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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Almost every individual experiences situations daily in which he formulates plans and acts on the basis of his first impressions of others. The degree of influence attributable to these impressions is dependent upon the attitudes of the individual perceiver. Rather than ponder over the philosophic question of whether or not first impressions should determine the course of future interpersonal relations, psychologists concerned with this type behavior have directed their interests to the understanding of the dynamics underlying impression formation and the behavior which results from these impressions.

It is the intent of this study to investigate an aspect of the accuracy of first impressions and the stability of attitudes formed on the basis of these impressions. The study of first impressions and their influence on behavior is one aspect of the general topic of person perception.

Theoretical Background

The underlying process of person perception may best be understood as a progression of phases, from cue selection, to inference drawing, to final translation (27). According
to Attneave (2, p. 189), the function of this process is the encoding of incoming information in its most economical form.

The complexity of person perception has long been recognized by anthropologists and sociologists, as well as psychologists (16). Concepts evolving from each discipline, while oriented within a discrete frame of reference, have proved to be compatible in the formation of theoretical explanations in this area.

The term "interpersonal relations" was first introduced by Sullivan, and was quickly adopted by psychologists (16). One of Sullivan's observations was that the utilization of information is directly related to awareness (21). The awareness which one person has for another dictates the direction which the ensuing relationship will assume. If the transmitted information is misperceived, the factor of awareness is reduced and interpersonal relationships are hindered.

Carl Rogers (25), in writing about what he calls an individual's phenomenal field, emphasizes that an individual reacts to his environment according to the manner in which he perceives what is to him the real world. In trying to maintain a degree of consistency in his conception of reality, the individual uses himself as a frame of reference with which to evaluate the environment. Then relating this concept to the process of person perception, it may be proposed that an accurate perception of others is at first dependent upon the similarities between the interacting individuals. With regard
to the similarities between individuals, Rogers hypothesized as follows:

The greater the congruence of experience, awareness and communication on the part of one individual, the more the ensuing relationship will involve: a tendency toward reciprocal communication with a quality of increasing congruence; a tendency toward more mutually accurate understanding of the communications; improved psychological adjustment and functioning in both parties; mutual satisfaction in the relationship.

Conversely the greater the communicated incongruence of experience and awareness, the more the ensuing relationship will involve: further communication with the same quality; disintegration of accurate understanding; less adequate psychological adjustment and functioning in both parties; and mutual dissatisfaction in the relationship (24, p. 345).

From Rogers' hypothesis it may be assumed that a judge's evaluation of another person will be most accurate when the other person shares similar personality traits and less accurate as the other person departs from this similarity. In terms of first impressions, an encounter with a person of similar personality traits will afford the judge a communication which may be evaluated on the basis of congruent past experiences.

Inferences drawn on the basis of past experiences have been considered by Cronbach (7) in the formulation of an implicit personality theory. Formally stated, an observed trait is associated with an inferential net linking one trait to another. First impressions may, therefore, be considered related to past experiences in which cognitive systems were established. Elements relevant to the cognitive system are generalized into a set pattern which determines the direction of the judgment.
The stability of a first impression has been found by Luchins (18) to be more significantly affected by primacy rather than recency. Assuming that a judge is not confronted by an extensive array of unrelated interpolated communications, he will maintain convictions forwarded by first impressions. In conjunction with Heider's balance theory (13), in which unbalanced cognitive systems ultimately shift to a state of balance, the stability of a first impression may be related to the similarity between the judge and the person being judged. In this manner the introduction of additional information would serve as a communication reinforcing the relationship between previous judgments and the cognitive systems from which they were generalized.

The theories forwarded by the forementioned psychologists represent a general overview of some of the theoretical explanations of interpersonal behavior. When considering an objective study of these theoretical propositions, it becomes necessary to utilize techniques which measure the quality and consequences of experience during interpersonal interaction and the determinants which regulate such behavior (12, p.61). In reference to the measurement of determinants, Harry Triandis wrote:

Since another person has many characteristics, the observation that an individual has a certain attitude toward him gives only idiosyncratic information. What is needed are the observations of the individual's behaviors toward people who have or do not have the various characteristics.

.""
To reach even this point of understanding of an individual's attitudes, we should as a minimum learn something about his personal constructs concerning the characteristics that are likely to be important for him in viewing other people (29, pp. 234-235).

Review of Related Studies

Studies investigating the dynamics of person perception may be found in abundance throughout the psychological literature. Those which will be considered at this time will be categorized according to their contributions in the areas of basic impression formation, factors in perception, motivational relativity, degree or amount of available information as stimulation, and similarity of traits or attitudes.

It has been suggested that impressions of personality evolve from an initial global conception of behavior (13). In several early studies conducted by Asch (1), it was found that such a conception is formed from a Gestaltic association of a variety of traits, the selection of which is discrete for each individual. Because of the discreteness of individual trait selection, Asch concluded that, although impression formation is an organized process, it can not be expressed as a mathematical function.

To illustrate the dynamics of perceptual organization, Heider and Simmel (14) conducted a study in which several groups of adults viewed a two and one-half minute motion-picture involving only the movement of three geometric forms: a large triangle, a small triangle and a circle. One group
was asked to report what they saw. A second group was asked to consider the figures to be human and report what they saw. Although the features of human action were eliminated nearly all subjects in the first group reported the action to be animated. They even gave the geometric figures personalities with definite characters. This finding led Heider to believe that past experiences determine the organization of a person's perceptions when he is evaluating the observed actions of other individuals.

In a later study conducted by Gollin (10), impression formation was found to be a function of observed characteristics and underlying cognitive factors. Such an explanation complimented the observations of Asch by defining the variety of traits as two separate systems functioning as a whole. Leby and Dugan (17) explored an aspect of the cognitive process and learned that individuals discern observable characteristics according to apparent worth, threat, dependability, and potential affinity of the person being observed.

Factors found influencing the formation of person perception have been categorized according to age, sex, background, intelligence, training in psychology, self insight, and emotional stability (28). When considering these factors as a joint combination of attitudes of the stimulus person, nature of the interaction, and characteristics of the perceiver, a general overview of the perceptual process may
be established, which will serve as a basis for the comprehension of segmented studies in personality perception.

During the course of an interpersonal interaction, the perceiver as well as the stimulus person participates in a dramatic display of role behavior, which is believed to be the most effective representation of self within a particular environment. Studies, such as those conducted by Wishner (32), illustrate the fact that the stimulus factors, observed during interpersonal interaction, are only as significant as their correlation with the environmental setting. Researchers such as Norman (22), Steiner (28) and Cattell (6) have taken into consideration the effects of role playing and distilled the resultant interaction into factors applicable to the formation of social perception.

Age and sex of the individual have not been found to differentiate an individual's ability to judge another person, again excluding the effect of role association within a given environment (28). Intelligence and background of the perceiver have proved to be effective factors in enhancing the accuracy of person perceptions (28). Despite the popular conception that psychologists possess an acute awareness of others, studies have shown them to fall short of this expectation when compared with inexperienced individuals judging personality traits during an initial interview (9, 30). It may, therefore, be seen that basic factors in person perception have been
determined from objective studies and are considered as valid variables in perception formation.

When considering the influence of motivation in the acquisition of information about other persons, it has been found that individuals recall more characteristics related to high-intensity needs than to moderate-intensity needs (5). The perceived desirability of personality characteristics is an important factor in the formulation of first impressions. This idea is supported by other studies which found that intra-judge trait intercorrelations are influenced by familiarity of traits (15), and the relationship between the trait and the judge (11). Such findings suggest that the similarity of personality traits between a judge and the person being judged would increase the accuracy of the judge's first impression. The judge's familiarity with the trait he would be rating would be increased, which would account for an increased perception of the relationship of the trait with the person being judged.

The amount of available information which a judge may employ in rating others has been found to influence the accuracy of interpersonal perception. Surprisingly enough, optimum accuracy has been found to be associated with a moderate amount of information (31). This suggests that first impressions afford a judge a reliable basis for a correct prediction, if the available information is limited.

It would appear, then, that persons who have only the most superficial information about one another can draw upon their more-or-less comparable prior experiences and whatever easily observable cues are
available to them to yield peer-rating structures that are highly similar to those obtained from subjects who are intimately acquainted with one another. But only in the latter sorts of groups will the peer ratings agree to any marked extent with self-appraisals (23 p. 49).

Once a judge has established an identification of the observed person with some reference group, the degree of accuracy for the prediction of behavior is dependent upon the similarity between the judged person's behavior and the typical behavior of that group (26). It is for this reason that the quality of information is as important in interpersonal perception as the quantity. Furthermore, it has been found that negative information has a stronger effect on personality prediction than does positive information (20). This finding was based on the predictions of a general population and did not take into account the differential effect of negative information on judges with personality characteristics similar to that of the person being judged and those with characteristics which are not similar. The present study suggests that negative information concerning the judged person will produce a greater effect upon those whose characteristics are dissimilar to the judged person's than upon those whose characteristics are similar.

In a study by Belenky (3), no evidence was found to support the hypothesis that the ability to perceive the self accurately is dependent upon the ability to perceive others accurately. "Accurate predictions of the other person takes place when differentiation of self from other is facilitated
by focusing upon the other person (19)." When this concept and sociometric findings that "... the positive relationship between perceived similarity and valuations of others is a function of the need to be similar to valued persons (3)" are jointly considered, the question arises as to whether or not the accuracy of personality prediction is dependent upon the similarity of a judge's self-image and the self-image of the person being judged. If the judge's self-image is negative, it would appear that he would not value a person with similar personality traits and would consequently predict the self-image of the other person as negative. In the same fashion, if a judge's self-image is positive, it would appear that he would value a person with similar personality traits and would predict the self-image of the other person to be positive.

In a study conducted by Bender and Hastorf (4), subjects were asked to evaluate another person on a forty-two item scale. The person being judged evaluated himself on the same scale, and accuracy predictions were determined by deviation scores between the two. The accuracy of predictions was found to be greatly influenced by projection. This suggests that judges similar to the person being judged would obtain a high accuracy score by generalizing a self-image to the other person.

The forementioned theories and findings have suggested that an individual judges others on the basis of observable traits. He associates these traits with established cognitive
systems. Communications which are consistent with the cognitive
systems reinforce original inferences and stabilize attitudes
formed on first impressions. In the interest of further
exploring the dynamics of predictions made during first im-
pressions, the current study was conducted and the following
hypotheses tested:

1. The accuracy of a judge's prediction of another
   person's self-image will increase as the similarity
   between the self-images of the judge and the other
   person increases.

2. The accuracy of a judge's prediction of another
   person's self-image will increase as the similarity
   between the age level of the judge and the other
   person increases.

3. Changes in the attitude of a judge toward another
   person, once negative information concerning the
   other person is introduced, will decrease as the
   similarity between the self-images of the judge
   and the other person increases.

4. Changes in attitude of a judge toward another
   person, once negative information concerning the
   other person is introduced, will decrease as the
   similarity of the age levels between the judge
   and the other person increases.
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CHAPTER II

METHODS

Subjects

The subjects used in this study consisted of seventy-six students from one junior high and two college classes. A ninth grade class, comprising twenty-seven of the subjects, was selected because it afforded an adequate age contrast with the college classes, as well as a marked difference in the sophistication of the students. Two college classes, of different disciplines, were selected for the purpose of allowing a maximum representation of the college population. They consisted of twenty-six students enrolled in a freshman sociology class and twenty-three students enrolled in a senior psychology class.

Procedure

An interview (Appendix I) with a twenty-one year old male college student, unknown to all of the subjects, was video taped and replayed for each of the three classes. This technique assured the standardization of the stimuli which would affect the subjects. Shortly after the taping session, the interviewee was given a Self-Image Questionnaire (1) (Appendix II) and instructed to answer the questions as they per-
the following instructions were read to the classes:

Today we are going to conduct an experiment to learn how accurately a person can judge a stranger using a first impression as the only guide. You are going to be shown a video tape and for the next few minutes your job will be to observe the behavior of a stranger, whom I have interviewed. After the interview, I will hand you a questionnaire with which you will rate the stranger according to your first impression of him. Your cooperation in making honest evaluations of your impressions will be very important to the outcome of this experiment, so do your best to concentrate on the task at hand.

With the completion of the video tape, each student received a copy of a Self-Image Questionnaire and two answer sheets. The following instructions were read:

I will now pass out the questionnaire and answer sheets. Be sure that you receive two answer sheets stapled together with the same number in the top right hand corner.

Look at your questionnaire. You will notice that by each number there are two adjectives describing personality traits. Your task is to rate as accurately as you can the degree to which you think the stranger answered these questions about himself and record these answers in the column marked "stranger". You are also to record in the column marked "you" the degree to which you would answer each question about yourself. You are to record all of your answers on the answer sheet provided, and not on the questionnaire.

Look at question one. Below the pair of traits "cautious" and "adventurous" you will notice a scale numbered from one to eight. If you considered the person being judged to consider himself very cautious, you would record a one on your answer sheet for question one. If you felt he considered himself very adventurous instead of cautious, you would record an eight on the answer sheet. If you felt the person to be somewhere between very cautious and very adventurous, you would record the appropriate number between one and eight which best described your judgment. Check only one of the eight divisions for each pair of traits. Work rapidly and do not omit any items.

Time was allowed for any questions related to the answering of the questionnaire. When all students had
completed the questionnaire, the following negative information about the stranger was read:

When I first saw Mr. Lambert, he was to be evaluated to see if we felt he would succeed in college. During an interview with Mr. Lambert, we discussed his background in which there was a long record of delinquent behavior. He was first arrested when eleven years old for stealing in a department store. His parents paid for the merchandise and he received no sentence.

Throughout his junior high and high school years he was frequently picked up for participating in destructive acts with a gang, drunken driving and illegal possession of alcohol before age twenty-one. Each time he was caught, his parents paid for any damage which he had done and promised to keep him out of trouble.

During his sophomore year of high school he was arrested for possession of narcotics and sent to a reform school. While in the reform school he continued his education and managed to receive a high school diploma at the same time that he was released on probation. He has not been in any trouble that we know about since he was placed on probation a few months ago. We recommended that he be given a chance in college, but because of his past will not speculate how he will turn out until more information can be obtained at the end of his first year in college.

With the introduction of the negative information, the following instructions were read:

As you know, this has been an experiment to determine the accuracy of a person's first impression. I would like for you to again list your impressions of this individual using the same criterion as before. Answer the questionnaire the same way you feel he would answer it about himself. If you feel your first impression gave you enough information about this individual to answer correctly, record the same responses as you did before. If you feel that this new information has given you a better understanding of this individual, then change your responses accordingly. Work rapidly and do not omit any items.

After the answer sheets were collected, each class received a brief explanation of the experiment and was given an opportunity to ask questions. The explanation began with
an assurance to the students that the negative information about the stranger was false.

Treatment of Data

Three scores were used as the dependent measures in the present study: the absolute difference between each subject's self-image and the actual self-image of the stranger, and the absolute difference between each subject's anticipation of the stranger's self-image and the actual self-image of the stranger, and a change score which was computed by subtracting each subject's anticipated self-image of the stranger prior to the introduction of negative information from his anticipated self-image of the stranger after negative information concerning the stranger was introduced.

Groups consisting of subjects with the greatest and the least amount of similarity to the stranger were created by ranking all data according to the absolute difference scores of the subjects' actual self-image and the actual self-image of the stranger. A median split of the ranked data provided two groups. The group with the lowest difference scores was labeled most similar to the stranger, and the group with the highest difference scores was labeled least similar.

The significance of the differences between the two groups for accuracy of first impression and degree of attitude change after the introduction of negative information were determined by t tests (2). The accepted significance was set at the .05 level.
The data was regrouped according to educational divisions. The junior high class comprised the group least similar to the stranger in terms of age and educational exposure. The two college classes formed the group most similar to the stranger in terms of age and educational exposure.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Accuracy of First Impressions

Two groups, defined according to degree of self-image similarity with the stranger, were compared to determine which could most accurately predict the actual self-image of the stranger. The results are presented in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>$S_p^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Similar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>-43.16</td>
<td>-7.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Similar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects determined to be most similar to the stranger were found to have a lower mean of absolute difference scores than the least similar group, when predicting the stranger's self-image, significant at the .01 level. This finding supported Hypothesis I, which stated that the accuracy of the judge's prediction of another person's self-image would increase as the similarity between the self-images of the judge and the other person increases.
On the basis of age levels, the ninth grade class was compared with the college classes to determine whether or not a discrepancy could be noted in accuracy prediction. The results are presented in Table II.

**TABLE II**

**ACCURACY OF FIRST IMPRESSIONS WITH RESPECT TO AGE LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>$S_p^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Grade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43.70</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there was a slight tendency for the college students to predict with greater accuracy than the ninth grade the manner in which the stranger responded on the questionnaire, the accuracy represented by the mean of the difference scores between the college students and the ninth grade students was not significant. This finding gives no support to Hypothesis II, which stated that the accuracy of a judge's prediction of another person's self-image would increase as the similarity between the age level of the judge and the other person increased.

**Attitude Change**

Hypothesis III stated that the changes in attitude of a judge toward another person, once negative information
concerning the other person is introduced, would decrease as the similarity between the self-image of the judge and the other person increases. The information summarized in Table III gives no support to this hypothesis.

**TABLE III**

ATTITUDE CHANGE WITH RESPECT TO SELF-IMAGE SIMILARITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>$Sp^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Similar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>58.21</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Similar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the mean of the absolute difference scores is slightly lower for the subjects with self-images most like the stranger, the difference is negligible and could be the product of chance.

Hypothesis IV stated that changes in attitude of a judge toward another person, once negative information concerning the other person is introduced, will decrease as the similarity of the age level between the judge and the other person increases. Table IV shows this hypothesis to be supported. The mean of the difference scores for the college students was considerably lower than for the ninth grade students. This difference was found to be significant at the .01 level.
TABLE IV
ATTITUDE CHANGE WITH RESPECT TO AGE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>$Sp^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Grade</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>77.19</td>
<td>-4.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

The current study drew upon the findings of a wide variety of interpersonal perception studies in an attempt to understand theoretical dynamics in terms of practical application. By incorporating these findings in an explanation of first impressions, several very interesting points arose.

Since Hypothesis I, relating the accuracy of a first impression to individual similarity, was supported, it could be assumed that available information is most beneficial when complementing familiarity with past experiences (6, 5, 3, 2). This, however, does not account for the rejection of Hypothesis II, relating accuracy of a first impression to similar age levels.

Considering the possibility that the judging ability of the ninth grade student would not be as sophisticated as that of a college student, it would appear that the college student would have an automatic edge in prediction studies. Since the person being judged came from the college population, this would give the college student another edge; he would
be judging a person within his own frame of reference. These factors did not prove to create a difference between the two judging populations.

On the assumption that negative information has a stronger effect on personality predictions than does positive information (4), the current study attempted to explore the effects negative information would have on first impressions. By comparing the difference between an initial informationally unsupported impression and one immediately following the introduction of negative information, a measure of attitude change was established. This change was measured to determine the differential effect negative information would have on various segments of the judging population.

The support of Hypothesis IV suggested that age levels are affected differently by negative information. Ninth grade students' attitudes changed significantly more than did the college students'. In relation to Hypothesis II, identification with an age group does not determine the accuracy of interpersonal perception; however, it does influence the individual's confidence in his perception (1, 5).

Hypothesis III stated that the changes in attitudes of a judge toward another person, once negative information concerning another person is introduced, would decrease as the similarity of the judge and the other person increased. The rejection of this hypothesis is attributed to the fact that the negative information was a false representation.
of the person being judged. In effect, the additional information proved to create an equal imbalance for both similar and dissimilar groups.

In conclusion, the current study has shown that the accuracy of a first impression is dependent upon the similarity between the judge and the person being judged and the positive overtones of the impression which are perceived by the judge. Of greater importance, it has supported other studies which suggest that familiarity with observed behavior increases the accuracy of interpersonal perception.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The current study was designed to investigate the dynamics of first impressions in terms of accuracy of prediction and stability of impressions or attitude change. The two dependent variables studied were self-image and age similarities.

Subjects were drawn from junior high and college populations. All were subjected to the same experimental treatment, and simple comparisons were made between predetermined groups to ascertain the significance of basic theoretical relationships.

The following hypotheses were formulated on the basis of previous studies in interpersonal perception:

1. The accuracy of a judge's prediction of another person's self-image will increase as the similarity between the self-images of the judge and the other person increases.

2. The accuracy of a judge's prediction of another person's self-image will increase as the similarity between the age level of the judge and the other person increases.

3. Changes in the attitude of a judge toward another person, once negative information concerning the
other person is introduced, will decrease as the similarity between the self-images of the judge and the other person increases.

4. Changes in attitude of a judge toward another person, once negative information concerning the other person is introduced, will decrease as the similarity of the age levels between the judge and the other person increases.

Only Hypotheses I and IV were supported. These findings along with the rejection of Hypothesis III supported the related theories on interpersonal perception. The rejection of Hypothesis II suggested that confidence in one's judgements is dependent upon peer identification when judging members of another age group.
APPENDIX I

VIDEO TAPED INTERVIEW

Mr. Lambert I'm going to ask you some questions related to your personality. Your cooperation in answering these questions will be very important to the outcome of this experiment.

Q. How old are you?
A. I'm 21, I'll be 22 in July.

Q. Do you have any brothers or sisters?
A. I have one brother.

Q. Would you like to tell me something about him?
A. Oh, he's several years older than I am. He is 29. I've never been too close to him, but we always got along pretty good.

Q. Could you tell me something about your home life?
A. I had a fairly normal home life. My dad made a pretty good salary, $12,000 a year. We always got along real well. My mother was pretty religious. I got along better with my dad. He hunted and fished a lot. I usually always did what I wanted, most of the time.

Q. You said your mother was religious. Do you consider yourself a religious person.
A. No, not really. When I was 16 or 17 I used to go all the time. That was more or less the thing to do around the house. But I have never been very religious.

Q. Were you forced to attend church?
A. Never was forced, but it was the general thing to do to get along with your parents.
Q. How did you get along with your classmates in junior and senior high school?

A. I got along fairly well, like the other kids. The boys I hung around with were in sports.

Q. Were you in sports.

A. Yes, I played basketball, football, everything all through high school.

Q. Did you date very often in high school?

A. I never dated much. There were two or three girls I dated over a period of time, but not really too much other than that.

Q. Do you have a regular girl friend now?

A. No.

Q. Do you have any plans for marriage in the future?

A. Well, I would like to get married when I am twenty-eight or twenty-nine, when I get established in something. I don't see getting married in the near future.

Q. What kind of jobs have you held?

A. Mostly manual labor jobs: dock worker, truck driver, oil field helper, salesman, and this that and the other.

Q. Suppose you had a choice in your jobs, being a salesman or a lab technician working for the same company and making the same amount of money. Which type of job do you think you would pick?

A. I'd rather be a salesman. I would enjoy being out meeting people, rather than being cooped up in a lab.

Q. If you could work in some city or travel, which would you choose?

A. I'd rather travel and get different views of life. I'd like to move around for fifteen or twenty years, then settle down.

Q. What course of study have you chosen in college?

A. Psychology.
Q. Why?

A. When I first came to college, I wasn't interested in anything else. Psychology seemed to be pretty interesting. I hoped to better understand myself and others. I first went into it to find out about myself.

Q. Did you find out anything about yourself?

A. Oh yes, I learned how I did a few things that I did while I was growing up.

Q. Are you dissatisfied with your past?

A. Not a whole lot. There are some things that I wish I hadn't done, but I guess everyone has.

Q. What kind of plans do you have for your future?

A. Well, I guess graduate from college and get a job someplace. Then I would like to travel around some.

Thank you for helping us today in this experiment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SELF-IMAGE QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | **Cautious**  
Avoids strange and new situations; prefers to know everything about a situation before acting; does not take risks. | **Adventurous**  
Seeks new and strange experiences; shows much initiative; enjoys risks and uncertainty. |
|   | **Imaginative**  
Has a rich and vivid imagination; thinks of unusual aspects of problems; imagines many more possibilities and alternatives than other people imagine. | **Unimaginative**  
Thinking is conventional, obvious, literal, matter-of-fact; not interested in complexities of a problem that are not immediately relevant to its solution. |
|   | **Ordered**  
Behavior is scheduled, planned, regulated; knows what he is going to do for the next few days or weeks; usually prepared. | **Disordered**  
Behavior is disorganized, unplanned, erratic; does not like to schedule or make plans; usually unprepared for the next few days or weeks. |
|   | **Apathetic**  
Lacks drive, energy, vitality; appears to be passive, without strong interests. | **Energetic**  
Has unlimited energy, high drive, vitality; needs to be constantly active; interested in many activities. |
|   | **Self-Perspective**  
Can be objective and detached about himself; accepts his mistakes with humor, able to laugh at himself. | **Self-Infatuation**  
Very serious about himself; unable to laugh or joke about himself and his mistakes; preoccupied by his own problems and desires; may not have a sense of humor. |
|   | **Understanding of others**  
Sympathetic, empathetic, insightful about the feelings and problems of other persons; a person to whom others go for advice when in trouble. | **Not understanding of others**  
Not aware of or interested in the feelings or problems of others; may be tactless and brusque; other persons may say he doesn't "understand" and do not go to him for advice. |
7. **Hot anticipate consequences**  
Impulsively acts without thinking of the consequences; frequently makes mistakes because he has not anticipated the possible outcomes.  

---

8. **Strong convictions**  
Dedicated to some value or ideal; motivated by strong beliefs and values (either religious, ethical, political, social).  

---

9. **Purposeful**  
Life has personal direction and meaning; behavior is planful, persistent and determined; energies are concentrated on a limited number of activities.  

---

10. **Unpredictable**  
Moods and behavior are inconsistent, changing and unpredictable; surprises other people with what he says or does.  

---

11. **Suspicious**  
Frequently believes other people are unfair or dislike him; distrusts motives of others; may believe others talk about him when in fact they are not; hard to convince.  

---

**Anticipates consequences**  
Considers future possibilities and consequences of his decisions before acting; foresighted.  

---

**Weak convictions**  
Few, if any, convictions or ideals that strongly influence his life; feels life is "empty" without meaning or value; may wish he had stronger beliefs and convictions.  

---

**Purposeless**  
Life has no direction or meaning; seems to be without purpose; flighty, distractable; does not know what he wants.  

---

**Predictable**  
Moods and behavior are generally similar and consistent from day to day.  

---

**Trustful**  
Generally accepts actions and comments of others without distrusting their motives toward him; does not believe most other people went to take advantage of him.
12. Reflective
Enjoys thinking and reflecting about his experiences, the motives of others, or social problems; seeks to understand why the facts are what they are; inner depth.

Unreflective
Prefers not to question why but to live life as it occurs; does not enjoy thinking about his experiences; accepts facts for what they are.

13. Accepts self
Accepts his limitations and mistakes as well as his good qualities; is reasonably satisfied with the kind of person he is; respects himself.

Rejects self
Critical of himself; does not accept some of his own traits or motives but would like to be a different kind of person; uncomfortable about some of his feelings and desires.

14. Open
Forthright, spontaneous, frank and direct in his expression; does not try to appear different than he is or try to protect himself when with others; easily expresses his own feelings.

Defensive
Secretive, keeps thoughts and feelings to himself; does not like to talk about his feelings and problems with anyone else; tries to appear he is a different person than he is; may evade questions or approaches of other people.

15. Self-centered
Thinks more about himself and what he wants than about other people; talks a great deal about himself; frequently ignores the rights and needs of other people; opportunist; egotistic.

Other person-centered
Thinks of others and what they want; tries to consider points of view of other persons; can compromise; may attempt to adjust to demands of others; altruistic considerate.

16. Decisive
Takes decisions with firmness; enjoys making decisions and fulfilling them.

Indecisive
Does not like to make decisions; must know all possibilities before he acts; hesitates a long time before making decisions; doubting.
17. **Enthusiastic**  
Emotionally responsive, interested and excited about new events; gets involved in activities easily; has strong interests which excite him.  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Unenthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not get emotionally involved or excited; may be difficult to motivate or to excite; unexpressive, mild; not much excites him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **High aspirations**  
Ambitious and has strong need to achieve; sets high goals for self and often dissatisfied when he does not accomplish all of them; when completes a task, begins another immediately.  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High aspirations</td>
<td>Low aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unambitious and sets low goals for himself; easily satisfied with what he accomplishes; not unhappy if does not accomplish very much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. **Dependent**  
Needs the advice and help of others; seeks guidance readily; suggestible; not self-sufficient; cannot deny requests of other people whose affection and respect he wants.  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not like to depend on others; seldom asks for advice; prefers to rely on his own efforts; may maintain own way of life in face of considerable opposition; can say no to requests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. **Easily upset**  
Easily becomes confused, excited, or embarrassed in new situations or emergencies; may readily blush or become tense and anxious.  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easily upset</td>
<td>Unshakable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not lose self-control in emotional or emergency situations is slow to anger; self-possessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. **Realistic**  
Has good judgment and common sense; makes practical and appropriate comments and decisions.  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Unrealistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes impractical, inappropriate suggestions that don't consider all aspects of a problem; other people do not rely on his judgments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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22. **Rigid**
- Strongly maintains his own ideas against all opposition; resists changing or adapting to new ways of doing things; does not like to change his habits or way of life.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

23. **Placid**
- Generally calm, relaxed, tranquil and composed

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

24. **Warm in personal relationships**
- Sincerely friendly, emotionally responsive, sympathetic to others; affectionate; may be demonstrative, enjoys other people;

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

25. **Fulfilling his potential**
- He is fulfilling his native capacities; satisfied he is accomplishing what he is capable of doing; does not feel blocked by inhibitions.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

| **Flexible** | **Tense** |
| Adapts his behavior when necessary to new situations; can compromise; is not surprised, baffled, or irritated if things are different from what he expected. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

| **Tense** | **Cold in personal relationships** |
| Forlorn, tense, nervous, generally apprehensive and anxious. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

| **Cold in personal relationships** | **Not fulfilling his potential** |
| Aloof, austere, and undemonstrative with others; does not like to express affection or sentiment; may be more comfortable in impersonal relationships. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
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