THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A CRITERION OF THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Arthur Dale Shears

1967

ABSTRACT

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A CRITERION OF THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

by Arthur Dale Shears

The purpose of this study was to develop an improved criterion of the ability to understand people. Understanding was defined as the ability to predict what an individual will feel, say, and do about himself and others.

The final form of 137 items was comprised of two subtests: a measure of Individual Accuracy that used transcripts of interviews to present material to judges, and a more general predictive measure that employed a case-sketch presentation.

The first subtest is a measure of Individual Accuracy, the ability to differentiate between individuals when group cues are reduced to a minimum. The new form is shorter, and has a higher coefficient of reliability than the form originally developed by Grossman (1963). The second subtest was developed originally by Trumbo (1955) and was expanded by

Silkiner (1962). The revised test preserves the brevity and reliability of the earlier form while expanding its generality.

Total criterion reliability (.72) compares favorably with the reliabilities reported by other sensitivity measures.

Several aspects relevant to the development and validation of the criterion were explored:

(1) The Individual Accuracy component was administered to 186 students in two forms, to test its success at reducing group membership cues. The predictive accuracy of judges using only a simple age-marital status-sex stereotype was extremely inferior to that of students using the stereotype plus written information. Results contraindicated a response-set explanation of the predictive success of judges using minimal stereotypes.

(2) A second group of 126 students was given filmed interviews in addition to the written material. The presence or absence of auditory and visual cues made no significant difference in the predictive accuracy of the two groups.

(3) Correlational analysis indicated that a) the criterion subtests were related, but assessed somewhat different components of sensitivity; b) class performance was

related to the ability to understand people; and c) boldness was inversely related to scores on the case-sketch subtest and to total criterion scores.

Suggestions were made for the interpretation and use of the criterion for the selection and training of people who understand people. The establishment of test norms was suggested as an objective of further research.

Approved: Henry Clay Smith

Date: November 14, 1957

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF A CRITERION OF THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

By

Arthur Dale Shears

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Henry Clay Smith for his generosity with time and advice, and for his continuing encouragement.

Appreciation is extended to Drs. Dozier W. Thornton and James L. Phillips for their helpful criticisms and suggestions.

My thanks also to my wife, Margie, for all the patience and coffee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents/cont.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The present study attempts to develop a better criterion of the ability to understand people. The ability may be defined operationally in terms of predictive accuracy about people's feelings, attitudes, and behavior. The criterion problem is a focal concern of research and training in interpersonal sensitivity: research is no more accurate than its "yardstick," and measurement is the sine qua non of effective training.

Predictive accuracy is influenced by many components. Sensitivity to individual differences, or Individual Accuracy, represents a relatively "pure" measure of interpersonal sensitivity. However, Stereotypes are also used in making judgments about people. The effect of group membership cues, therefore, requires and receives assessment in this study. Observation, or the use of auditory and visual cues, is another component related to predictive accuracy (Harris, 1962). The present study assesses the consequences of omitting observational cues. Some personality correlates of these components are also investigated.

HISTORY

The following discussion considers the development of the concept of sensitivity and reviews attempts to establish criteria for its measurement. Stereotypic accuracy, observation, and personality variables related to sensitivity are also examined.

The Concept of Interpersonal Sensitivity

The "ability to understand people" has a long developmental history. An early term for it was "empathy," defined by Dymond (1949, 1950) as "the imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling, and acting of another." This process of transposition made the prediction of another person's behavior possible. The assumption was generally made that sensitivity was a single dimension.

Cronbach (1955) proposed a statistical breakdown of empathy scores. He felt that the use of component scores was essential to the study of accuracy in interpersonal perception, and that global accuracy measures combined

all sorts of independent sources of variation in an uninterpretable way. Cronbach isolated, defined, and measured five components of predictive accuracy: accuracy of elevation (tendency of rater to rate high or low), accuracy of differential elevation (tendency of rater to spread his ratings), accuracy of assumed similarity (to rater), accuracy of stereotypes (between groups), and differential accuracy (between individuals).

Cronbach's analysis served as a basis for further methodological developments. Differential Accuracy seemed to be the key concept in the ability to predict the behavior of individuals. Attempts were made (Cline, 1955; Crow and Hammond, 1957; Cline and Richards, 1960) to measure this component through modification of Cronbach's analytic model. Pieper (1960) eliminated the influence of elevation and differential elevation on differential accuracy by using a matching rather than a rating method.

Bronfenbrenner et al. (1958) proposed that the ability to understand people be treated as a social skill, involving two types of social perceptions: Sensitivity to the Generalized Other (an awareness of the social norm as the typical response of a large class or group), and Interpersonal Sensitivity (recognition of the ways in which one

person may differ from another, or from the average in his behavior). Bronfenbrenner further suggested that an analysis be made of different kinds of predictions of behavior, and that both second person sensitivity (A's predicting what B thinks or does) and third person sensitivity (A's predicting what some C thinks of B) be studied.

Smith (1966), building on the work of Cronbach and Bronfenbrenner, proposed that the ability to understand people was composed of a number of relatively independent components: Level, Spread, Empathy, Observation, Differentiation Between Groups (Stereotype Accuracy), and Differentiation Between Individuals (Individual Accuracy).

Level and Spread were characteristics of the perceiver, or judge. Empathy and Observation were defined as characteristics of the interaction between perceiver and perceived, and did not represent "the accuracy of inferences based on perceptions, but the accuracy of the perceptions themselves" (Smith, 1966). Stereotype Accuracy involved the prediction of differences between groups, not norms within groups, as proposed by Bronfenbrenner and Cronbach. Individual Accuracy, measured independently of the other five components, was the ability to differentiate between individuals when group membership cues were reduced to a

minimum. Individual Accuracy represents a relatively "pure" measure of sensitivity, free from the influence of less essential factors such as level, spread, and stereotype accuracy effects.

The Measurement of Interpersonal Sensitivity

Many early attempts to develop adequate measures of sensitivity failed to take account of the components involved. Often, investigators trying to measure sensitivity were actually measuring level (Dymond, 1949; Gage, 1958) or leadership competence.

Instruments for measuring predictive accuracy have generally demonstrated low reliabilities (see Table 1). Also, they have usually asked judges to predict only a few behaviors of a few people, and have thus been open to criticisms of low generality.

Kelly and Fiske (1951) reported a criterion measure, developed by W. F. Soskin, that asked VA trainees in clinical psychology to predict the behavior of two patients. Inter-case reliability was low, and there was a zero correlation between scores on this diagnostic prediction test and trainee-ratings of diagnostic competence.

Table 1.--Reliabilities of sensitivity criterion instruments.

Soskin (1951)*	.23
Trumbo (1955)	.77
Cline (1959)	.71
Grossman (1963)	.59
Grossman (1967)	.57

*From Kelly and Fiske (1951)

Trumbo (1955) developed a criterion with better reliability and greater generality. He presented judges with eight case-sketches derived from actual case study material; judges then answered 120 true-false statements based on behavioral data about the individuals. Trumbo pointed out that a test measuring predictions of behavior should contain a large number of items concerned with a wide variety of behaviors, since this type of test design would provide higher reliability and would give the criterion greater face validity as a measure of the general ability to judge people.

Cline and Richards (1959) used a series of filmed interviews to develop a battery of judging instruments measuring the ability to predict such diverse behaviors as MMPI responses, sentence completions, and personality trait

ratings. Judges observed a film and filled out the judging instruments; the procedure was then repeated for each film in the series. Predictive ability was both reliable and general over different measures and diverse persons to be judged. The criterion developed in this study had one shortcoming: difficulty of administration, due to the use of filmed presentations.

Grossman (1963) developed an instrument for the measurement of Individual Accuracy based on the color-sound films produced by Cline (1960). To lessen the effects of Stereotype Accuracy upon test scores, he grouped the films by sex (one sub-test used three men; the other, three women), and selected test items with high discrimination for interpersonal sensitivity and no discrimination for group sensitivity.

Grossman (1967) refined his earlier instrument, changing from a visual presentation (film) to a written presentation (typescripts of the original interviews). Only the "men" test was used, because of its higher reliability. The new mode of presentation (1) provided for ease of administration to a larger group of subjects; (2) helped control extraneous variables affecting predictive accuracy

such as memory, and differences in hearing and vision, and (3) reduced the effect of stereotyping by eliminating physical appearance cues. The final form of the criterion consisted of typescripts of interviews with the three men, followed by a sixty-item test, 30 items measuring second person accuracy and 30 items measuring third person accuracy.

The Effect of Stereotyping on Prediction

Judges also make use of stereotypes, or generalizations from group membership, in their predictions of people's behavior. A body of research indicates that they often predict better when they stick to their stereotypes than when they use more specific information on which to base predictions.

Meehl (1954) reviewed twenty studies comparing the accuracy of predictions based on an actuarial stereotype and the accuracy of predictions based on the judgments of clinicians, counselors, and social workers. In nineteen of these cases it was found that judgments based on the actuarial method were equal to or superior to those made individually.

Stone, Leavitt, and Gage (1957) asked a group of judges to fill out an interest inventory as they thought

a series of students had filled it out, knowing only a general stereotype for each student: undergraduate male education major, graduate female art student, etc. Next, the judges observed each student as he entered the room and engaged in several expressive acts: then they filled out the inventory again. Judges made more accurate predictions on the basis of their stereotypes alone than on the basis of their stereotypes plus their personal observations.

It has generally been found (Zavala, 1960; Silkiner, 1962) that stereotype accuracy is not a general trait, but an ability relatively specific to the group membership of the person being judged. Johnson (1963) found that accurate judges of sex differences were not necessarily accurate judges of age differences, of differences between psychologists and nonpsychologists, or of differences between unskilled and professional workers. Results suggested that stereotype accuracy was not, therefore, a factor of the general ability to understand people--a point of importance in the selection of content for a criterion measure of understanding.

Stelmachers and McHugh (1964) proposed a slightly different view of stereotype accuracy. They had judges

predict the MMPI responses of four persons, on the basis of varying amounts of information about them. Judges given only a simple "differentiating stereotype" (well adjusted normal, delinquent, etc.) were more accurate than judges who were given personal descriptions of the subjects written by their friends, or judges given the five traits that friends thought were most descriptive of the subjects. Stelmachers and McHugh concluded that predictive accuracy depended little on the type and amount of information provided: "It is not the information contained in the stereotyped input which leads to good prediction scores, but rather the very absence of it! That is, not having enough information on which to base his predictions, the judge would be forced to rely more heavily on his built-in response sets, with their demonstrated capacity to lead to accurate prediction scores." Stereotypes served the function of preventing errors of judgment due to a tendency to "overpredict."

The Effect of Observation on Prediction

Observational accuracy is the accurate noting and recalling of specific, empirically verifiable elements of the appearance, actions, and content of speech of the

observed person. It is not the accuracy of inferences based on perceptions, but the accuracy of the perceptions themselves.

Harris (1962) made the first effort to develop a standard test for measuring accuracy in observing people. He used brief filmed interviews, each followed by selected true-false statements about the interviewee. Harris showed that observation was a general ability, and that the extent to which an observer remembered details of appearance, actions, and content of conversation with others was related to his ability to understand others.

Bruni (1963), using the same filmed interviews, verified Harris' conclusion that observation was a general ability related to the ability to judge people accurately. Better observers were better judges of both individuals and groups.

Kepes (1965) demonstrated that, aside from being a basic component of sensitivity, observation was also the easiest on which to show dramatic improvement with training. He found, in fact, that both his experimental training group and a control group made very large improvements in observational accuracy. The motivation and knowledge provided by feedback on scores seemed to be sufficient to bring about improvement.

There is evidence, however (Borke and Fiske, 1957; Kepes, 1965), that mode of presentation of material has no significant effect upon judges' predictive accuracy. Giedt (1955, 1958) found that experts were able to predict the behavior of four patients as accurately from seeing a transcript of an interview as from seeing a film of the interview. Auditory and visual cues were not such a critical component of total prediction that their omission seriously affected performance on a criterion. Giedt's findings have practical significance for the problem of criterion development, since it is generally much easier and cheaper to use written records.

Personality Correlates of Sensitivity

Who is sensitive, and what are his traits?

Cline (1955) found that the sensitive person had high social responsibility and was antifascist, tolerant, liberal, and intelligent. Chance and Meaders (1960) reported that high affiliation, independence, and low hostility were related to understanding. Grossman (1963) listed considerate and constructive leadership attitudes, readiness for change, humanitarian religious views, high verbal intelligence, and good college grades as further correlates.

Of course, a great many personality traits are capable of conception and measurement. Allport and Odbert (1936) pointed out that there were almost twenty thousand possible trait names in the dictionary. Smith (1966), reviewing studies of traits related to sensitivity, concluded: "In sum, the most sensitive person is the one best equipped to learn about people. He is curious about and deeply involved with others but is neither gregarious nor undiscriminating. He is open to people and nondefensive in his relations with them. He is frank about himself and bold, but not hostile, in his dealings with others. He is an intelligent user of complex concepts."

Intelligence is one of the most certain correlates of sensitivity. Among intelligence measures reported to be related to sensitivity are scores on the Henmon-Nelson general intelligence test, scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test, grades in college, and scores on the MMPI scale measuring intellectual efficiency (Cline, 1955; Chance and Meaders, 1960; Grossman, 1963). Smith (1966) summarized research on the relationship: "Of 20 studies relating intelligence to sensitivity published between 1915 and 1963, all were positive, the median being .30." In the present

study, performance scores in the subjects' Psychology of Personality class were taken as an indirect intelligence measure.

Linden (1965) factor-analyzed 25 traits isolated by Hershey (1958) from a study of traits measured by other personality inventories. The five trait-dimensions that emerged were (1) Impulsive-Controlled, (2) Rationalistic-Empirical, (3) Introverted-Extroverted, (4) Cautious-Bold, and (5) Emotional-Calm. From this analysis, Linden developed the 200-item Protebob Personality Inventory. A modification of this inventory was used in the exploration of traits related to sensitivity as measured by the criterion under development in the present study. Particularly relevant in this connection was Boldness.

Both Kelly and Fiske (1951) and Cline (1955) found that the most sensitive individuals had high scores on the MMPI Capacity for Status Scale ("ambitious, active, forceful, insightful, resourceful, ascendant, and self-seeking"). Chance and Meaders (1960) also found the sensitive individuals to be more independent and dominating.

Hershey (1960) tested the training gains of five discussion groups that had been ranked on the basis of social boldness scores. The bold groups improved more than

the cautious groups. Grossman (1967) found boldness related to improvement in Individual Accuracy for male students.

Boldness, then, has been thought to be related to the ability to understand people. The present study serves a replicative function, and attempts to validate the boldness-sensitivity relationship for this criterion measure.

PROBLEM

The preceding discussion brings into clearer focus some of the problems involved in developing an improved criterion of the ability to understand people. The present study used two approaches to the measurement of understanding. A revised test of Individual Accuracy, developed through successive item analyses from an earlier instrument by Grossman (1963), serves as a relatively "pure" measure of sensitivity; a case-sketch section lends generality to the overall measure.

During the course of the development of the criterion, prediction scores of judges using different amounts of information on which to base their predictions were compared. The Individual Accuracy section was tested for its success at minimizing group membership cues, and for the effects of shifting to a written mode of presentation.

Hypotheses:

1. Judgments of individuals based upon simple stereotype information are more accurate than judgments based upon individualized information plus stereotype.

Several studies (Meehl, 1954; Stone, Leavitt, and Gage, 1957; Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964) have reported that the use of simple stereotypes can facilitate high predictive accuracy.

2. Judgments of individuals based upon written material are more accurate than judgments based on written material plus sound films.

Some studies have shown typescripts more effective than sound films (Giedt, 1955; 1958). The present study, however, compares written material alone with the combined method, and provides a more direct test of the effect of observational cues by holding constant the variable of memory.

Protebob trait-dimensions and a class performance measure were correlated with the sections of the criterion. Two exploratory hypotheses were formulated:

3. Bolder persons are more accurate in their predictions of behavior than cautious persons.

This test serves a replicative function and attempts to validate, for this criterion measure, a relationship reported in many studies (e.g., Kelly and Fiske, 1951; Cline, 1955; Chance and Meaders, 1960; Hershey, 1960; Grossman, 1967).

4. The higher a person's class performance score, the more accurate are his predictions of behavior.

Numerous studies (e.g., Cline, 1955; Chance and Meaders, 1960; Grossman, 1963) have reported intelligence to be related to sensitivity. The present study takes performance scores in one undergraduate class as an indirect measure of intelligence.

METHOD

The study was carried out in two phases. The first dealt with the effect of group membership cues on Individual Accuracy scores, and collected the data for a correlational study. The second dealt with the effect of observational cues on Individual Accuracy scores.

Subjects

Subjects for the first phase were 186 students in a Psychology of Personality class at Michigan State University during the Fall of 1966. All subjects had previously taken at least one psychology course. For the second phase, subjects were 126 students from a Psychology of Business and Personnel class, at a level approximately equivalent to that of the first group.

For both groups, tests were administered during class time, earlier in the term than graded examinations. Motivation to participate was partially contingent on motivation for grades. A breakdown of the two groups by sex is tabulated on the following page.

Table 2.--Sex of Subjects.

Conditions	Males	Females	Total
Psychology of Personality Students:			
I. Using stereotype alone	53	48	101
II. Using stereotype + written material	41	44	85
III. Completing correlational measures	35	37	72
Psychology of Business and Personnel Students:			
IV. Using written material + film	99	27	126

Procedure

In the first phase of this study, a new instrument for the measurement of Individual Accuracy was developed, based on an earlier test by Grossman (1963) developed from color-sound films produced by Cline (1960). The revised test, like Grossman's, minimized the effects of group membership cues, and served as a relatively stereotype-free measure of Individual Accuracy. It provided judges with typescripts of interviews with three men, and included a simple age-marital status-sex stereotype of each. This revised test of Individual Accuracy was one of a battery of

measures administered to the Psychology of Personality class. Another measure employed was the Test of the Ability to Understand People, a case-sketch sensitivity criterion developed by Trumbo (1955) and expanded by Silkiner (1962).

Subjects taking the Individual Accuracy test were divided into two groups. Both groups answered the same test questions, but for one the written material was omitted and predictions had to be made on the basis of the stereotype alone. The groups were then compared for predictive accuracy.

In the second phase of the study, the final revision of the Individual Accuracy test was administered to the Psychology of Business and Personnel class. This time, the subjects were given films of the interviews to aid their predictions, in addition to the regular stereotype-plus-typescript information. The predictive success of this group was compared with that of the group using stereotype and typescript.

These comparisons, and the correlational study, were used to evaluate the Individual Accuracy component of the criterion under development, and to explore its relation to the case-sketch component.

Written vs. Stereotypic Presentations

Grossman's test of Individual Accuracy was given a trial administration in the Fall of 1966. Through an item analysis, questions which failed to differentiate between good and poor judges were eliminated. The quartile of highest scorers and the quartile of lowest scorers were separated for an item count to determine the percentage of subjects in each group that correctly answered each item. The difference between these percentages was an index of item discriminability, and the most discriminating items were retained. In keeping with studies (Kepes, 1965; Grossman, 1967) indicating that third person predictions of Individual Accuracy ("How do you predict B would describe A?") are more difficult, less direct, and do not improve with sensitivity training, items measuring third-person predictive accuracy were also eliminated.

The revised test, shortened from 126 to 71 items, was administered in December, 1966, to a class of Psychology of Personality students. Two forms of the test were run. One form (Predictions-About-People) included the typescript; the other form (Stereotypes About People) did not. Randomization was attempted by placing the test forms in two separate piles, each to the front of one of two entrances to the

large testing room. No mention was made that the two piles contained separate forms of the test. As students entered the room, they took test forms from one or the other of the piles, then went to their seats. Eighty-five students took PAP forms; one hundred and one took SAP forms.

Kuder-Richardson Formula #20 reliabilities were .65 for the PAP and .61 for the SAP forms, an increase over the reliability of .57 reported by Grossman, although the revised test was shorter by 55 items.

Prediction scores of the two groups were compared using a standard t-test of significance. Further investigation of the SAP results through item analysis was contraindicated because of the extremely poor predictive performance of this group. The results of the PAP group, however, were used as the basis for a second item analysis. Ten more items which failed to discriminate between good and poor judges were omitted. The final form of the Individual Accuracy component appears as the second section of the overall criterion reported in Appendix A.

Correlational Analysis

Of the 85 students who finished the PAP form of the Individual Accuracy test, 72 also completed a battery of

other measures. Student numbers were recorded to facilitate future investigation with the scores. An outline of variables follows:

Test of the Ability to Understand People. This 76-item sensitivity criterion had been developed by Trumbo in 1955. A more general measure of sensitivity, it employed a case-sketch presentation. Revised by Silkiner in 1962 and by Smith in 1966, its final form had a reliability of .67. It appears as the first section of the criterion reported in Appendix A.

Personality Trait-Dimensions. These measures were taken with Linden's Protebob Personality Inventory, a test composed of 200 items with 40 items measuring each of five basic traits: Cautious-Bold, Emotional-Calm, Impulsive-Controlled, Rational-Empirical, and Acquiescence.

Class Performance. Each student's scores on examinations in the Psychology of Personality class were obtained, and the total taken as a measure of performance.

Data Analysis

Intercorrelations were carried out on Michigan State University's Control Data 3600 computer. Intercorrelations were carried out for the combined N of 72, rather than

separately for male and female subjects. A comparison of the data for men and women on the variable of primary concern (Individual Accuracy) found insignificant sex differences. For both sexes, the frequency distribution of scores was similar; ranges were identical (21-47 items correct); and mean scores were 34.2 and 34.3 for men and women, respectively.

Written vs. Filmed Presentations

The Individual Accuracy test was reduced from 71 to 61 items following a second item analysis. It was then combined with the case-sketch measure to form the final, composite criterion of the ability to understand people. This criterion was administered to 126 students in a Psychology of Business and Personnel class. Test administration for the 137-item measure required two class periods. One period was devoted to the Individual Accuracy component, and one to the case-sketch component.

During the administration of the Individual Accuracy component, judges were given the original sound-films of the interviews to help them with their predictions. Then, data sheets for the 85 students who had earlier taken the test were rescored for the 61 items of the final form. Accuracy

scores of the two groups were compared with a standard t-test of significance, to assess the effects of observational cues.

Results of this comparison, and of the other comparisons made in this study, are reported in the following section.

RESULTS

A statement of reliabilities is important to the assessment of the sensitivity criterion developed in this study. A measure of high reliability may or may not be valid, but a measure of low reliability cannot be valid.

Table 3.--Kuder-Richardson Formula #20 reliabilities for the composite sensitivity criterion. (N = 126)

Components	Reliabilities
Part I (76 items), case sketches)	.69
Part II (61 items, individual accuracy)	.61
Composite Criterion	.72

The criterion was administered a second time in the Fall of 1967, to 208 Psychology of Personality students. Composite criterion reliability was not available for report in the present study; reliabilities for Part I and Part II were .74 and .60, respectively.

The correlation between the two parts of the criterion was .27, which was significant at the .02 level in a two-tailed t-test.

An evaluation of the data relevant to each hypothesis is tabulated and reported in detail below.

Hypothesis 1. Judgments of individuals based upon simple stereotype information are more accurate than judgments based upon individualized information plus stereotype.

The hypothesis states, in effect, that having less information upon which to base predictions is more conducive to successful prediction--a recurrent phenomenon in research (Meehl, 1954; Stone et al., 1957), sometimes said to be due to the very lack of information that stereotypes provide (Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964).

The hypothesis was tested by allowing two groups to predict the behavior of three men. Both groups were given a simple age-marital status-sex stereotype, while only one had access to a transcribed interview with each subject.

Scores of the two groups are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.--Predictions of the behavior of three men in a "pure" test of Individual Accuracy. (Total no. of test items = 71)

Experimental Conditions	N	$\bar{X}$	Var	t
Typescript (PAP) Group	85	34.48	38.79	4.84***
Stereotype (SAP) Group	101	18.07	29.11	

***Significant at .001 level.

Results were highly significant, and do not support the hypothesis. Clearly, the inclusion of typescript material did result in a large increment in predictive accuracy. In fact, judges predicting the behavior of the three men knowing only the simple stereotype averaged only 18.07 correct responses out of 71 problems. As each item on the test offered only three possible choices, the average performance in this group was less than the 71/3, or 23.7, that would have been maximally likely if questions had been answered randomly.

Results indicate that the inverse of the original hypothesis is true, at least for this criterion measure. Generalizations beyond this specific instance are hazardous, for the test was designed to minimize the effects of group membership cues. It is clear, however, that under certain conditions judgments based on information about specific individuals are far superior to judgments based on stereotypes.

Hypothesis 2. Judgments of individuals based upon written material are more accurate than judgments based on written material plus sound films.

This hypothesis states, in effect, that when judges stick to the stated facts in the interviews, and do not try

to interpret them in the light of visual cues, they will make better predictions. They hypothesis was tested by comparing the scores of two groups on 61 questions of the Individual Accuracy test. Both groups used typescripts of the interviews, but only one was alowed to observe the films from which the typescripts had originally been made. Results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.--Predictions of the behavior of three men in a test of Individual Accuracy, with and without filmed observational cues. (Total no. of test items = 61)

Experimental Conditions	N	$\bar{X}$	Var	t
Typescript Group	81	29.69	42.39	.56 N.S.
Sound-Film Group	126	34.48	29.71	

N.S. = Not significant.

The group permitted to observe films had higher mean predictive accuracy on the test, although the difference was not significant. The findings, however, are not in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. A difference of this size in the means could have occurred about one in five times by the random process alone. While they may have aided predictions, observational cues effected no significant difference in accuracy scores.

Hypothesis 3. Bolder persons are more accurate in their predictions of behavior than cautious persons.

This hypothesis was tested within the framework of a correlational analysis. Correlations were obtained among scores on the two components of the sensitivity criterion, scores for the five trait-dimensions of the Personality Inventory, and a class performance score. The relationship between boldness and sensitivity, as measured by the criterion developed in this study, is tabulated below.

Table 6.--Correlations between boldness and criterion components. (N = 72)

Test	Correlation with Boldness
Case-sketch section	-.21*
Individual Accuracy section	-.14
Composite Criterion	-.21*

*Significant at .05 level.

None of the other personality traits were as strongly correlated with sensitivity as cautiousness, and none of the other correlations were significant. Intercorrelations are reported in full in Appendix B.

Hypothesis 4. The higher a person's class performance score, the more accurate are his predictions of behavior.

A measure of class performance was taken, using the total score on three tests in the Psychology of Personality class in which the subjects were enrolled. The relationship between this performance measure and sensitivity is tabulated below.

Table 7.--Correlations between class performance and sensitivity measures. (N = 72)

Test	Correlation with Performance
Case-sketch section	.44**
Individual Accuracy section	.33**
Composite Criterion	.48**

**Significant at .01 level.

The class performance variable was more strongly correlated with accuracy scores than were any of the personality variables, and the correlations were significant. This relationship, along with the other findings, will be discussed in the following section of this study.

DISCUSSION

An evaluation of the composite sensitivity criterion developed in the present study must concern itself with the issues of reliability and validity.

Criterion Reliability

Table 3 indicates the success of the effort to improve the reliability of the measure. Composite criterion reliability was .72, which compares favorably with the reliabilities of earlier measures reported in Table 1. Only Trumbo (1955) has reported a higher reliability, and the case-sketch section of the composite criterion was a revised form of Trumbo's test, reconstructed for greater generality and validity at some expense to its reliability. The Individual Accuracy section, twice item-analyzed and revised in this study, attained a reliability of .61. This was higher than the .57 reported for its earlier form by Grossman (1963), although the revision was shorter by 65 items. Reliability is, however, not the only indicator of probable validity.

Criterion Validity

Trumbo (1955) pointed out that a test measuring predictions of behavior should contain a large number of items, concerned with a wide variety of behaviors. Trumbo's test contained 120 items, but asked questions about only eight cases. The case-sketch section of the composite criterion has only 76 items (which may help to account for its lower reliability), but considers 13 cases. Dealing with a wider variety of behaviors, it has greater generality, hence more face validity as a measure of the general ability to predict people's behavior.

Researchers since Cronbach (1955) have stressed the multiple determination of sensitivity. That is, the ability has been felt to be made up of several independent components. A composite criterion, which would either measure or control several of the factors related to sensitivity, would have more logical validity than sensitivity measures adapted to a single factor.

It has been demonstrated (Cline, 1962) that statistical prediction is superior to clinical prediction with regard to stereotype accuracy, and that only in interpersonal (individual) accuracy are clinical predictions superior. A criterion which reduces stereotype accuracy effects and

focuses more upon measuring Individual Accuracy would therefore provide a more valid criterion for measuring clinical predictive accuracy, and for evaluating the effectiveness of training programs aimed at increasing the ability to understand and predict individual behaviors.

The poor predictive performance of judges using simple stereotype information indicates that the Individual Accuracy section of the criterion is relatively free from the effects of group membership cues. This produces some evidence for the validity of this section. It is measuring what it is intended to measure: individual, not stereotype, accuracy. In the case-sketch section, stereotype effects are unknown.

Since, on the whole, stereotype accuracy is group-specific (Zavala, 1960; Silkiner, 1962; Johnson, 1963; Smith, 1966), it is not a characteristic of the perceiver, and could hardly be a factor of the general ability to understand people. The reduction of group membership cues increases criterion validity by minimizing the effect of this confounding variable.

Stereotype With and Without Typescript

In addition to its relevance in the assessment of criterion validity, the stereotype-vs.-typescript experiment conducted in the first phase of this study has some relevance for interpreting the phenomenon of successful prediction with minimal information (Meehl, 1954; Stone, Leavitt, and Gage, 1957; Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964). The experimental comparison was not between modes of presentation, since both groups used the age-marital status-sex stereotype; rather, it tested the effects of providing judges with different amounts of information on which to base their predictions.

Stelmachers and McHugh (1964) advanced a "response set" hypothesis to explain the accuracy of predictions based on stereotypes. The core of the idea is that stereotypes work well because they don't provide much information on which to base predictions. Judges then presumably fall back on powerful response sets "which are more erroneously than correctly modified with additional or more individualized information."

The extremely poor predictive accuracy of judges in the present study who used a simple stereotype indicates that a lack of information is not responsible for the phenomenon. Results indicate that a sensitivity test can be

"purified" to eliminate the effects of group membership cues, so that judgments based upon individualized information are far superior to judgments based on simple stereotypes.

Interpretation of Correlational Study

The correlational analysis carried out in the first phase of the present study revealed several relationships. Their interpretation aids in the evaluation of criterion construction and in the study of traits related to the ability to understand people.

The correlation between the two subtests of the criterion (Individual Accuracy and case-sketch sections) was .27. While significant at the .02 level, this correlation is not large. This may indicate that the criterion subtests are partially independent in what they measure, and assess somewhat different aspects of sensitivity. This interpretation would seem to support the value of the two-component approach to criterion construction. Each component serves to measure something the other misses, and the two together "cover" the measurement of the general ability to understand people better than either would separately.

Boldness scores on the Protobob Personality Inventory were inversely related to scores on the case-sketch section and to total criterion scores, but were not related to scores on the Individual Accuracy section (see Table 6). This unexpected result did not agree with the previously reported relationship between boldness and predictive accuracy (e.g., Cline, 1955; Hershey, 1960; Grossman, 1967).

Results of the present study indicate that cautiousness, not boldness, is linked to predictive accuracy. The disparity with previous research may be due in part to the fact that other studies have correlated boldness measures to gains scores with sensitivity training. If cautious persons are more sensitive, a "ceiling" effect might be expected to make their training gains smaller. The relationship between cautiousness and sensitivity is, in any case, a minor one.

A high correlation, significant at the .01 level, was found between the ability to understand people and class performance, as measured by scores on tests in the subjects' Psychology of Personality class. The exact nature of this relationship is not clearly indicated. The correlation may reflect the influence of a third variable--that of intelligence. It has been amply demonstrated (e.g., Cline, 1955;

Chance and Meaders, 1960; Grossman, 1963) that intelligence is related to the ability to understand others. The sensitive person is an intelligent user of complex concepts, and it is possible that this facility reflects itself in class performance. This is, however, by no means the only plausible explanation of the results. An alternative explanation might be that more highly motivated subjects do better on paper and pencil tests, whether they deal with class material or information relevant to predicting a person's behavior.

Typescript With and Without Film

The present study did not follow the pattern of previous studies (Giedt, 1955; 1958), which compared written and audio-visual modes of presentation. Instead, in this analysis both groups of judges were allowed to use written material on which to base their predictions. This design controlled the important variable of recall, and provided a more direct assessment of the effects of observational cues in Individual Accuracy.

Results confirm previous research findings (Borke and Fiske, 1957; Kepes, 1965) indicating that mode of presentation of material does not have a significant effect on predictive accuracy. The presence or absence of observational

cues does not make a significant difference in accuracy scores. This finding has relevance for an evaluation of the Individual Accuracy component of the criterion. It seems likely that the small decrement in test validity incurred by the shift to a written mode of presentation is offset by an important practical matter: it is generally much easier and cheaper to obtain and make use of a written criterion than to arrange to show films. In practical situations calling for an assessment of sensitivity, therefore, it is probably more useful to employ a written presentation of material.

Directions for Training and Research

The major development of this study is the improved criterion of sensitivity. It provides a convenient, reliable, and general measure of the ability to understand people that may be of value in sensitivity research, as well as in the assessment of the effects of sensitivity training programs.

The interpretation of criterion scores should take both subtest scores into account, as well as overall criterion score. The low (.27) correlation between the two

subtests, and their differential relation to boldness, indicates that the subtests measure overlapping, but somewhat different components of sensitivity. Further research should examine the nature of this difference.

Although an improvement in some ways, the present criterion is far from perfect. The reliability could be higher, and the generality greater, especially in the Individual Accuracy section. The relation of scores on the criterion to everyday and long-range indicators of understanding needs exploration and validation. From a practical standpoint, a slight shortening of the criterion might make possible its administration in a single session. The establishment of norms for the criterion is also indicated. Norms for both sexes, founded upon a large N, would make possible a more accurate assessment of programs aimed at evaluating and training the ability to understand people.

SUMMARY

A test of the ability to understand people was developed from revisions of two earlier instruments. The final form of 137 items has two subtests. The first subtest is an improvement on a test for Individual Accuracy developed by Grossman (1963). The revision is shorter, requires less time, and has a higher reliability. The second subtest is an expansion of a test, employing a case-sketch presentation, developed by Trumbo (1955), and revised for greater generality by Silkiner (1962) and H. C. Smith. Final criterion reliability is .72, which compares favorably with the reliabilities reported by earlier sensitivity measures.

Two experimental comparisons and a correlational analysis were carried out during the course of the criterion's development, and four exploratory hypotheses were generated to aid in an assessment of the criterion: (1) Predictions based on stereotypes will be more accurate than predictions based on more complete written information, (2) Predictions based on written material will be more accurate

than predictions based on written material plus observational cues from sound films, (3) Bolder persons make more accurate predictions, and (4) The higher a person's class performance score, the more accurate are his predictions.

The first hypothesis was not supported. Results strongly indicated that the inverse of the hypothesis was true. This was interpreted as a demonstration that the Individual Accuracy subtest successfully met its intended design, and minimized group membership cues. Results strongly contraindicated a "response-set" explanation of the predictive success of judges using minimal information.

The second hypothesis was also not supported. The differences in mean Individual Accuracy scores for groups using written and written-plus-sound-filmed material was insignificant. Results indicated that the criterion's omission of observational cues attained the important practical advantages of a written mode of presentation without sacrificing (with the observational cues) a vital component of overall predictive accuracy.

To test hypotheses three and four, the correlations between boldness scores on a personality inventory, class performance scores, and prediction scores on the criterion were calculated and tested for significance. Boldness was

inversely related to scores on the case-sketch component and to total criterion scores, but was not significantly related to scores on the Individual Accuracy component of the criterion. Class performance scores were significantly related to both components of the criterion.

A significant but low (.27) correlation between criterion subtests indicated that they assess overlapping but somewhat different components of sensitivity.

Suggestions were made for the improvement of the criterion developed in this study, and for its interpretation and use in research and training programs concerned with the ability to understand people. The establishment of test norms was suggested as an immediate objective of further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W., and Odbert, H. S. Trait-names: a psycho-lexical study. Psychol. Monog., 1936, 211.

Borke, Helen, and Fiske, D. W. Factors influencing the prediction of behavior from a diagnostic interview. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 78-80.

Bronfenbrenner, V., Harding, J., and Gallwey, M. The measurement of skill in social perception. In McClelland, D. C. (ed.). Talent and Society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958, 29-108.

Bruni, E. A film test of accuracy in observing people and its correlates. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1963.

Chance, June E., and Meaders, W. Needs and interpersonal perception. J. Pers., 1960, 28, 200-210.

Cline, V. B. Ability to judge personality assessed with a stress interview and sound film technique. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 50, 183-187.

Cline, V. B., and Richards, J. M. Variables related to accuracy in interpersonal perception. Second annual report, Office of Naval Research, Contract NE 171-146, University of Utah, 1959.

Cline, V. B., and Richards, J. M. Accuracy of interpersonal perception: A general trait? J. abnormal. soc. Psychol., 1960, 60, 1-7.

Cline, V. B., and Richards, J. M. Components of accuracy of interpersonal and perception scores and the clinical and statistical prediction controversy. Psychol. Rec., 1962, 12, (4), 373-379.

Crew, W. J., and Hammond, K. R. The generality of accuracy and response sets in interpersonal perception. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 384-390.

Dymond, R. F. A scale for measurement of empathic ability. J. consult. Psychol., 1949, 13, 127-133.

Dymond, R. F. Personality and empathy. J. consult. Psychol., 1950, 14, 343-350.

Gage, N. L. Explorations in teachers' perceptions of pupils. J. Teacher Educ., 1958, 9, 97-101.

Giedt, F. H. Comparison of visual, content, and auditory cues in interviewing. J. consult. Psychol., 1955, 19, 407-416.

Giedt, F. H. Cues associated with accurate and inaccurate interview impressions. Psychiatry, 1958, 21, 405-409.

Grossman, B. A. The measurement and determinants of interpersonal sensitivity. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1963.

Grossman, B. A. Evaluation of a training program to improve the ability to differentiate between people. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Harris, W. A. The relation of observational to inferential accuracy in judging people. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.

Hershey, G. L. College grades in relation to inventory measures of personality. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1958.

Hershey, G. L. The relative effectiveness of discussion groups with dominant and submissive members. Unpublished research report, 1960.

Johnson, R. L. Correlates of a test of group sensitivity. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1963.

Kelly, E. L., and Fiske, D. W. The prediction of performance in clinical psychology. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951.

Kepes, S. Y. Experimental evaluations of sensitivity training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University, 1965.

Linden, J. The self-centered orientation in interpersonal relationships. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1965.

Meehl, P. E. Clinical versus statistical prediction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Pieper, W. J. Study on and revision of a test on accuracy in judging people. Unpublished research project, Michigan State University, 1960.

Silkiner, D. S. A cross-cultural study of the measurement, determinants, and effects of stereotype accuracy. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.

Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to people. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Stelmachers, Z. T., and McHugh, R. B. Contribution of stereotyped and individualized information to predictive accuracy. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 234-242.

Stone, G. C., Leavitt, G. S., and Gage, N. L. Two kinds of accuracy in predicting another's responses. J. soc. Psychol. 1957, 45, 245-254.

Trumbo, D. A. The development and analysis of a test of the ability to predict behavior. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1955.

Zavala, A. A test of stereotype accuracy. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1960.

APPENDIX A

H.C. Smith
Sept., 1966

TEST OF THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND PEOPLE

Directions: How well can you predict the feelings and behavior of people? In each of the following actual cases some information is given about a person. Study the facts then pick the answer to each statement that you think is correct. Mark "1" on the answer sheet if you think the statement is true; "2" if you think it is false. The correct answers are known from more complete information about the individuals.

Amos

Amos is the traffic manager for a Milwaukee Brewery. He was promoted from the driver ranks and possesses a fourth grade educational background. He is very loyal to the company and has high moral standards. When working in the ranks, he gained the reputation of being the hardest working driver. He is a big man and says that, "Hard work never hurt anyone".

T F 1. He works 10 to 12 hours a day and 6 to 7 days a week.
T F 2. He believes his employees should be paid on a commission basis.
T F 3. He feels that the union's seniority rule is as good a basis as any for promoting helpers to drivers.
T F 4. He tries to promote his product at all times, even to the point of losing friends.

Betty

Betty is the tall and slender receptionist of a university dean. Thirty-nine years old, she has top seniority among the seven girls in the office. The job requires that she meet the large number of students who have been asked to see the dean or who come to him for advice. She refers to students as "dumbbells", openly blames them for their errors, and swears when she is angry, which she often is.

T F 5. She consults the other girls about the regulation of the heat and ventilation in the office.
T F 6. She compliments the other girls when they do a good job.

T F 7. She was an only child.

T F 8. She is dependable about passing along phone messages she receives for the other girls.

Christopher

Christopher's parents live in a small western town where his father teaches school and his mother is librarian. Both parents are shy and quiet, fond of reading and natural history. His brother, 5 years older, is now a lawyer. Christopher has always been thin and frail but seldom ill. He began to talk early, but did not walk early. He seldom cried and required little discipline as a child. His intelligence test scores are considerably above those of the average college student.

(over)

T F 9. Christopher seldom daydreamed.

T F 10. He enjoyed his school gang.

T F 11. He feels that he is not a true participant in life.

T F 12. While in college he went to many movies.

T F 13. He creates imaginary friends.

T F 14. He enjoyed high school activities.

T F 15. Occasionally, when excited, he loses his voice.

T F 16. His college grades are lower than the grades of other students of his intelligence.

Dorian

When he first came to Harvard Dorian was a tall, narrow-shouldered 24 year old graduate student in engineering. He was born on a farm in Wisconsin, the youngest of a large family. He received most of his education at country schools until he entered engineering college. Recalling his family and childhood Dorian said: "My earliest impressions of life that I can remember now, were to a large extent miserable. As a baby I was constantly ailing, apparently having one childhood disease after another, starting off with measles at the age of six weeks. Mother was an intelligent, gentle, loving woman, and was much thought of by friends and neighbors. My father was at times a brutal man and inclined, when drinking, to be unpleasant to me. At such times he would make fun of me, call me all sorts of unpleasant names and say that I probably wouldn't live the year out, and that it would be better if I didn't...My father had become an invalid, I forgot to mention before, shortly after mother died. He was in acute need of a job for he had no money, and was living on what he could borrow from a brother. He was earning his meals by working in a restaurant."
Dorian was one of 50 college students hired for an intensive study of personality at Harvard in the 1930's.

T F 17. In an experiment involving a mild electric shock, Dorian was unusually disturbed.

T F 18. He had some difficulty in recalling the names and ages of his brother and sisters.

T F 19. Dorian was a good conversationalist.

T F 20. He had recently become a Christian Scientist.

Edgar

Edgar is 16 years old. A bit slight for his age, he is a medium-brown negro boy, the oldest of 4 children in a middle-class New Orleans family. His mother is a physically powerful woman, religious, dominant, and thrifty. She has been the head of the family since the father deserted seven years ago. She insists on well-mannered and obedient children. Edgar's father was a semi-skilled worker. Before he deserted the family the mother had decided that Edgar would be a doctor. Now she works to keep up appearances and to keep the children in school. Edgar was not to bring 'lower class" children home or to play with them. He had to stay in the yard after 4 p.m. His mother frequently used beatings in disciplining her children.

In spite of money problems his mother arranged for Edgar to attend a private negro prep school. He was above average intelligence and maintained good academic and athletic records throughout school.

T F 21. He is severely punished by his mother when he exhibited curiosity about sex.
T F 22. He shows few signs of anxiety or worry.
T F 23. He saves his money to buy good clothes.
T F 24. He feels strongly that lower class negroes are unfairly persecuted.
T F 25. He says: "I'm as good as anybody in the world."
T F 26. He is boastful.
T F 27. He is verbally but not physically aggressive.
T F 28. He is proud of his mother.

Frank

Frank entered Dartmouth College from a private school and graduated as an economics major. He was of slight build, average height, good health, a very superior intelligence. An observer who had known him and his family for a long time commented:

> "The only child of very admiring and doting parents. During his pre-college life, he was brought up to be a perfect gentlemen; so much so, in fact, that he failed to reveal the usual boyish traits as completely as he should have. As he grew older, he veered from the exemplary behavior and developed a reputation of being a great ladies' man, a somewhat reckless driver and indifferent to the serious aspects of living. At times, his appearance is very smooth, and then again he is quite neglectful and looks extremely seedly. The mother has been a semi-invalid during all of the boy's life and has dominated him, and I believe imposed upon him beyond reason."

T F 29. When asked what super-politeness expressed, he replied: "contempt!"
T F 30. Fellow students think of him as a "snob"
T F 31. Frank received high grades in college.
T F 32. Frank has few artistic interests.

George

George was the second son of Irish immigrant parents who had grade school educations. His father's earnings were meager at first, but improved when encouraged by his wife. He invested a small inheritance in a flower shop. George's mother felt that education was less important than religion, but necessary for getting ahead socially. She was very affectionate, but dominating. George's parents decided he should be a doctor. His father was rather passive, but capable of outbursts. Punishment of the children was severe. It included shaming, denying of affection, spanking, and denying of pleasure. As a child George was his parents' favorite, and was often the center of attraction. He was good looking, and was considerably above average intelligence. Later, however, he lost favor when his brothers made more social progress.

(over)

T F 33. He found it easy to make decisions.
T F 34. He had very strong guilt feelings about masturbation.
T F 35. He acted childish in high school.
T F 36. He was a "show off" in kindergarten.
T F 37. He bragged about his sexual conquests.
T F 38. He bragged about being so young in high school.
T F 39. He was very studious.
T F 40. He found it much easier to get along with boys than girls.

Harrisons

Margaret Harrison is the owner and manager of an independent woman's ready-to-wear shop in a suburb of Cleveland. She also does all the buying which means leaving the shop in charge of a saleswoman twice a year while she is in New York. She is married to a man who is lame. Because of this he has refused to work for quite some time. He does odd jobs around the store and gives orders to the employees. He drinks heavily. Mrs. Harrison is about 55 years old. She is large, sturdy, and extremely intelligent. She has had a great deal of experience in the retail field. She is in the upper middle class. She is industrious and ambitious, but has a quick temper and never admits a mistake.

There are 5 saleswomen, 2 maids, and 10 alteration women working for her. They receive excellent pay and work from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. with an hour off for lunch. The merchandise in the shop is extremely high-priced and consequently the customers are very wealthy, high-society people.

T F 41. Mrs. Harrison is liked by her employees.
T F 42. She is constantly enlarging her shop.
T F 43. She let her employees take a ten minute break in the afternoon.
T F 44. She doesn't hesitate to state her opinion if she disagrees with a customer's taste in clothes.

John

John at 15, was 5'4" tall and weighed 105 pounds. He had a childhood record of ill health. John was usually reserved but sometimes expressed himself forcefully. He was not at home in social gatherings, though he often attended. He enjoyed talking about books, art, politics, and movie stars. He got good marks in Literature and Language, but poor ones in Math. John grew up in a middle class suburban area. His father provides a modest income as a plumber. He is patient and friendly with John. John's mother, the dominant figure in the household, is often apprehensive about his safety and demands much of his time.

T F 45. John is unusually fearful of his emotional impulses.
T F 46. John stated: "I wish my mother could be happier."
T F 47. John saw himself as seldom worrying about "things which he had done, but never told to anyone."
T F 48. John felt that radical agitators should not be allowed to make public speeches.

Karl

Karl, a Dartmouth student, was a cheery, sociable, and conventional young man of average intelligence who was earnest and diligent in his college work. He graduated, however, in the lowest tenth of his class. He had considerable feelings of inferiority and has a fear of making independent judgments. His completions of incomplete sentences ("artificial as the ice cream in a soda fountain window",

"exciting as a battle between a mongoose and a cobra", "idealistic as the life of a nun", etc.) indicated that Karl had a creative capacity that had not been used in his academic work. Both of his parents were talented musicians but he could not carry a tune or play an instrument.

T F 49. In his autobiography he wrote that he was "the most even-tempered cuss that has ever walked on two feet."
T F 50. About the same number of friends described him as "even-tempered" as described him as "quick-tempered".
T F 51. Karl was unable to organize and present ideas clearly.
T F 52. He clearly distinguished between what he thought from what others expected him to think.

The Lawrences

William Lawrence, 24 and Laura, 23, have been married for a year and a half. Both his and her parents had approved of their marriage. Their parents were foreign-born, similar in social and economic backgrounds, and lived in the same community. At the time of their marriage, William had had only irregular employment since his graduation from high school. William is proud of his dead mother. She had run her husband's affairs, planned her seven children's vocational and social activities, and faced death with an unsagging spirit. The youngest of his three sisters, all of whom were much like their mother, took care of him when their mother died. Laura, although she wanted to teach kindergarten, had worked as a store clerk for two years before her marriage and continued to work at the same job afterward. Her father had been a successful merchant. However, he developed an interest in gambling and had given up several good positions impulsively. He often gave Laura and her mother tongue-lashings. Her mother was patient and long suffering. The Lawrences had few friends and belonged to no social organizations.

T F 53. William expected his wife to do many things for him.
T F 54. His mother was also named Laura.
T F 55. He feels that his childhood was happy.
T F 56. He knows that he wants to depend on his wife as he used to depend upon his mother and sisters.
T F 57. William commenting on getting married, said: "With superhuman effort I forced myself to go to the courthouse and say, 'I want a license'".
T F 58. Laura continued to respect her father even after he had ceased to support the family.
T F 59. William considers his marriage a mistake.
T F 60. William still greatly admires his wife's appearance and personality.

The Medford Twins

Earl and Frank, identical twins, were born in a midwestern city, of uneducated and unmarried parents. When the boys were six months old, they were turned over to their mother's sister. She kept Frank but placed Earl with a family who had advertised their wish to board a baby. This family soon assumed full responsibility for Earl and took him to a city in the northwest without consulting the aunt of the two boys. Earl's foster father was a college graduate and a successful salesman; Frank's a streetcar conductor. Earl graduated from college; Frank attended high school only six months, though later he attended night school. Earl was raised in comfort; Frank was brought up by his fond aunt with little economic security in the neighborhood where he was born. Both twins had happy homes with only moderate discipline.

(over)

They were both interviewed and tested by psychologists in 1941 when they were 37 years old. The twins were remarkably similar in many respects: same height, same color hair, same fingerprints, same good health, same poor spelling, same ratings on many personality traits, very similar vocational interest scores, etc... In some respects, however, they were different. For each of the statements indicate the name of the twin to whom you think the statement applies. Mark "1" for Earl and "2" for Frank.

1 2 61. Was less pompous and affected.
1 2 62. Said that what he wished for most was the happiness of his family.
1 2 63. Was more eager to impress people.
1 2 64. Said that what he wanted most in life was a good business with men working for him.
1 2 65. Was more emotional.
1 2 66. Was more timid and self-conscious.
1 2 67. Was more disturbed by his failure to achieve his ambitions.
1 2 68. Was more friendly in his personal relations.

The Nelson Twins

Fred and John, identical twins, had very similar backgrounds and personality. Their father, an unsuccessful and alcoholic son of a well-to-do father, had gone to Cuba to make his fortune. He failed there as a farmer and also failed in Florida where the family had moved when the boys were 4. He eventually returned to New England to live with the twins' grandmother. The mother of the twins was industrious and long-suffering. Though she was, for the most part, responsible for rearing the children, their father was sporadically a demanding and cruel disciplinarian. The twins left school after the eighth grade and went to work in the same factory on semi-skilled jobs. They are working at identical jobs today. They have the same eye and hair color, and look very much alike. Both have type O and RH positive blood. Both are shy, dependent, passive, and anxious.

The twins came to the attention of physicians at the age of 46 because John had developed a severe duodenal ulcer while Fred remained in good health. For each of the statements below indicate the name of the twin to whom you think the statement applies. Mark "1" for Fred and "2" for John.

1 2 69. Had better understanding of himself and of other people.
1 2 70. Was more optomistic.
1 2 71. Showed greater hatred of his father.
1 2 72. Described his wife as a good cook and mother.
1 2 73. While the level of gastric secretion was much higher than normal in both twins, his level was higher than his brother's.
1 2 74. Was more resentful that their mother had not given them more from the $100,000 she inherited about ten years ago.
1 2 75. Was a warmer and more tender person.
1 2 76. Was readier to accept blame.

PART II: TEST OF THE ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND PFOPLE

DIRECTIONS: This is a test of your ability to make accurate predictions about people. You will be given information about Mr. George, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Allen. Your task is to use this information to make judgements about them; that is, to predict their behavior. Correct answers have been obtained from attitude and personality scales filled out by each man, and from ratings and sketches made on each man by his friends and relatives. The test is divided into two sections:

Section 1: Individuals
Section 2: Comparisons

***

SECTION 1: This part consists of brief interviews with three men followed by questions about their behavior. Follow the directions given at the beginning of each case. The interviews are given in the order:

(1) Mr. George
(2) Mr. Walter
(3) Mr. Allen

THE CASE OF MR. GEORGE:

Your task is to make accurate predictions about Mr. George. Mr. George is a middle-aged, married man with one child. As part of a research project on understanding people, he was given a brief interview. A typescript is given below.

Psychologist: "What sort of person are you?"
Mr. George: "Just an average person. I like the normal things most people do. I like sports, I like to dance and play around that way. Of course, I don't run around, I'd say I was getting into a stable class. I'm over the younger fling."
Psychologist: "What would you consider your greatest personality handicap?"
Mr. George: "Well, maybe too reserved."
Psychologist: "In what way?"
Mr. George: "Well, especially in business. I think I take too much of what the boss says, and do it. And, though maybe I can do it better, I do it the way he says to avoid trouble. In other words, I try to get along with people, which is good. But maybe sometimes I should say more about it to maybe help me and the others."
Psychologist: "Assert yourself a little more?"
Mr. George: "Yes."
Psychologist: "Do you ever lose your temper?"
Mr. George: "Well, very seldom with the person. I may become upset. I try my best not to let them know it."
Psychologist: "What would you do if someone told a lie about you?"
Mr. George: "Well, what kind of a lie--that I did something I didn't?"
Psychologist: "Yes, A lie that perhaps would be damaging to your character."
Mr. George: "Well, I don't know, but I imagine I'd try and find out why the person said it. Maybe, as far as he knew, he was telling the truth."

Psychologist: "Would you go to him and talk to him about it?"
Mr. George: "If it was of importance, otherwise I would forget it."
Psychologist: "What sort of hobbies do you particularly enjoy?"
Mr. George: "Well, I like to make things. Woodwork and hunting are the main things."
Psychologist: "How important do you feel religion is to people in these times?"
Mr. George: "I don't go in for religion too much. I believe that it is necessary for everybody to have a basic belief. As far as the religious part goes, in my own living I don't place that as a major issue."
Psychologist: "Then religion is not too important to you personally?"
Mr. George: "No."
Psychologist: "But you do feel that people should have some sort of basic faith?"
Mr. George: "Yes, they have to have a code to live by, and that's the best one I can think of."

The Case of Mr. George

DIRECTIONS: Mr. George has checked one alternative on each of the statements below to describe himself. You are to check the alternative you think he checked. Use spaces 77-80.

77. When my conscience begins to bother me. . .
(1) I'm ashamed
(2) I analyze myself
(3) I try to do the right thing

78. I could hate a person who . . .
(1) is a hypocrite and two-faced
(2) is cruel and ridicules others
(3) . . . I don't hate anybody

79. When they offered me help I . . .
(1) was somewhat embarrassed
(2) thanked them but refused
(3) accepted

80. I boiled up when . . .
(1) I was criticized unjustly
(2) I saw people hurting others
(3) I was cheated

***

THE CASE OF MR. WALTER:

Your task is to make accurate predictions about Mr. Walter. Mr. Walter is a young married man with two children. As part of a research project on understanding people, he was given a brief interview. A typescript follows.

Psychologist: "What sort of a person are you?"
Mr. Walter: "That's hard to determine. I'm one person to myself and another type of person to society. I'd have to give two definitions to answer that correctly ---how I am to myself, and how I am to people who know me."
Psychologist: "What sort of person are you to yourself?"
Mr. Walter: "Well, I think I'm a person of probably over-average intelligence, with ambitions to be able to better myself and my society."
Psychologist: "What sort of person do you feel you are to other people?"

Mr. Walter: "Well, I hope I'm pretty nearly the same kind of person to other people as I am to myself. I get along well with most people, I don't have a great many friends; I have a few intimate friends, and with these people I'm quite close. I get along well with these people. And, I can be pretty compatible with most people."
Psychologist: "What do you feel is your greatest personality handicap?"
Mr. Walter: "The fact that I try too hard to do things, I believe. This hinders me from being able to do things--by being under certain tensions."
Psychologist: "Do you ever lose your temper?"
Mr. Walter: "Rarely."
Psychologist: "What sort of thing would cause you to lose your temper."
Mr. Walter: "Well, never having lost my temper completely--I've always been able to hold my emotions pretty well in check--it would have to be a fairly devastating thing, I think, to make me lose it, or to become completely out of control of myself?"
Psychologist: "What sort of hobbies do you particularly enjoy?"
Mr. Walter: "Golf, music, spectator sports--I am not too athletic--tennis, things such as this."
Psychologist: "How important do you feel religion is to people in these times?"
Mr. Walter: "That's a pretty deep subject. Not being a deeply religious man myself, it isn't too important to me. The moral teachings of religion help man be able to live better with himself, and with other people in society. I think today it's quite important for most people--not for the supernatural aspects of it, but for the moral teachings."
Psychologist: "You don't feel that it's necessary for you?"
Mr. Walter: "Not necessary, no."

The Case of Mr. Walter

DIRECTIONS: Mr. Walter has checked one alternative on each of the statements below to describe himself. You are to check the alternative you think he checked. Use spaces 81-85.

81. I would go mad if . . .
(1) somebody nagged me all the time
(2) I had nothing to do
(3) I thought there were no purpose in life

82. At the party, I was . . .
(1) a little shy and reserved
(2) the life of the party
(3) quite smooth and polished

83. My philosophy of life is . . .
(1) "Whatever you do, do well."
(2) "Enjoy today, think of tomorrow."
(3) "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

84. I enjoy . . .
(1) great music
(2) being with people
(3) sports

85. When I meet people, I generally feel . . .
(1) indifferent
(2) uneasy and self-conscious
(3) at ease and genial

THE CASE OF MR. ALLEN:

Your task is to make accurate predictions about Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen is a young, single man. As part of a research project, he was given a brief interview. A typescript follows:

Psychologist: "Just what sort of a person are you?"
Mr. Allen: "Well, I guess an easy-going one. I'm easy to get along with."
Psychologist: "What else can you tell me about yourself?"
Mr. Allen: "Well, I guess that's about all. I have some temper--not much."
Psychologist: "What would you consider your greatest personality handicap?"
Mr. Allen: "Well, I guess just paying attention when there are people talking to me. Just paying attention to them."
Psychologist: "Do you have difficulty paying attention when people talk to you?"
Mr. Allen: "No, no, I don't have no difficulty, it's just that whenever I walk into a place, I just don't speak, I'm quiet."
Psychologist: "Do you have difficulty making friends?"
Mr. Allen: "No, no, I don't find no difficulty making friends."
Psychologist: "After you once get to know them, then. But to begin with, you feel a little reserved, is that it?"
Mr. Allen: "Yuh."
Psychologist: "Well, do you ever lose you temper? What about?"
Mr. Allen: "Once in a great while. It has to be something pretty mean, I guess, or something pretty big. One I guess is just--I don't know--couldn't tell you that until I lost my temper. Well, for instance, my little brother taking off with my car."
Psychologist: "That would make you unhappy?"
Mr. Allen: "Yuh."
Psychologist: "What would you do if someone told a lie about you?"
Mr. Allen: "I guess that would make me a little sore too, if it wasn't true."
Psychologist: "What would you do, go to the person and talk to him about it?"
Mr. Allen: "I wouldn't do nothing. Just sort of keep it to myself."
Psychologist: "What sort of things do you do in your spare time?"
Mr. Allen: "Oh, usually drive around; I like to drive around quite a bit."
Psychologist: "Do you participate actively in sports, or are you a spectator?"
Mr. Allen: "No, I participate in it. Basketball, for instance."
Psychologist: "How important do you feel religion is to people in these times? How is it important to you?"
Mr. Allen: "Yes, I really do think that religion is important. I don't know. I guess just being good, people go out, and that ain't so bad, just going out and partying, but after that, the way they gather. . ."
Psychologist: "And you think that religion would affect that sort of thing?"
Mr. Allen: "I think so, because of conscience--people have a conscience, and that would be on it.
Psychologist: "In what way is religion important to you?"
Mr. Allen: "I don't know, well, sometimes when you go out partying, you feel like doing something else, and yet you don't."
Psychologist: "Because of your religion, is that it?"
Mr. Allen: "Uh-huh."

The Case of Mr. Allen

DIRECTIONS: Mr. Allen has checked one alternative on each of the statements below to describe himself. <u>You are to check the alternative you think he checked</u>. Use spaces 86-90.

86. When I make a mistake, I . . .
(1) don't give a damn
(2) am embarassed
(3) laugh it off

87. I feel "down in the dumps" when . . .
(1) . . . I don't
(2) I say the wrong thing
(3) I don't succeed

88. When they told me what to do . . .
(1) I did just the opposite
(2) I listened politely but did nothing
(3) I did it

89. At the party, I was . . .
(1) a little shy and reserved
(2) the life of the party
(3) quite smooth and polished

90. Religion seems to me . . .
(1) unnecessary
(2) a problem
(3) necessary and important

***

SECTION 2:

INFERENCE ACCURACY

INSTRUCTIONS:

All the men in Section 1 filled out a series of attitude and personality scales. Their friends rated them on a series of traits and also gave sketches of them. The statements below are based on the answers that the men and their friends gave. When you answer the questions, use only spaces 1, 2, and 3 on the IBM sheets. The numbers correspond to the order in which the interviews appeared. Mr. George is (1), Mr. Walter is (2), and Mr. Allen is (3).

If you think the answer to a particular question is:

Mr. George mark "1"
Mr. Walter mark "2"
Mr. Allen mark "3"

You may go back and reread the interviews if you wish to; in any given subsection, an individual may be used more than once.

Religious Beliefs

(1) Mr. George, (2) Mr. Walter, and (3) Mr. Allen filled out a rating scale about their religious beliefs. Which one answered in the following manner?

(2) 91. Agreed that "I am unable to accept the idea of 'life after death' at least not until we have some definite evidence there is such a thing."

(3) 92. Agreed that "God will punish those who disobey his commandments and reward those who obey Him (either in this life or a future life)."

(2) 93. Disagreed that "There exists an evil intelligence, personnage, or spirit in the universe often referred to as Satan or the Devil."

Adjective Check List

The three men were each given pairs of adjectives and were asked to choose the one which they thought was a better description of themselves. In each of the pairs below, only one of the men checked the adjective underlined. Mark "1" if you think it was Mr. George, "2" if you think it was Mr. Walter, or "3" if you think it was Mr. Allen:

2 94. Arrogant --- apathetic
2 95. Progressive --- outgoing
3 96. Shy --- assertive
1 97. Steady --- spunky
1 98. Tolerant --- igenious
1 99. Stable --- robust
3 100. Contented --- quick
1 101. Warm --- forceful
1 102. Moderate --- artistic
2 103. Restless --- unemotional
3 104. Sincere --- original
1 105. Good-natured --- painstaking
3 106. Kind --- insightful
1 107. Changeable --- tense
3 108. Loyal --- clever
1 109. Foolish --- cynical

Personality Inventory Items

(1) Mr. George, (2) Mr. Walter, and (3) Mr. Allen were given a series of true-false items. Which one of the three answered false to these items?

3 110. I like to be the center of attention.
3 111. It is easy for me to talk to strangers.
2 112. At times I think I am no good at all.

Which one of the three answered true to these items?

2 113. I easily become impatient with people.
1 114. I take a pretty easy-going and lighthearted attitude toward life.
3 115. Policemen are usually honest.

Thumbnail Sketches by Friends

Friends of (1) Mr. George, (2) Mr. Walter, and (3) Mr. Allen also gave thumbnail descriptions of them. Which one was described as follows?

2 116. "Is in a state of rebellion against all religions."
2 117. "Enjoys almost all good art and music."
3 118. "Does quite poorly in speaking to groups."
2 119. "Rather fussy about what he eats and how it is prepared."
3 120. "Is shy and reserved at parties."
3 121. "Prefers going steady with one person."
1 122. "Is fairly easy-going with children."
1 123. "Raises voice a little but maintains control in family arguments."

1 124. "Is about average in regards to ambition."
2 125. "Somewhat insecure and highstrung."
1 126. "Is easy to get along with."
3 127. "Is a rather quiet and humble person."
3 128. "Loyal, honest, and kind."
2 129. "Tends to 'stew' about things, changes his mind back and forth before making final decisions."

Ratings by Friends

(1) Mr. George, (2) Mr. Walter, and (3) Mr. Allen were rated by their friends on a series of personality traits. Which one was rated as follows?

2 130. least affectionate
2 131. most rebellious
2 132. least shy
3 133. least egotistical
3 134. most careful
1 135. least ambitious
2 136. most egotistical
1 137. least careful

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

CORRELATIONS OF SENSITIVITY CRITERION COMPONENTS WITH OTHER VARIABLES
(N = 72; 35 Males, 37 Females)

Variable		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Case-sketch Component	(1)		.27	.79	.44	-.20	.14	-.21	-.06	-.02
Individual Accuracy Component	(2)			.79	.33	-.05	.18	-.14	-.12	.00
Total Criterion	(3)				.48	-.17	.18	-.21	-.11	-.01
Class Performance	(4)					.00	.13	-.20	-.29	.03
Impulsive-Controlled	(5)						-.09	.17	-.18	.31
Rational-Empirical	(6)							-.08	.00	-.02
Cautious-Bold	(7)								-.23	.35
Emotional-Calm	(8)									.00
Acquiescence	(9)									