. The place of testing was a classroom,

well lighted and with comfortable desk-chairs. The experimenter monitered all testing and read the instructions for all materials used.

In addition to the Moss-Hunt Test and the personality trait ratings, the Otis Intelligence Examination with a time limit of thirty minutes was used. The order of sequence in testing was the Otis Intelligence Examination, the Moss-Hunt Test, 1949 edition; with time limits for each subtest; and the Personality Trait Rating Scale.

The suggested forty minute time limit for the Moss-Hunt Test was found to be insufficient for this population after testing a group of fifteen individuals not included in the sample. For this reason, the following time limits for each subtest were imposed: subtest I, 30 minutes; subtest II, 10 minutes; subtest III, 10 minutes; subtest IV, 20 minutes; and subtest V, 15 minutes. With these limits, everyone had equal time for each test ruling out the possibility that some would not have sufficient time for the latter subtests as was noted in the pre-run test of fifteen individuals. A fifteen minute break between the intelligence tests and the personality ratings gave the individuals a chance to smoke, walk around and talk among themselves.

The rating scales were distributed so that each individual was given a different form than the individual

next to whom he was sitting, eliminating the opportunity for copying. The instructions for the rating procedures were read by the experimenter as printed on the face sheet of each set of ratings. After this, any questions asked concerning the method of rating were answered, making reasonably sure that everyone understood the directions. In addition, the experimenter circulated among the group after the first photograph was projected and during which each group was rating to make sure that everyone was rating as instructed.

Each photograph was projected onto a screen, placed fourteen feet from the projector. All raters were within four to six feet from the screen directly before the central projection area. The angle of vision was not measured since it was assumed to be straight ahead using these methods. Each photograph remained projected for the length of time it took each group to complete a rating. The average time for each rating was approximately twelve minutes. Also at the time of the first photograph rating, the experimenter gave the following additional information to each group: "All the persons you will see in the pictures will be males, over eighteen years of age, None of them are or were prisoners nor law enforcement officers." At no time was any other information given about the persons in the photographs. Accordingly, it was thought that the raters

were forced to rate personality traits with a minimal number of anchoring cues which was crucial for this study since the personality perceptions needed to be as equally a function of the raters as the stimuli and hopefully more so.

The remainder of the data for the study was collected from the institutional files which listed the individual's age and educational attainment level.

6. Reliability Statistics.

Table II indicates the obtained corrected split-half reliability coefficients for each test. Generally, the reliability of the Otis Test was comparable to reported reliabilities presented in Buros.[22] The Moss-Hunt Test reliability of total test score was comparable to that presented in the manual.[23] The Moss-Hunt Test subtest reliabilities, not reported elsewhere, indicated that taken individually the subtests vary considerably in the obtained coefficients. However, it was assumed that all the tests, including the subtests of lower reliabilities were sufficiently reliable for experimental purposes.

---

22 O.K. Buros, Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Gryphon Press, New York, 1959, p. 499.

23 Moss-Hunt, et al., Op. Cit., p. 2.

Table II.-

Obtained and Corrected Split-Half Reliability Coefficients for Each Test and Subtest Used in the Study.

Test	r	rtt
Otis Test	.97	.98
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.86	.92
Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker Score	.47	.63
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.80	.88
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.47	.64
Sense of Humor Score	.68	.80
Total Test Score	.84	.91

Reliability of the rating scale was obtained by calculating the greatest mean differences between the four forms according to each trait. As shown in Table III, the rating scale forms were found to be significantly different in mean rating of the traits Intelligence versus Dullness, Adventurousness versus Shy, Dependency versus Independency, Shrewdness versus Awkwardness, and Excitability versus Composure. Accordingly, these traits were eliminated from the study and it was assumed that for rating purposes the rating scale forms were reliable for the remaining traits.

The photographs were checked for comparability and since the ratings were pooled for four photographs the significance of differences between photographs in rating error was calculated. Table IV indicates the greatest mean differences between photographs according to trait and the resultant *t* value. A 1.99 and a 2.63 with 76 degrees of freedom were needed for significance at the .05 level and the .01 level respectively. Accordingly, since no difference was found to be significant, it was assumed that the photographs were comparable and that it was justifiable to pool the ratings of the four photographs. This pooled rating score for the four photographs was considered to be the error rating score for this study.

Table III.-

Greatest Mean Differences Between Rating Scale Forms According to Factor with *t* Value.

Factor	Greatest Mean Difference	*t*
Sociable vs. Unsociable	.73	1.13
Intelligent vs. Dull	1.67	2.28
Patience vs. Impatience	1.16	1.76
Aggressivity vs. Submissiveness	.26	.36
Talkativeness vs. Silence	.27	1.03
Dependable vs. Undependable	.94	1.32
Adventurous vs. Shyness	1.84	2.59
Sensitive vs. Tough	1.51	2.22
Jealous vs. Trustful	1.37	2.40
Absentminded vs. Practical	1.19	1.51
Sophisticated vs. Simple	1.38	2.60
Insecure vs. Confident	.57	.96
Conservative vs. Liberal	.64	.82
Resourceful vs. Dependent	1.89	1.47
Exactness vs. Laxness	.38	.49
Excitable vs. Composed	1.47	3.19

Table IV.-

Greatest Mean Rating Differences Between Photographs According to Factor with the Obtained *t* Value.

Factor	Greatest Mean Differences	*t*
Sociable vs. Unsociable	.28	1.00
Patience vs. Impatience	.74	1.00
Aggressivity vs. Submissiveness	.10	.03
Talkativeness vs. Silence	.37	1.01
Dependable vs. Undependable	1.32	.09
Absentminded vs. Practical	.26	1.00
Insecure vs. Confident	.54	1.00
Conservative Vs. Liberal	.54	1.00
Resourceful vs. Dependent	1.66	1.07
Exactness vs. Laxness	.80	1.00

7. Statistical Procedures.

In addition to the reliability statistics mentioned above, the data was analysed by means of correlational techniques. For the computation involved, the author had at his disposal an IBM 650 Model 4 computer.

First, Pearson r's were computed between each of the independent variables and each personality trait rating score.[24] Secondly, each set of ratings for each trait taken singly was considered a criterion variable for the independent variables and beta coefficients were calculated. The formula for calculating beta coefficients was the normal equation solution, formula 16.13, as given by Guilford.[25] Beta weights were then calculated by multiplying each beta coefficient by its corresponding Pearson coefficient. Multiple correlation coefficients were obtained directly from the beta weights using formula:

$$R^2 = \beta 12 r12 + \beta 13 r13 + \ldots \beta 19 r19.$$[26]

The correctness of the multiple solutions was checked using formula:

$$r12 = \beta 12 + r23\beta 13 + r24\beta 14 + \ldots r29\beta 19.$$[27]

---

24 University of Ottawa Computing Centre, IBM Program U7101.

25 J.P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, McGraw Hill Co., 1956, p. 406.

26 Ibid., p. 409.

27 Ibid., p. 409.

The work table used in checking the correctness of the multiple solution is presented in Appendix 2.

The multiple coefficients were corrected for sample bias using formula:

$$CR^2 = 1-(1-R^2)\left(\frac{N-1}{N-m}\right)$$

as suggested by Guilford[28] since the sample size was less than one hundred.

Finally, only those multiple correlations which were found to be statistically significant will be discussed in the following chapter.

---

28 Guilford, Op. Cit., p. 409.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first consists of the presentation of the experimental findings and their interpretation within the context of the study. The discussion follows wherein the findings are related to previous research. In the third section, the results are summarized and the conclusions presented, followed by suggestions for further research.

1. The Results and Their Interpretation.

Table V indicates that six of the coefficients between Age and the remaining independent variables were negative. Four of these were significant at the .05 level or more, i.e., significant inverse relationships were obtained between Age and Otis Test Score where r equaled -.44; Age and Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker, -.36; Age and Memory for Names and Faces, -.40; and Age with Moss-Hunt Total Score where r equaled -.24. For significance at the .05 level an r equal to .23 or better was needed. It would appear that higher Age was definitely associated with poorer performance scores on the Otis Test, Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest, Memory for Names and Faces subtest, and total

Table V.-

Correlation Matrix of Coefficients Obtained Between the Variables Assessed in This Experiment.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	-	.09	-.45	-.16	-.37	-.41	.01	-.15	-.24	.11	.17	-.16	.23	.10	-.15	.01	.12	.19	.04
2		-	.44	.47	.46	.27	.26	.37	.45	.08	-.26	.12	.00	-.05	.03	-.03	.09	.14	-.23
3			-	.69	.67	.62	.46	.67	.78	-.26	-.33	-.10	-.30	-.10	.01	-.13	.04	-.07	-.08
4				-	.61	.42	.56	.69	.81	-.08	-.12	-.09	-.08	.02	.09	.00	.09	-.01	-.16
5					-	.47	.36	.55	.75	-.12	-.17	-.05	-.27	-.01	.03	-.13	.10	-.05	-.18
6						-	.22	.50	.64	-.12	-.17	.08	-.20	-.10	-.06	.07	.14	-.10	-.05
7							-	.58	.78	-.05	-.18	-.17	-.04	.06	.03	.08	-.12	.19	.05
8								-	.82	-.20	-.11	-.15	-.17	.07	.03	.00	.11	.02	-.02
9									-	-.14	-.19	-.10	-.19	.00	.03	.03	.06	.05	-.05

Moss-Hunt Test score. On the other hand, Age was positively associated with error in rating of the trait Talkativeness versus Silence in which the obtained correlation of .23 was significant at the .05 level. This was taken to mean that higher Age was definitely associated with higher rating error of this trait.

All of the coefficients between Educational Level and the other independent variables, excluding Age, were significantly associated at beyond the .05 level. Apparently, higher Educational Level assures higher performance on the Otis Test and the Moss-Hunt Test. However, Educational Level was found to be negatively correlated with rating error of the traits Patience-Impatience, r -.26, Exactness-Laxness r -.23 wherein both correlations were significant at the .05 level and beyond respectively. Accordingly, it can be said that higher Educational Level was definitely associated with lower rating error of these traits.

Moss-Hunt Test subtest scores were significantly interrelated such that high performance on one assured high performance on the others, but with one exception. The exception was noted in the correlation between the Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest and Observation of Human Behavior subtest which was approaching significance with an r .21. Only one of the subtests, Recognition

of the Mental State of the Speaker, was found to be negatively associated with trait rating error. This occurred for the trait Talkativeness-Silence and the correlation (-.26) was significant at the .05 level. This association seemed to point in the direction that higher scores on this subtest were definitely associated with lower rating error of this trait.

Multiple Analysis.- Appendices 2 to 12 show the obtained beta weights for each trait taken singly and multiple R's corrected for sample bias in Appendix 13. With sixty-seven degrees of freedom and nine variables, a multiple R had to equal or exceed .43 and .49 for significance at the .05 and the .01 level respectively. Accordingly, only two of the multiple R's were significant both at the .01 level, i.e., the R's between the independent variables and ratings of the trait Absentmindedness versus Practicality and the trait Exactness versus Laxness were .60 and .47 respectively. The remaining R's and the corresponding beta weights were not considered for analysis since they were not found to be significant.

Table VI indicates that the beta weights associated with ratings of the trait Absentmindedness versus Practicality accounted for a total variance of .438 of which total social intelligence scores accounted for 20 per cent; the Judgment in Social Situations subtest accounted for 11 per cent; Memory for Names and Faces and Observation of Human

Table VI.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Absentmindedness vs. Practicality.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.023
Educational Level	.000
Otis Test Score	-.002
Judgment in Social Situations	.115
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker	.054
Memory for Names and Faces	-.093
Observation of Human Behavior	.099
Sense of Humor	.040
Total Moss-Hunt Test Score	.201

Behavior subtests each accounting for 4 per cent; Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest, 5 per cent; Age, 2 per cent; and Educational Level and Otis Test scores each accounting for less than one per cent.

Table VII shows the beta weights accounting for a total variance of .291 in ratings of the trait Exactness versus Laxness. Of this total variance, ten per cent was contributed by the Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest; 8 per cent by the total Moss-Hunt Test score; 7 per cent contributed by the Judgment in Social Situations subtest; 4 per cent by Educational Level; 2 per cent each contributed by Memory for Names and Faces and Observation of Human Behavior subtests; and less than one per cent contributed by the Sense of Humor subtest, Age, and Otis Test scores.

From the obtained beta weights, it seemed justifiable to consider that for the traits Absentmindedness-Practicality and Exactness-Laxness, Moss-Hunt Test performance contributed the bulk of the obtained variances such that the Otis Test, Age, and Educational Level contributed but a combined maximum of five per cent for the trait Exactness-Laxness, with four per cent of this taken up by Educational Level contribution. Likewise, for the trait Absentmindedness-Practicality the combined contribution of Age, Educational Level and Otis Test scores amounted to but two per cent.

Table VII.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Exactness vs. Laxness.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	-.001
Educational Level	.043
Otis Test Score	-.005
Judgment in Social Situations	.076
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker	.104
Memory for Names and Faces	.020
Observation of Human Behavior	-.028
Sense of Humor	.002
Total Moss-Hunt Test Score	.080

contributed soley by the Age variable. Accordingly, the hypothesis that Moss-Hunt Test performance is not a contributing variable in rating error of personality traits was rejected for these two traits in which it was noted that Moss-Hunt Test performance contributed most of the obtained variance independent of the variables of Age, Educational Level and Otis Test performance. Likewise, the hypothesis was not rejected for the remaining eight traits in which it was not possible to demonstrate that Moss-Hunt Test performance was a contributing factor since the obtained multiple R's were not significant which dictated against using the obtained beta weights.

2. Discussion.

The association of intelligence as a variable in rating personality traits of other persons was in keeping with previous results reported by Vernon[1] and Adams.[2] However, the data, here, indicates that it is associated, depending upon what trait is being rated. It seems associated with ratings of the traits Sociableness versus Unsociableness, Patience versus Impatience, and Talkativeness versus Silence.

---

1 P. Vernon, "Some Characteristics of the Good Judge of Personality", Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1933, p. 42-58.

2 H.F. Adams, "The Good Judge of Personality", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 22, No. 2, 1927, p. 172-181

On the contrary, it is not associated with ratings of the traits Aggressivity versus Submissiveness, Dependency versus Independence, Absentmindedness versus Practicality, Insecurity versus Security, Conservatism versus Liberalism, Resourcefulness versus Dependency, nor Exactness versus Laxness. Granted that the extent of generalization from this data remains somewhat restricted due to the restricted sample size, it nevertheless suggests that perhaps intelligence test performance is not an inclusive variable operating in perceptual processes with regard to other persons' personality traits.

Age was found to be associated more with enhancing rating error than lessening it with only two exceptions. Older inmates tend to rate the traits of Aggressivity versus Submissiveness and Absentmindedness versus Practicality with less error but the association was not significant. On the other hand, they also rated the trait of Talkativeness versus Silence definitely with more error. Generally, Age does not seem to be an important variable for inmates' perceptions of other persons' personality traits.

Perhaps a concomitant variable of age is length of time spent in jail during an inmate's lifetime. Upon inspection, the older inmates were also those who had spent a considerable portion of their lives incarcerated for offenses not in keeping with societal norms. It would be of

interest to control for this variable, i.e., length of time spent in jail during one's lifetime, rather than simply the chronological age of the inmates. Perhaps one becomes less talkative himself after spending much time in jail and tends to project this onto others. Or perhaps the error is in rating the other end of the continuum, silence.

Higher educational level of the inmates seems to be necessary for lesser rating error of the traits Patience versus Impatience and Exactness versus Laxness, but of no consequence for rating Sociableness versus Unsociableness, Aggressivity versus Submissiveness, Talkativeness versus Silence, Dependence versus Undependence, Absentmindedness versus Practicality, Insecurity versus Security, Conservatism versus Liberalism, nor Resourcefulness versus Dependency. One could speculate with interest why inmates of higher educational level can judge these traits with less error. Perhaps being bothersome and bright (since educational level was significantly associated with intelligence level) in school fostered their ability to perceive which persons were patient or impatient and exacting or lax in their work and toward their behavior. It was also of interest that of the ten traits studied, these two traits appeared to be more highly loaded with recipient connotations than the others. However, this remains on the level of pure speculation at this time.

Measured social intelligence of inmates appeared to bulk heavily in contributing to judging of the traits Absentmindedness-Practicality and Exactness-Laxness but this can only be interpreted on the basis of the additive phenomenon in multiple association procedures. In the multiple correlation associated with rating error of the trait Exactness-Laxness, it was noted that the highest beta weight was with the Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest. This seemed to corroborate Woodrow's finding that perhaps this subtest does represent the social factor in the Moss-Hunt Test.[3] However, this subtest was one of the lesser contributors in rating of the trait Absentmindedness-Practicality, the other significant multiple association obtained. Accordingly, the possibility of this subtest being associated with something "social" became only slightly more tenable on the basis of these results, but by no means has it been clearly exposed as being highly loaded with a social factor or not. This would be possibly only through a factor analysis of these data.

Taken independently, the Recognition of the Mental State of the Speaker subtest was definitely associated with lower error in the inmates' ratings of the trait Talkativeness. However, because of the inability to separate the

---

3 H. Woodrow, "Common Factors of Fifty-Two Mental Tests", Psychometrica, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1939, p. 105.

influence of abstract intelligence, which also was found to be definitely associated with lesser rating error of this trait and the fact that inmates of higher intelligence performed significantly higher on this subtest seemed to indicate that the complexity of this result obviated clarification and interpretation in this study.

Inmates' performances on the remaining Moss-Hunt Test subtests were not found to be associated significantly with trait rating error of the remaining traits. Tendencies of association were inferrable but again due to the high association of inmates' intelligence level and performance on these subtests and the inability to separate the overlapping influence on rating error, it was though unjustifiable to draw inferences.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis that social intelligence was not a contributing variable in personality trait perception of social delinquents was not accepted for two of ten traits rated. The rating variances of the traits Absentmindedness versus Practicality and Exactness versus Laxness were accounted for by Moss-Hunt Test subtest and total scores more than by Age, Educational Level, and Otis Test score. The remaining eight traits were not assessed since the beta weights obtained were not associated with significant multiple correlation coefficients.

It was concluded that for a sample similar to the seventy-seven inmates who participated in this research, the higher the measured social intelligence the lesser amount of error in trait ratings would be obtained in rating Absent-mindedness versus Practicality and Exactness verus Laxness, controlling for general intelligence score, age, and amount of education achieved. Secondly, the combination of the independent variables since they contributed to highly significant multiple R's, i.e., as much as twice and three times the amount of any single obtained Pearson r, could be used in a predictive study, if one would be interested in predicting which inmates would have lessor error in rating these traits.

The data also suggested that rating personality traits of other persons is not a simple function of rater attributes or the kind of traits rated. What seems outstanding is the complexity in interaction between rater, trait and ratee as well as internal complexities of each, i.e., the interaction between rater attributes, between trait combinations and between persons in the experience of the rater as corresponding to the person stimuli used perceptual study.

Future research in this area of study should of necessity begin by reproducing the present study in an attempt to further objectify the results. For example, the sample size of seventy-seven could have had adverse effects on the power of a multivariate analysis since it probably should have been at least doubled for the number of variables under consideration.

Studies might also be pursued in the direction of finding out what kind of offenders, if they were classified according to offenses, do better or poorer than others in rating traits. One might speculate that property offenders manifest less or more perceptual error of others personality traits than person offenders.

Another approach might include testing the Eysenckian notion that social offenders of certain types are poor

learners, or profit from experience less than other offenders. Would these coincide with the poorer or better perceivers of others as defined in this study? One might use recidivists-nonrecidivists or Guilford's or Eysenck's measure of introversion-extraversion as related to perceiving error of personality traits of others.

One could also do a comparative study between social delinquents and a more "normal" socially non-delinquent group on ability to perceive other persons' personality. This could be a crucial study in possible differentiation of potential offenders.

It would be also of interest to find out in what direction offender ratings of others' personality traits are, i.e., do they on an average underestimate or overestimate others' traits? Which offender types predominantly underestimate or overestimate others' traits? Is it likely that such variables as length of time in jail within a lifetime might be associated with more or less error in rating others' personality traits?

The question of associated personality traits of offenders and the amount of error found in their ratings could be most revealing. Is rating of some offender types merely a projection mechanism wherein they project their traits onto others? For example, does the extreme antisocial type of offender feel that others are the same as he and thereby distort the expression of the others'

personality characteristics in terms of his own needs? On the other hand, do certain offender types see, in others, only those traits they wished they possessed to the extent that their perception of others is distorted?

Do female offenders perceive in the same way as male offenders in terms of others' personality traits? Do male offenders differ in their perceptual acuity if female persons were to be rated and for female offenders vice versa?

Since some institutions have an operating isolation cell block used for protective custody and punishment, what is the effect of varying lengths of time in isolation on perceptual error of others' personality traits?

These mentioned studies and many other possibilities will remain basic for furthering understanding of offenders' perception of other people. Likewise, study in this area might result in a better understanding of problems of offenders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G.W., Personality: A Psychological Interpretation, Henry Holt, New York, 1937, xvi-588 p.
A text replete with ideas and assumptions based on the author's approach to understanding personality. A classic in psychological literature.

Asch, S., "Forming Impressions of Personality", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 47, No. 3, p. 258-290.
A report of a series of well organized and designed research projects on impression formation. A basic reference for subsequent studies.

Heider, F., The Psychology of Interpersonal Relationships, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1958, ix-322 p.
An integrated presentation of the author's thinking and research on some phenomenological aspects of social perception.

Jackson, V.D., "Social Proficiency", Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1940, p. 422-474.
An exhaustive review of research on social intelligence and what this concept has meant to various researchers and theorists.

Kaess, W., and S. Witryol, "Memory for Names and Faces; A Characteristic of Social Intelligence", Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 39, No. 6, p. 457-462.
One of the few validation studies onwhat has been postulated as an aspect of social intelligence.

Thorndike, R.L., and S. Stein, "An Evaluation of the Attempts to Measure Social Intelligence", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 5, 1937, p. 275-285.
A critical approach in review of literature and studies concerned establishing measures of social intelligence.

Vernon, P.E., "Some Characteristics of the Good Judge of Personality", Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1933, p. 42-58.
A poorly organized and reported research conspicuous in the absence of mentions of experimental controls.

Wolff, W., The Expression of Personality, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1943, xii-334 p.

A must for students of experimental depth psychology with much that can be used as background for present day studies in personality. An outstanding 428 entry bibliography.

Woodrow, H., "The Common Factors in Fifty-Two Mental Tests", Psychometrica, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1939, p. 98-108.

A good piece of statistical research uncluttered by personal biases.

APPENDIX 1

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PERSONALITY TRAIT RATINGS ACCORDING TO TRAIT

APPENDIX 1

Table VIII.-

Descriptive Statistics of Personality Trait Ratings According to Trait.

Trait	Mean	Standard Deviation
Sociable vs. Unsociable	4.90	2.01
Patience vs. Impatience	5.14	2.09
Aggressivity vs. Submissiveness	5.43	1.96
Talkativeness vs. Silence	4.83	1.88
Dependable vs. Undependable	6.74	2.14
Absentmindedness vs.Practicality	5.17	2.23
Insecurity vs. Security	4.75	1.94
Conservatism vs. Liberalism	6.82	2.53
Resourcefulness vs. Dependency	7.64	2.40
Exactness vs. Laxness	6.31	2.13

APPENDIX 2

WORKTABLE USED IN VERIFYING THE ACCURACY OF THE OBTAINED BETA COEFFICIENTS ASSOCIATED WITH RATINGS OF THE TRAIT SOCIABLE

APPENDIX 2

Table IX.-

Worktable[a] Used in Verifying the Accuracy of the Obtained Beta Coefficients Associated With Ratings of the Trait Sociable.

	k	r2k	kr2k
X2	.003	1.000	.003
X3	-.008	-.085	.006
X4	-.430	-.447	.192
X5	.421	-.165	-.069
X6	.347	-.368	-.128
X7	.380	-.408	-.155
X8	.552	.010	.005
X9	-.027	-.145	.004
X0	-1.066	-.241	.257

r12 = sum = .111

a L.T. Dayhaw, Manuel de Statistique, Editions de l'Universite d'Ottawa, Ottawa, 1958, p. 247.

APPENDIX 3

MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RATING SCALE FORM SCORES ACCORDING TO FACTOR

APPENDIX 3

Table X.-

Mean Differences Between Rating Scale Form Scores According to Factor.

Factor	1-2	1-3	1-4	2-3	2-4	3-4
Sociable vs. Unsociable	.21	.73	.21	.52	.00	.52
Intelligent vs. Dull	.58	.42	1.67	.16	1.10	1.25
Patience vs. Impatience	.68	.20	1.16	.42	.53	.95
Aggressive vs. Submissive	.11	.26	.09	.15	.02	.17
Talkative vs. Silence	.25	.00	.02	.25	.27	.02
Dependable vs. Undependable	.89	.06	.88	.83	.01	.94
Adventurous vs. Shyness	1.21	1.37	1.84	.16	.63	.47
Sensitive vs. Tough	1.00	.47	1.51	.53	.51	1.04
Jealous vs. Trustful	1.37	.69	.43	.31	.57	.26
Absentminded vs. Practical	.11	.68	.51	.79	.40	1.19
Sophisticated vs. Simple	1.38	1.32	.87	.16	.61	.45
Insecure vs. Confident	.05	.52	.04	.57	.09	.48
Liberal vs. Conservative	.64	.11	.28	.53	.36	.17
Resourceful vs. Dependent	.53	1.89	.60	1.36	.07	1.29
Exact vs. Lax	.21	.06	.17	.27	.38	.11
Excitable vs. Composed	.52	1.47	.73	.95	.21	.74

APPENDIX 4

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT SOCIABLE VS. UNSOCIABLE

APPENDIX 4

Table XI.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Sociable vs. Unsociable.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.000
Educational Level	.000
Otis Test Score	.113
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.033
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.041
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.047
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.030
Sense of Humor Score	.000
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	.157

APPENDIX 5

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT PATIENCE VS. IMPATIENCE

APPENDIX 5

Table XII.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Patience vs. Impatience.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.001
Educational Level	.056
Otis Test Score	.174
Judgment in Social Situations Score	-.010
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.028
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.038
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.103
Sense of Humor Score	-.005
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	-.175

APPENDIX 6

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT AGGRESSIVITY VS. SUBMISSIVENESS

APPENDIX 6

Table XIII.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Aggressivity vs. Submissiveness.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.032
Educational Level	.008
Otis Test Score	.028
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.001
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.009
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.001
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.077
Sense of Humor Score	.039
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	-.085

APPENDIX 7

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT TALKATIVENESS VS. SILENCE

APPENDIX 7

Table XIV.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Talkativeness vs. Silence.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.010
Educational Level	.000
Otis Test Score	.117
Judgment in Social Situations Score	-.034
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	-.007
Memory for Names and Faces Score	-.056
Observation of Human Behavior Score	-.019
Sense of Humor Score	-.017
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	.185

APPENDIX B

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT DEPENDABILITY VS. INDEPENDABILITY

APPENDIX 8

Table XV.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Dependability vs. Undependability.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.002
Educational Level	.003
Otis Test Score	.028
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.006
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	-.005
Memory for Names and Faces Score	-.025
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.032
Sense of Humor Score	.033
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	-.001

APPENDIX 9

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT INSECURITY VS. SECURITY

APPENDIX 9

Table XVI.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Insecurity vs. Security.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	-.001
Educational Level	-.001
Otis Test Score	.058
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.000
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.055
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.000
Observation of Human Behavior Score	-.019
Sense of Humor Score	.006
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	.030

APPENDIX 10

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT CONSERVATISM VS. LIBERALISM

APPENDIX 10

Table XVII.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Conservatism vs. Liberalism.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.027
Educational Level	.001
Otis Test Score	-.002
Judgment in Social Situations Score	-.002
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	-.007
Memory for Names and Faces Score	-.001
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.074
Sense of Humor Score	.004
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	.041

APPENDIX 11

OBTAINED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR RATINGS OF THE TRAIT RESOURCEFULNESS VS. DEPENDENCY

APPENDIX 11

Table XVIII.-

Obtained Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Ratings of the Trait Resourcefulness vs. Dependency.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	.019
Educational Level	.031
Otis Test Score	.006
Judgment in Social Situations Score	.003
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.013
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.025
Observation of Human Behavior Score	-.009
Sense of Humor Score	-.002
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	.039

APPENDIX 12

DERIVED BETA WEIGHTS OF EACH INDEPENDENT VARIABLE FOR MEAN TOTAL RATING SCORE

APPENDIX 12

Table XIX.-

Derived Beta Weights of Each Independent Variable for Mean Total Rating Score.

Variable	Beta Weight
Age	-.002012
Educational Level	.001681
Otis Test Score	.109405
Judgment in Social Situations Score	-.003968
Recognition of Mental State of Speaker Score	.027881
Memory for Names and Faces Score	.004996
Observation of Human Behavior Score	.006817
Sense of Humor Score	.002261
Total Social Intelligence Test Score	-.052292

APPENDIX 13

CORRECTED MULTIPLE COEFFICIENTS OF EACH TRAIT WITH THE NINE VARIABLES USED IN THE EXPERIMENT

APPENDIX 13

Table XX.-

Corrected Multiple Coefficients of Each Trait With the Nine Variables Used in the Experiment.

Trait	C.R.
Sociable vs. Unsociable	.06
Patience vs. Impatience	.33
Aggressivity vs. Submissiveness	.00
Talkative vs. Silence	.29
Dependable vs. Undependable	.00
Absentminded vs. Practical	.60
Insecurity vs. Security	.20
Conservatism vs. Liberalism	.22
Resourceful vs. Dependent	.20
Exactness vs. Laxness	.47

APPENDIX 14

SAMPLE PERSONALITY TRAIT RATING SCALE AS USED IN THIS STUDY

APPENDIX 14

SAMPLE PERSONALITY TRAIT RATING SCALE AS USED IN THIS STUDY

NAME _____
(Please Print)

BIRTHDAY _____
(Month) (Day) (Year)

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

You are going to see pictures of people. Look at each very carefully as though the person were being introduced to you. Then, describe what kind of person you think each one is.

In order to help you describe your impression of the persons in the pictures, you will use a list of 16 pairs of words which are often used to describe people.

LOOK AT PAGE ONE

Notice that there are 2 capital lettered words with the letters "A" and "B" in front of them. Notice, also, that after each pair of words there are some other words; these words will help everyone to understand the capital lettered words in the same way.

Now look underneath each set of capital lettered words; notice the five different categories:--

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

"Very much A" means very much of the capital lettered word with A in front of it.
"More A Than B" means more of the capital lettered word with A in front of it than the word with B in front .
"Sometimes A Sometimes B" means as much of one capital lettered as the other.
"More B Than A" means more of the capital lettered word with B in front of it than with A in front.
"Very much B" means very much of the capital lettered word with B in front of it.

WHAT YOU ARE TO DO

Look at each picture, keeping the list of words in front of you so that you can easily see them. Describe the person in the picture, FIRST, by circling the capital lettered word you think best describes the person. SECONDLY, draw a circle around one of the categories. For example, you may think that the person is very rich -- You would circle this way:--

A. RICH - lives well, owns several cars
B. POOR - owes many bills,

(Very much A)	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

Or, you may think that the person could best be described as being both of the capital lettered. This is entirely possible since we know that some people are not always the same. In this case you would circle both capital lettered words and the middle category, like this:--

(A. RICH - lives well, owns several cars
B. POOR) - owes many bills

Very much A	More A Than B	(Sometimes A Sometimes B)	More B Than A	Very much B

Your description of the person will not be complete if you skip any of the words or forget to circle a category for each pair of words.

(IV)

A. JEALOUS:-suspicious, hard, unbelieving
B. TRUSTFUL:-accepting, soft hearted, believes in others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INTELLIGENT:-smart, alert, precise
B. UNINTELLIGENT:-dull, slow, careless

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. RESOURCEFUL:-makes own decisions, offers his ideas
B. DEPENDENT:-lets someone else make decisions, asks for ideas

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. TALKATIVE:-happy-go-lucky, cheerful
B. SILENT:-serious, depressed

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INSECURE:-fussy, feels lonely most of the time
B. CONFIDENT:-accepts mistakes, has many friends

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SENSITIVE:-kindly, gentle
B. TOUGH:-self-sufficient, realistic

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXACT:-methodical, self-controlled, carries out plans
B. LAX:-negligent, inexact, tends to let things go.

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. CONSERVATIVE:-critical, opposed to changes
B. LIBERAL:-makes changes, not strict in ideals

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(III)

A. ABSENT-MINDED:-preoccupied, forgetful, inattentive to others
B. PRACTICAL:-gets things done, not forgetful, attentive to others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. DEPENDABLE:-responsible, faithful, reliable
B. UNDEPENDABLE:-irresponsible, unloyal, unreliable

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXCITABLE:-tense, irritable, anxious
B. COMPOSED:-calm, untroubled, doesn't let things get on his nerves

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. RESOURCEFUL:-makes own decisions, offers his ideas
B. DEPENDENT:-lets someone else make decisions, asks for ideas

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INSECURE:-fussy, feels lonely most of the time
B. CONFIDENT:-accepts mistakes, has many friends

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ADVENTUROUS:-likes meeting people, bold, carefree
B. SHY:-timid, retiring, considerate of others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SENSITIVE:-kindly, gentle
B. TOUGH:-self-sufficient, realistic

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOCIABLE:-easy going, co-operative, warm hearted towards others
B. UNSOCIABLE:-unreasonable, hostile, indifferent towards others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(IV)

A. ABSENT-MINDED:-preoccupied, forgetful, inattentive to others
B. PRACTICAL:-gets things done, not forgetful, attentive to others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. AGGRESSIVE:-boastful, vigorous, self-confident
B. SUBMISSIVE:-modest, meek, unsure

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOPHISTICATED:-polished, experienced, handles people well
B. SIMPLE:-clumsy, awkward with people, inexperienced

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXCITABLE:-tense, irritable, anxious
B. COMPOSED:-calm, untroubled, doesn't let things get on his nerves

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. DEPENDABLE:-responsible, faithful, reliable
B. UNDEPENDABLE:-irresponsible, unloyal, unreliable

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ADVERTUROUS:-likes meeting people, bold, carefree
B. SHY:-timid, retiring, considerate of others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOCIABLE:-easy going, co-operative,warm hearted towards others
B. UNSOCIABLE:-unreasonable, hostile, indifferent towards others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. PATIENT:-calm, mature, unworried
B. IMPATIENT:-unstable, immature, worried

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(I)

A. PATIENT:-calm, mature, unworried
B. IMPATIENT:-unstable, immature, worried

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ADVERTUROUS:-likes meeting people, bold, carefree
B. SHY:-timid, retiring, considerate of others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INSECURE:-Fussy, feels lonely most of the time
B. CONFIDENT:-accepts mistakes, has many friends

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Spmetimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOPHISTICATED:-polished, experienced, handles people well
B. SIMPLE:-clumsy, awkward with people, inexperienced

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. TALKATIVE:-happy-go-lucky, cheerful
B. SILENT:-serious-minded, depressed

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. CONSERVATIVE:-critical, opposed to changes
B. LIBERAL:-makes changes, not strict in ideals

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXACT:-methodical, self-controlled, carries out plans
B. LAX:-negligent, inexact, tends to let things go

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOCIABLE:-easy going, co-operative, warm hearted towards others
B. UNSOCIABLE:-unreasonable, hostile, indifferent towards others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(II)

A. INSECURE:-fussy, feels lonely most of the time
B. CONFIDENT:-accepts mistakes, has many friends

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXACT:-methodical, self-controlled, carries out plans
B. LAX:-negligent, inexact, tends to let things go.

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SOPHISTICATED:-polished, experienced, handles people well
B. SIMPLE:-clumsy, awkward with people, inexperienced

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. DEPENDABLE:-responsible, faithful, reliable
B. UNDEPENDABLE:-irresponsible, unloyal, unreliable

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXCITABLE:-tense, irritable, anxious
B. COMPOSED:-calm, untroubled, doesn't let things get on his nerves

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. AGGRESSIVE:-boastful, vigorous, self-confident
B. SUBMISSIVE:-modest, meek, unsure

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SENSITIVE:-kindly, gentle
B. TOUGH:-self-sufficient, realistic

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. TALKATIVE:-happy-go-lucky, cheerful
B. SILENT:-serious, depressed

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(II)

A. SOCIABLE:-easy going, co-operative, warm hearted towards others
B. UNSOCIABLE:-unreasonable, hostile, indifferent towards others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ADVENTUROUS:-likes meeting people, bold, carefree
B. SHY:-timid, retiring, considerate of others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. PATIENT:-calm, mature, unworried
B. IMPATIENT:-unstable, immature, worried

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. CONSERVATIVE:-critical, opposed to changes
B. LIBERAL:- makes changes, not strict in ideals

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. RESOURCEFUL:-makes own decisions, offers his ideas
B. DEPENDENT:-lets someone else make decisions, asks for ideas

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ABSENT-MINDED:-preoccupied, forgetful, inattentive to others
B. PRACTICAL:-gets things done, not forgetful, attentive to others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. JEALOUS:-suspicious, hard, unbelieving
B. TRUSTFUL:-accepting, soft hearted, believes in others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INTELLIGENT:-smart, alert, precise
B. UNINTELLIGENT:-dull, slow, careless

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(II)

A. SOCIABLE:-easy going, co-operative, warm hearted towards others
B. UNSOCIABLE:-unreasonable, hostile, indifferent towards others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ADVENTUROUS:-likes meeting people, bold, carefree
B. SHY:-timid, retiring, considerate of others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. PATIENT:-calm, mature, unworried
B. IMPATIENT:-unstable, immature, worried

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. CONSERVATIVE:-critical, opposed to changes
B. LIBERAL:- makes changes, not strict in ideals

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. RESOURCEFUL:-makes own decisions, offers his ideas
B. DEPENDENT:-lets someone else make decisions, asks for ideas

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ABSENT-MINDED:-preoccupied, forgetful, inattentive to others
B. PRACTICAL:-gets things done, not forgetful, attentive to others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. JEALOUS:-suspicious, hard, unbelieving
B. TRUSTFUL:-accepting, soft hearted, believes in others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INTELLIGENT:-smart, alert, precise
B. UNINTELLIGENT:-dull, slow, careless

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

(I)

A. AGGRESSIVE:-boastful, vigorous, self-confident
B. SUBMISSIVE:-modest, meek, unsure

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. EXCITABLE:-tense, irritable, anxious
B. COMPOSED:-calm, untroubled, doesn't let things get on his nerves

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. INTELLIGENT:-smart, alert, precise
B. UNINTELLIGENT:-dull, slow , careless

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. DEPENDABLE:-responsible, faithful, reliable
B. UNDEPENDABLE:-irresponsible, unloyal, unreliable

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. SENSITIVE:-kindly, gentle
B. TOUGH:-self-sufficient, realistic

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. RESOURCEFUL:-makes own decisions, offers his ideas
B. DEPENDENT:-lets someone else make decisions, asks for ideas

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. JEALOUS:-suspicious, hard, unbelieving
B. TRUSTFUL:-accepting, soft hearted, believes in others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

A. ABSENT-MINDED:-preoccupied, forgetful, inattentive to others
B. PRACTICAL:-gets things done, not forgetful, attentive to others

Very much A	More A Than B	Sometimes A Sometimes B	More B Than A	Very much B

APPENDIX 15

ABSTRACT OF

Person Perception and Social Intelligence of Social Delinquents

APPENDIX 15

ABSTRACT OF

Person Perception and Social Intelligence of Social Delinquents[1]

Personality trait ratings were obtained from seventy-seven inmates of a maximum security reformatory. The person stimuli for the ratings were four facial photographs of individuals measured on the Cattell Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. The rating scale was constructed using the Cattell Sixteen Personality Factors. Four forms of the scale were used and only those traits which were not rated significantly different between the forms were used. The final list of ten traits, ratings not being significantly different, were pooled to obtain a single score. The score consisted of the amount of error in scale position between what the individual rated himself on a trait, and what the inmates rated him.

The inmates were also measured for general intelligence, and social intelligence using the Otis Self Scoring Test of Mental Abilities for grades four to nine and the Moss-Hunt-Omwake Social Intelligence Test respectively.

---

1 Raymond J. Parthun, master's thesis presented to the School of Psychology and Education of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, May 1963, x-78 p.

Also, the grade level achievement in school and age of each inmate were used. These variables were included since both general intelligence and social intelligence have been postulated as requisite for accurate judgments of personality traits. Also, these two have been found to be highly correlated in past research which dictated that these variables needed to be controlled. Educational level was controlled since there was a question as to the amount education played in developing social intelligence; age, because the writer noted possible differences in social tact between younger and older inmates, was also controlled. The control of these variables was statistical in nature making use of a multivariate technique. This consisted of obtaining beta coefficients and weights associated with the nine variables. Multiple R's were then computed from the beta weights. This technique allowed for assessing each pair of variables while holding all others constant. The results indicated that only two of the ten traits were associated with significant multiple R's. The beta weights associated with these significant multiple R's were taken as a suggestion that the social intelligence subtest scores contributed the bulk of the obtained variances in both cases, with general intelligence, age and educational level contributing a small portion. Accordingly, for these two traits the hypothesis

that social intelligence was not a contributing variable to personality trait ratings was not accepted. Likewise, this hypothesis was not rejected for the remaining eight traits.