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ABSTRACT

The present work is a socio-psychological study of value congruity and interpersonal value perception among a selected group of engaged couples. Values were identified, mutual perceptions analyzed, and the homogamy theory of mate selection tested by use of Allport-Vernon-Lindzey's *Study of Values*. Six specific personality motives were identified: theoretical; economic; aesthetic; social; political; and religious. Hypotheses were couched in: Mead's symbolic interaction theory; Newcomb's interpersonal interaction theory; and Coomb's homogamy theory of mate selection.

The project represents an effort to identify value congruity as well as the strength of congruity of global and specific value orientations. Three levels of interpersonal perception were incorporated into the analysis; i.e., (a) ego's self perception, (b) ego's perception of alter, and (c) ego's perception of alter's perception of him. Consensus was defined as the degree of agreement, or lack of such, on the value types. Value consensus was determined by correlating the summated difference scores of male self with female's self (real congruity); value perception by analyzing the differences between ego and alter's perception of ego (perceptual accuracy); assumed similarity by determining differences between ego's self and his perception of alter; understanding or misunderstanding of perception by analyzing differences between
alter's perception of ego and ego's perception of alter's perception of him.

Seventy-six engaged couples, all full-time students at L.S.U., spring semester, 1971, served as subjects for Phase 1 of the study. The panel design of the study required a second testing of the couples six to eight months after the first testing. Fifty-seven couples (79 percent) of the intact couples answered the questionnaire at Time 2; of these fifty-seven couples, thirty-five were married and twenty-two were still engaged.

Split-plot factorial analysis (ANOVA) was utilized to test the relationship between the dependent variables, value consensus and interpersonal perception, and the independent variables: couple, sex, time, and level of perception. Correlation analysis was used as an alternative tool and comparisons were made between conclusions reached by both methods, while stepwise regression was run on the influence of selected stages of dating involvement variables as well as father's occupation on interpersonal perception.

With respect to the specific objectives and hypotheses of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Naturally paired couples revealed significantly more homogamy in value orientation than randomly paired couples.

2. Assumed similarity, on the six values, did not differ significantly from actual similarity.

3. Actual value orientations were quite stable and revealed little tendency toward "balance" during the first few months of marriage.
4. The sample university students identified themselves to a greater extent with the perceived values of peers than the perceived values of parents.

5. Of the six independent variables tested, length of constant dating and length of engagement improved both the male and female's ability to accurately perceive each other on all dependent variables except the economic.

6. Ego was significantly accurate in his perception of alter's value orientation.

7. Mutual perception of value orientation revealed a non-significant increase for both married and "still" engaged couples between Phase 1 and Phase 2.

8. The male revealed greater accuracy than the female in the perception of his engagee's value orientation.

9. Ego was able to perceive with significant accuracy his engagee's perception of him.

10. Couples with the greatest disparity between value systems appear to be able to perceive as accurately as those couples with greatest congruency perceive their similarity.

11. Both the homogamy and the heterogamy theory of mate selection was supported by the data.

12. Analysis of variance and difference of means tests were found to be a more stringent test of relationships between variables than simple linear correlations.
CHAPTER I

A STUDY OF VALUE CONGRUITY AND INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION

I. Statement of the General Problem

The present study is an investigation of the hierarchial arrangement of the value orientation of a selected number of engaged couples; the perceived value identification of each person with his significant others; the ability of couples to accurately perceive, reciprocally, the others' value system; and a test of homogamy versus heterogamy theory of mate selection.

A continuing interest of specialists in the family as an institution is evidenced through their attempt to define the factors which lead to a fulfilling and lasting relationship between a man and a woman. If precise factors could be located, then accurate predictions could be made as to the likely outcome of an extended dyadic relationship, which may or may not result in continued interaction.

Engaged couples were chosen as the subjects for this study, since it has been suggested by family sociologists that engagement adjustment is a positive predictor of good marital adjustment. It is possible that most young engaged couples are considered to be well adjusted and yet be unaware of each other's value orientation. Since values are held to be very important attributes to an individual and are responsible for
much of one's actions and reactions in interpersonal associations, the
author felt that an accurate perception of one's value orientation may
be one of the most important predictors of marital adjustment.

In order to be able to determine whether mate selection is made on
the basis of homogamy (or heterogamy) the researcher must get the engaged
persons' perception of his congruity with his mate before marriage
rather than afterwards. Actual perception may change after marriage or
one may have a tendency to view the person more realistically after
marriage than he was viewed during the engagement period.

In undertaking this study, it was hoped that some of the conceptual
and methodological framework surrounding a study of value orientation
and interpersonal "value perception" could be empirically tested and
perhaps some clarification added to this very complex relationship.
Perhaps some of the methods utilized will provide impetus for other
researchers to further seek better and more adequate research techniques.

II. Significance of Study

Value orientations are extremely important data for use in under­
standing human behavior. A person's behavior must be judged in light
of the particular values which he holds, the way he perceives that alter
sees his value orientation, and the way he perceives the value orientation
of alter. Values influence: how a person sees himself and others, the
decision-making process, his familial and social relationships and con­
licts, as well as his moral judgments and basic motivations. Becker
(1950) concluded: "Nowhere does man's ever-present tendency to develop
and define his values appear more strikingly than in the family" (p. 7).
Christensen (1964) saw values, when viewed as variables affecting behavior, as: dependent variables wherein the family causes values to be formed (in the socialization process) in the personality of its members; independent variables wherein the values held by family members cause them to behave according to predictable patterns; or as intervening variables wherein values intrude themselves into the interaction of other variables in ways which affect the outcome.

The concept of value convergence, as it relates to marital happiness, is implied by such studies as marital-success-prediction studies, which emphasize the similarity of socio-cultural background factors of the spouses, as well as role conflict studies which suggest the importance of value congruency of individuals. Ort (1950), in a study of role-conflict, reported that a negative correlation coefficient of -.83 existed between the expressed happiness of the spouses and the number of value conflicts they experienced. Keeley (1955), in a study of married couples, found that value convergence was positively related to marital success. He also found that value convergence, among specific values such as religion and politics, was a function of length of marriage.

Since value congruency appears to be positively related to friendship formation and marital success, the present study attempted to identify the important value systems of engaged couples as well as value consensus or lack of such. Included in the study will be an emphasis upon the engaged person's ability to accurately perceive the value orientation of his engagee.
A review of literature indicated that there has been very little empirical research directed toward the understanding of the importance of value orientation and congruence of orientation in formation of temporary and life-long friendships and commitments. Hopefully the present study will further stimulate interest in value research, especially the development of methodological techniques for measuring congruity and mutual perception of one's value system, both of which may be viewed as a predictive factor in friendship formation as well as the enhancement of marriage solidarity.

III. Overview

The present research project is divided into six chapters. The opening chapter introduces the study by stating the general problem, its significance, objectives and hypotheses, and general theoretical framework.

Chapter II presents the general methodology. Included in the chapter is a discussion of the research instrument, sampling frame and procedure, data collection, and the techniques used in data analysis.

Chapter III deals with the theoretical concepts of values as well as a hierarchical arrangement, by the sample couples, of Spranger's six value orientations: (1) theoretical, (2) economic, (3) aesthetic, (4) social, (5) political, and (6) religious. Value identification is tested by analyzing the perceived value identification of each individual with his "significant others." Chapters III, IV, and V contain, besides the specific conceptual framework and the testing of hypotheses relevant
to the chapter subject, a review of related literature, synopsis of findings, and theoretical and methodological implications.

Chapter IV deals mainly with accuracy of interpersonal perception. The chapter is introduced by the presentation of the conceptual framework. Actual and perceived value orientations are compared for Phase 1 (N = 76 engaged couples) and Phase 2 (N = 57 married couples). The hypothesis that value perception after marriage has a tendency to increase is tested. Differences in perceptual ability between male and female are statistically tested. The third level of perception (Mpf:Fpm and Fpmp:Mpf) is tested in order to determine if ego's perception of alter's perception of him is correct.

Chapter V begins with a statement of the relevant theory related to value consensus and mate selection. A cursory comparison of homogamy vs. heterogamy mate selection theory is offered. Homogamy of socioeconomic variables is evaluated. The perceptual accuracy of couples whose actual consensus scores revealed a great deal of similarity is compared with those couples whose actual consensus scores indicated a great deal of disparity. The assumption that marital interaction increases one's perceptual ability is tested, as well as the theory of homogamy of mate selection.

Chapter VI contains the summary of findings, conclusions, theoretical and methodological implications, and recommendations for further study.
IV. Objectives, Assumption, General and Specific Hypotheses

The present study is an empirical socio-psychological approach to the study of values as a major variable operative in friendship formations, especially mate selection. Interpersonal perception of the value system of one's engagee is the major focus of the study.

Objectives

The stated objectives of the study are:

1. To discover and compare the "value orientation" or "value foci" of a selected sample of engaged students on the L.S.U. campus, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, as indicated by the subjects' response to questions related to value systems.

2. To determine the ability of an engaged person to accurately perceive the value system of his engagee.

3. To determine at Phase 1 (before marriage) and Phase 2 (7-9 months later) the degree of congruity (or lack of congruency) in the value orientations of engaged and/or married couples.

4. To determine whether 2-9 months of marriage significantly improves an individual's ability to accurately perceive his spouse's value orientations.

5. To develop a methodology for eliciting idiographic as well as perceptive responses of each subject for: (1) ego (self-identity--1st level); (2) alter (perception--2nd level); (3) ego's perception of how alter will respond for him (meta-perception--3rd level).

Assumptions

Underlying the overall design of the study are the following assumptions:

1. Values of individuals can be identified by use of a forced choice questionnaire.

2. Values of another individual may be perceived by role taking (one taking the role of his engagee or spouse).
3. Accuracy in perception varies over time, while values of individuals tend to be relatively stable.

**General Hypotheses**

The general hypotheses may be stated as:

1. Value orientations of individuals who interact frequently tend to be similar.

2. Ego's perception of alter's value orientation changes as a result of interaction.

**Specific Hypotheses**

The formulated specific hypotheses for the present study are:

1. A rank ordering of the means for the six values will differ little from those reported by Allport.

2. Value orientations of engaged couples will be more congruent than those of couples who may be randomly matched.

3. Assumed similarity will reveal a stronger correlation than actual similarity at both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

4. Actual value orientations will be more congruent at Time 2 than at Time 1.

5. Individuals will perceive their value orientation as being closer to their peers than to their parents.

6. Of the independent variables, occupation, prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating and length of engagement; length of constant dating and length of engagement will explain more of the variation than the other three variables.

7. Alter's perception of ego's value orientation will differ from ego's self perception.

8. Mutual perception of value orientations will reveal a significant increase from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

9. Those couples who are married at Phase 2 will reveal a more accurate perception of their spouses than the couples who are "still engaged" at Phase 2.
10. The male's ability to perceive the value orientation of his engagee will be greater than that of the female.

11. Ego will not accurately perceive alter's perception of him (Cooley's looking-glass-self).

12. Those couples with small value disparity scores will be no better at mutual perception than those with the greatest disparity.

13. The theory of homogamy as well as that of complementarity will be supported by the data.

V. Theoretical Framework

Introduction

The major conceptual framework for the present study had its genesis in the theory of Edward Spranger in his presentation of Types of Men (1928). Allport-Vernon-Lindzey operationalized his typologies, producing a widely used instrument, The Study of Values, which is utilized in this study as the instrument for operationally defining value orientations of ego, alter, and ego's perception of how alter has responded for him. Laing, Phillipson and Lee (1966, pp. 49-72) refer to these three levels of consensus as levels of agreement, co-orientation, and perception of co-orientation. Among two or more persons in an interpersonal relationship there may be: (1) agreement or disagreement (first level of consensus); (2) understanding or misunderstanding of the agreement-disagreement (second level of consensus); (3) realization or failure to realize the understanding-misunderstanding of agreement-disagreement (third level of consensus). W. I. Thomas' "definition of the situation" and Charles Cooley's "looking-glass-self" are aids in
further explaining values and interpersonal perceptions. How people see things or define a situation often determines their action.

Values may be more important in explaining behavior than external reality factors. An individual's values and actions, and even the effects of his action on alter, are closely related to how the individual perceives or defines the situation. "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Thomas and Thomas, 1928, p. 572).

The theory of homogamy, in friendship formation and mate selection, is extracted from the work of Heider and Newcomb. The theory of complementary needs serves as a basis of contrast in discussing divergence of value orientations.

The following chapters deal with the conceptual framework more completely since it forms the basis for the generation of empirically testable hypotheses.

Commensurability of Values

Lundberg, in a 1954 presentation to the Pacific Sociological Society (Catton, 1954), stated: "Up until the present time the direct empirical investigation of the values of men in different cultures has somehow seemed beyond the proper province of scientific inquiry . . ." (p. 49). Lundberg felt that much of the failure to include value studies in research was due to a failure to obtain objective results in the study of values. Likewise, the very assumption that scientific studies of values are impossible follows from the fact that the habitual approach to the subject has involved highly abstract terms like truth, beauty,
justice, etc. Part of the resistance to the study of values also comes from the belief that qualitatively unlike values are not quantitatively commensurable. Catton (1954) concluded, from research evidence, that commensurability does not seem to depend statistically on qualitative similarity:

Human values, including those which are regarded by certain authorities as being of infinite worth, become measurable relative to each other in exactly the same manner as other verbal stimuli . . . by application of Thurstone's law of comparative judgment (p. 55).

He continued by stating that:

The mere fact that the stimuli in question are labeled "values" does not make them non-measurable, nor does the fact that responses to such stimuli are called "value judgments" prevent them from displaying empirical regularities which may enable social scientists to make predictions (Ibid.).

Robinson and Shaver (1970) implied that many psychologists consider "value judgments to be outside the boundaries of an empirical discipline. They seem to have confused making value judgments, which is incompatible with scientific objectivity, with studying objectively how other people make them . . . a phenomena as amenable to psychological study, in principle, as other forms of human learning and choice" (p. 407).

Consensus

A review of sociology texts and journal articles reveals that there is no real consensus among sociologists as to the definition of consensus. (The present study uses consensus and congruity interchangeably throughout the discussions.) One can go to such notables as Comte, Durkheim, Tonnies, Dewey, Thomas, Mead and others and locate an emphasis on consensus.
Consensus is treated as a dependent variable in the current investigation and is conceptually defined as the areas of agreement and common definitions of the situation by persons who engage in reciprocal interaction. Operationally, it exists as a variable insofar as its relative weight can be measured quantitatively. Rokeach (1968) suggests that:

... the belief congruence asserts that we tend to value a given belief, subsystem, or system of beliefs in proportion to its degree of congruence with our own belief system and, further, that we tend to value people in proportion to the degree to which they exhibit beliefs, subsystems, or systems of belief congruent with our own. Congruence can be defined both in terms of similarity and importance. Given two beliefs or subsystems of belief equal in importance, the one more similar to our own is more congruent ... (p. 83).

Christensen (1971, pp. 70-71) declares that many highly important values are never brought to light in the interaction of couples before marriage. He states "of course it is not expected that any marriage is characterized by either total consensus or total conflict. Realistically, most couples will have some values in agreement and some upon which they disagree" (p. 71).

Symbolic Interaction

The broad socio-psychological branch of social behaviorism, symbolic interactionism, encompasses the conceptual tenets of the present study for: socialization; a "definition of the situation"; the "looking-glass-self"; and "significant others." This theoretically important approach can be located in the writings of Cooley, Thomas, Znaniecki, Mead, Blumer, and others.

Mead says that the evolution of language enables one to observe the intentions of others. One attempts to define the intentions of
others and then reacts not to the actions of an individual but to the meanings one attaches to the intentions of others. Mead calls this "self indication," while Thomas calls it a "definition of the situation." Accurate perception must be an integral part of the definition in order for adequate predictions to be made. Communication is the symbolic aspect of acts and is reciprocally influencing.

"Role taking" is a part of the interpersonal interaction process. Mead (1934) suggests that role taking is the taking of attitudes or points of view of another by imagining oneself as the other person in order that the other's behavior may be anticipated.

Significant others, such as parents, other relatives, and friends, very strongly influence what one values most. These significant others instill in the person attitudes, values, and norms which allow him to evaluate and anticipate the actions of others. An individual may then use these socially instilled attributes to judge himself and others. Simmel (in Tagiuri and Petrullo, 1958) maintains that "By the glance which reveals the other, one discloses himself. By the same act in which the observer seeks to know the observed, he surrenders himself to be understood by the observer. The eye cannot take unless at the same time it gives" (p. 31). Cooley (1902) suggests that a person's perception of himself is determined by the way he imagines he appears to others. This self feeling consequently carries with it self feelings of pride or mortification.
Homogamy versus Heterogamy in Mate Selection

The "complementary need" theory developed by Winch (1953) combines aspects of need-motivation theory and homogamous mate selection. He proposes that needs are experienced both consciously or unconsciously and that they become operative within social groups.

Homogamy of structural (socio-demographic) variables in mate selection may be readily verified as one observes couples who are similar on variables such as race, age, education, etc. Residential and occupational propinquity are influential in insuring similarity in many supposedly important variables.

Bell (1971, pp. 150-51) suggests that "a person starts his life with a theoretically vast market for future mate selection, but as he is socialized and incorporates the value systems of his society, his market is drastically reduced."
CHAPTER II

GENERAL METHODOLOGY

I. Introduction

In order that the objectives of the present study might be accomplished, the sample design, operationalization of the variables, data collection, and data analysis combine to either offer support or rejection of the hypotheses which were deduced from a review of theoretical and empirical statements.

Choice and discussion of the instrument, sampling procedure, data collection, and a discussion of the analytical tools and techniques used in data analysis are discussed in the present chapter.

II. Choice of Instruments

Any research projects which specify value variables and perception in the design are hampered by methodological and technical difficulties. If a value is, according to Kluckhohn, a "conception of the desirable" then one must study it by analyzing preferences among alternative choices. Kluckhohn (1954) writes concerning the operation for the study of values:

There is, first of all, the establishment of regularities in "should" or "ought" statements by the usual procedures of sampling, formal and informal interviews, recording of normal conservation, analysis of the oral or written lore of the group. . . . Sometimes what a person says about his values is truer from a long-term viewpoint than inferences drawn from his actions under special conditions (p. 406).
Williams (1970) supports the idea that the relevance of values may be identified through "choice" situations:

The criterion of choice seems to provide an adequate way of defining values empirically. We reason that any choice involves a renunciation of other values; the choice of A over B over C, and so on, would define a hierarchy of values. If we look for typical modes of choosing, we can characterize deviant and subsidiary goals and, eventually, the standards of value by which selections are ordered in any given group or situation (p. 444).

Since an individual's values are often implicitly held covert attributes, it seems as though a projective device would provide an appropriate means for revealing them. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey's A Study of Values (AVL) can be effectively utilized not only for identifying ego's value system, but it also lends itself to an analysis of ego's perception of alter's values. By utilizing the same instrument, ego can respond as he feels that alter will respond for him (Cooley's third level of self-appraisal). By noting an individual's ratings of a large number of different items on the AVL scale, it is possible to obtain a score which expresses the relative importance of these values to the individual rather than the "absolute" importance of each value. Comparing self-perception scores of male and female in a dyadic relationship reveals consensus or disparity on the basic values.

Use of the AVL instrument admittedly results in some loss of information concerning idiosyncratic and specific personality attributes, but it allows for the type of flexibility desired in the present study.

Study of Values

"Spranger believed that the personalities of men are best known through a study of their values or evaluative attributes" (Allport, 1970,
Based on Spranger's *Types of Men* as a foundation, Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey put Spranger's traits to test and asked if the six dimensions were measurable on a multidimensional scale. Their research, based on the premise "that a more adequate logic of personality is a prerequisite to improved measurement" (Allport and Vernon, 1931, p. 231), was realized in 1931 when they published the *Study of Values*.

During the early phase of Allport's research, about 1400 adult respondents from eleven colleges or universities were used. The final form of the first edition of the *Study of Values* was administered to about 800 subjects. This so-called "standardization group" served as the subjects for the purpose of generating the norms for the first edition of the questionnaire.

The first edition (as well as the 1970 edition) of the questionnaire consisted of two parts, which contained a total of 45 questions. Twenty questions were referenced to each of the six values. Part I contained 30 "forced choice" questions, while Part II contained 15 questions with a rank ordering of 4 alternatives; each value was paired an equal number of times with each of the remaining values. About 20 or 30 minutes were required, by respondents, to complete the questionnaire. Graphs and instructions were provided so that if the respondent desired, he could score his own responses and plot his personal value profiles. In addition, the norms for the standardized population, broken down by sex, were provided for the use of the respondent.*

*This is the format for the third edition (1970) which was used in the present study.
There is thus some guidance in terms of general norms for a comparison of the ranges and relative scores in individual profiles. In this way the test combines advantages of both an idiographic and a nomothetic method (Allport, 1965, p. 456).

In 1951, the second edition of the Study of Values was published. The new questionnaire was more reliable than the previous one, since new norms were generated.

Extensive use of the Study of Values during the 1951-1960 period produced new norms which were included in the third edition published in 1960. The current manual of instructions contain norms based on 1,816 college students as well as several thousand students and nonstudents who were surveyed; the results of which provided the norms for establishing occupational differences. In 1968 a machine-scorable booklet to be used with the third edition was made available. Supplementary high school norms were developed from administration of the new questionnaire. Directions for machine scoring and high school norms are printed in Part 8 and 9 (respectively).

The test is not transparent in that one cannot readily determine what the instrument intends to measure and has a reported reliability range of the six values from .84 to .93. The test has an established validity which distinguishes, in predicted ways, among groups differing in occupation, religion, and other interests.

Numerous research efforts have centered around the Study of Values. Comparison with other attitude and interest scales has been produced by Wickert (1940), Morris (1956), and Kluckhohn (1961), for example. A number of factor-analytic studies, including those of Guilford, et al.
(1954) and Van Dusen, et al. (1939) have also been undertaken.* Allport (1965) feels that intercorrelations are not high enough to warrant a reduction to fewer values. Various other types of studies, too numerous to be listed herein, indicate a general acceptance of the Study of Values as a research tool--Buros (1970) references 475 studies utilizing a portion of, or the complete questionnaire.

An important feature of the Study of Values is its idiographic nature. A value profile gives the relative importance of the six values within a single life. Allport states: "In fact, the lowest value of a person who has high 'value energy' might in absolute terms be more dynamic in his life than the highest value of a person who is generally apathetic and devoid of interests" (Allport, 1965, p. 456).

The instrument has been found useful in varied situations such as: in teaching, since it reveals to the student his own values; in counseling and vocational guidance; in choice of industrial executives; and in marital-choice and marriage counseling. "Prospective marriage partners gain from knowing in advance of marriage each other's profile. In short, the test is primarily an aid to self-insight" (Allport, 1965, p. 457).

The extensive work of Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey translated the concepts of Spranger into measurable dimensions, although Spranger specifically denied the relevancy of any empirical test of his types.

* In a discussion of factor-analytic attempts, Sarason (1969, p. 16) writes: "Some investigators discover that fewer than six factors are needed . . . some that we need more. And in all cases the clusters that emerge seem strange and unmanageable. Here is a case, I believe, where our empiricism should submit to rational restraint. The traits as defined are meaningful, reliably measured and validated. Why sacrifice them to galloping gamesmanship."
III. Sampling Procedure

In order to identify engaged students on the L.S.U. campus, permission was obtained from A. L. Clary, L.S.U. Registrar, to receive information from each regular, full-time student who processed through the regular three-day spring registration period--February 1-3, 1971.

A brief outline and stated purpose of the research was explained to general managers or advertising managers of 10 department and variety stores frequented by L.S.U. students. Each store was asked to donate a gift item, or gift certificate, in exchange for brief advertising which would be found on one of the three "Hope Chests." Five of the stores cooperated and donated gift items or gift certificates in price from $5.00 - $22.00.

Posters containing the following information were printed and distributed at all locations where the students were scheduled to pick up registration materials:

ARE YOU IN LOVE?

Married?
Engaged?
Pinned?
Hopeful?
Untouchable?
Let us Know at Registration

Win a Free Gift Certificate

a Free Gift Certificate
Posters were also placed at three strategic locations in the Student Union Building.

Two students, male and female, were positioned each day at the entrance of the registration processing line. Each student going through registration was given a form (Appendix A), asked to fill it out and deposit it in a "Hope Chest" at the registration exit. Two persons (researcher and spouse) stationed at a table at the exit reminded every student who exited of the importance of the form and the need to receive a response from every student. Students were asked to drop the completed forms in one of three "Hope Chests" labeled: Married; Engaged and Pinned; and Hopeful and Untouchable.

A total of 5,525 completed forms were received, distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinned</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untouchable</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous (added by students)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,525</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forms of each category (miscellaneous was included with hopeful) were mixed in a home style dryer drum and three forms drawn from each category. The first person drawn was given one of the gift certificates.

Students who were engaged, and both of whom were enrolled in school during the spring semester, were matched and a total of 230 couples were contacted, by use of an explanatory letter, asking them to serve as
couples in a research project which was endorsed by the Department of Sociology (see Appendix B). Students' addresses and phone numbers were obtained from the current personal information cards which were filed with the student information center. A self-addressed postal card was included in the letter (see Appendix B). Each respondent suggested a time (beginning April 19, 1971) when he and his engagee could come to a specified location to fill out the questionnaire. Fifty-four couples returned a card indicating that they would serve as subjects. An attempt was made to contact all other couples by phone. Nine of the couples admitted that they were not engaged. Seventy-six couples served as subjects for Phase 1 of the testing. All other couples either refused to cooperate or did not keep the appointment as scheduled.

IV. Data Collection

**Phase 1**

The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (AVL) was administered by the researcher, over a period of three weeks, to seventy-six couples. Both fiancée and fiancé answered the questionnaire at the same time, provided some personal data information, and rank ordered significant others. (Permission to construct answer sheets was obtained from the publishers. These were provided for each respondent.) In order to conceal the purpose of the research, the title page of the booklet was stapled to the first page, and the respondents were told that the research project was an attempt to identify how they felt about several attitudes and to discern if they knew how their engagee felt about the
same attitudes. The couples were asked not to confer and to answer the questions as honestly as they could. After ego had answered the set of questions for himself, he was asked to answer the same questions as he thought his engagee would answer them. The six value orientations were summarized in a one-sentence statement and each subject was asked to rank order the orientations. The couples were given the following instructions: "In your opinion, how would your parents, the majority of your close friends, you, and your fiancée (fiancé) rank the following orientation (working vertically, use 6 as most important and 1 as least important)." (See Appendix C.)

Each subject answered the identical questionnaire three times at Time 1; once for self's orientation; once for the perception of the orientation of his engagee; and once for how he felt that his engagee would respond for him. The couples were told that they would be asked to answer the same set of questions again 6-9 months later, and that it was not, nor would not be, an intelligence or recall test.

The respondents were told that the results from the test (Time 1) for each individual couple would be summarized in the form of a graph and mailed to them.

**Phase 2**

All 76 couples were contacted in November - January, seven to nine months after completion of the first questionnaire. Four engagements were broken between Phase 1 and Phase 2. Fifty-seven couples
completed the questionnaire at Phase 2.* A large majority of those who did not respond at Phase 2 were among the very late responders at Phase 1.

At time 2, the couples were asked, in addition to completing the identical AVL questionnaire, to place themselves on a Kirkpatrick-Cantril (1960) type self-anchoring scale.** (See Appendix G.) Information was also obtained concerning their marital status. Twenty-two couples were still engaged and recorded their proposed wedding date. Thirty-five couples had married.

V. Data Analysis

After the data were collected for Phase 1, it was coded and partial analysis was completed before the administration of the questionnaire at Time 2. Means were obtained for each couple on the six dependent variables, theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious. These means were plotted on a graph showing differences between male and female's actual and perceived congruity. These were mailed to the subjects after the administration of the questionnaire at Time 2.

*A majority of the couples completed the questionnaire at Phase 2 in the presence of the researcher. For those questionnaires mailed, a letter was included reminding the couple not to discuss any of their responses with their engagee, or spouse, until after the questionnaires were completed (See Appendix D).

**The information obtained from this scale will not be used in the present study.
There were three levels of responses for each subject on the value questionnaire: (1) self perception; (2) ego's perception of alter; (3) ego's perception of alter's perception of him. The response categories were utilized in determining actual congruity scores as well as the differences between actual consensus and perceived consensus. Interval level measure was assumed when analyzing the forced choice order-metric data.

Since dyadic perceptual methodology appear to be still in its formative stage, it seemed wise to test some of the suggestions for data analysis presented by a leading authority in the area of perceptual research. Many of Lee Cronbach's suggestions are incorporated in the present analysis.

The dyadic studies test hypotheses about interactions between two sets of data. Difficulty in interpretation evolves from the fact that interpretations dealing with interactions can be advanced meaningfully only after the simpler main effects associated with the perceiver have been given separate consideration.

Cronbach (1958) feels that much of the research has dealt with "global" indices when it should have dealt more with separate ideographic attitudes. By global scores is meant . . . those which compress many aspects of personality into a single index. The chief difficulty with the global index is that unless there is a clear rationale for the manner in which traits are combined, significant within-trait effects obscure each other (p. 355).

Cronbach (1958) states that:
Difference scores representing the same construct (e.g., insight into others) are found to have negligible correlations. Results are attributed to social interactions even when they can be much more simply interpreted. And, above all, findings have been left in a highly ambiguous form when a more penetrating analysis would show which of the many alternative interpretations to accept (p. 355).

In the present research, the data for the total value orientation was subjected to split plot analysis of variance (ANOVA); that is, actual and perceived scores on theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious values were summed and difference scores between male and female (by couple, Time 1 and Time 2) were determined. In order to test Cronbach's (1958) statement concerning masking (or the global effect) of the separate traits, or attitudes, the combined six values were tested against the main factors of couple, sex, level, and time. (Couple was the sampling unit.)

Cronbach (1958) discusses two major faults of global indices: (1) observed effects are interpreted as general, without sufficient evidence, and (2) significant relations are overlooked (pp. 361-362). Accurate perceptual ability in one dimension, or on one criterion, does not necessarily mean that an individual has the same perceptual ability on a divergent dimension. Different traits, or different aspects, of the global composite may be related to the criterion in opposite directions, producing effects which tend to cancel each other and reveal no significant difference between variables. In some cases where attributes lead to similar relations, there may be advantages in combining the attributes into an over-all index. (In the present study this was true for some hypotheses testing.)
Difference scores were compared by means of the Pearson Product Moment formula, and comparisons were made between results obtained by this method and results obtained from subjecting data to ANOVA. Artifacts may appear in dyadic correlations. The usual procedure in measuring value perception is to measure ego's actual perception and then compare his actual with his perception of ego's value system. Cronbach states that since these scores are derived from the same instrument, they are not mathematically independent. "Where errors of measurement affecting one element influence the other also, significance tests are spurious and correlations are artifactually raised or lowered" (Cronbach, 1958, p. 359). The distance or AD (absolute difference score) usually loses information regarding the direction of difference. In some cases, it may be quite imperative to know the direction.*

*In the present study the direction of the difference in perception does not appear to be of great significance when looking at some relationships, but significant in others.
CHAPTER III

THE IDENTIFICATION AND CONSENSUS OF VALUE ORIENTATION
OF ENGAGED COUPLES

I. Introduction

Social psychologists have long recognized the fact that certain of each person's values are unique to him alone; however, individuals seem generally to be most attracted to groups or other individuals whose values and interests are congruent with their own. Furthermore, perceived or assumed similarity seems to be more crucial to the formation of friendship bonds than actual similarity.

The essential starting point in sociology may be said to be the conception of two or more individuals interacting in such a way as to form an interdependent system, and as a personality each individual is a system with its own values, goals, ambitions, etc.

We can say even such an elementary two-member system of social interaction has most of the structural essentials of a social system. The essential property is mutuality of orientations, defined in terms of shared patterns of normative culture. Such normative patterns are values . . ." (Parsons, 1961, p. 42).

Values may be seen as the link between society, culture, and personality. Values are social facts which have been established, defined, and symbolized by one's forebears and passed on to him as a challenge and heritage.
This chapter is devoted to: delineating a definition of value and value orientation; differentiating between values and related concepts; defining Spranger's six values; looking at the individual and how his socialization influences his values; reviewing related research; testing formulated hypotheses; and discussing the findings in relation to theoretical and methodological concepts.

II. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

Introduction

One might ask if a study of values does not belong to psychology rather than sociology. Fallding (1965), in an article entitled "A Proposal for the Empirical Study of Values," asserts:

The individual is an abstraction that belongs equally to biology, psychology, and sociology. Whether he yields biological, psychological or sociological facts depends entirely on how he is regarded. 'The individual' is in social organization as bricks are in the wall, and in all he does he is clothed with culture as he is with garments . . . . As a girder in social structure and an exponent of culture 'the individual' is turned over to sociology (p. 230).

Concerning values, Homans (1950) writes: "... we should not forget . . . the unconscious assumptions the members of any society make or, as some sociologists would say, the values they hold." He continues, "they are not propositions to be proved by logical processes, but premises from which logic starts" (p. 128).

Thomas (1918) theorizes that action consists of an individual in a social situation determined by the objective conditions, the attitudes and values of the actor acquired during his life experience and his "definition of the situation."
Explanation and Selected Definitions of Value

Value terminology has become prevalent in a wide range of social and behavioral sciences such as sociology, cultural anthropology, psychology, economics, and political science.

There is at least the basis for hoping that value can become one of the important concepts that potentially link different levels of organization and analysis and can therefore play a central part in developing a general science of social man (Smith, 1969, p. 99).

Asch (1962) has suggested that we hardly possess a description of value, not to mention a theoretical explanation. However, since Thomas and Znaniecki (1918) felt that attitudes and values were the basic data of social becoming (change), sociologists must reckon with values in order to explain society, culture, and personality and the interdependence of each of these.

In 1918, with the publication of the first volume of the Polish Peasant in Europe and America, Thomas and Znaniecki stress, for the first time in sociological literature, the importance of one's value orientation.

Following a review of several definitions of value, it was felt that recording a few of these would be sufficient to illustrate the diversity of concepts concerning values. Clyde Kluckhohn (in Parsons and Shils, 1954) defines value as: "a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action (p. 395)."
Value is defined by Robin Williams (1970) as:

... any aspect of a situation, event, or object that is invested with a preferential interest as being "good," "bad," "desirable," and the like. Values are not the concrete goals of action but rather criteria by which goals are chosen. They are modes of organizing conduct... meaningful, affectively invested pattern principles that guide human action (p. 440).

Nye (1967, p. 241) sees values as being high-level abstractions which encompass a whole category of objects, feelings, and/or experiences. Values are mental phenomena rather than behavior.

The concept of value arrived at by Smith (1969) is: "that of a symbolically formulated standard of the desirable. A standard is not itself a motive, but in relation to other facts, it may generate motivation" (p. 116).

Fallding (1965) concludes that the term "value" is often used in a broad sense to mean "things valued." This concept represents the economic emphasis of "value." Self-sufficient ends or values are what a person desires the most and not items for which he pays most. Fallding says that: "A value, then, is a generalized end that guides behavior toward uniformity in a variety of situations, with the object of repeating a particular self-sufficient satisfaction" (p. 224).

**Conceptual Definition of Value for Present Study.** For purposes of the present study, value is defined as: the degree of worth ascribed to an object or activity which represents a standard of preference for the actor. In decision-making theory, values may be seen as the criteria which one uses for choosing among alternatives.
Value Orientation

Talcott Parsons (1951, p. 12) has defined value as "an element of a shared symbolic system which serves as a criterion or standard for selection among the alternatives of orientation which are intrinsically open in a situation." Value orientation concerns the content of the selected standards themselves. The concept of value-orientation in this sense is thus the logical device for formulating one central aspect of the articulation of cultural traditions into the action system.

Value orientations are complex but definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process . . . the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements . . . which give order and direction to ever-flowing streams of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of "common human" problems (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 4).

Differentiation of Concepts Related to Values

Some confusion exists as to the difference between values and related terms such as attitudes and beliefs. Some distinctions between these terms will aid in conceptual clarification, as well as provide a general background for the discussion of the instrument used in the present study.

Kluckhohn (1951, p. 423) has stated that attitudes differ from values in that, "attitudes refer exclusively to the individual and that there is an absence of imputation of the 'desirable' in attitude." Values are inherently supraordinate to the attitude under study--they are a special kind of attitude functioning as standards by which choices are evaluated. Volkart (1951, p. 60) states that "an attitude is a tendency to act, representing the drive, the affective states, the wishes."
Values are not the concrete goals of behavior but rather are aspects of these goals and components in the selection of adequate means. Values appear as criteria against which goals are chosen, and as the implications which these goals have in the situation, while the situation represents the configuration of the factors conditioning the behavior reaction.

The difference in values and needs lies in the desirability aspect. Needs can be met through varying patterns of values. Values may arise out of the context of needs, however.

Sanctions, or norms, and values may be closely related; however, norms are more specific, concrete, situation-bound specifications. Values are the criteria by which norms are judged. The more organized and direct sanctions reinforce group values. "It is from group values that rules are derived and sanctions justified" (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 432).

The realm of ideals and values is almost co-extensive. However, the concept of the ideal does not imply the property of "choice" or selection which is a differential of a value.

Preferences are sometimes considered as values. A preference per se, however, may mean simply a choice among various alternatives without consideration being given to desirability.

Belief systems and values are related but not identical; beliefs have primarily an existential reference and are virtually untestable. A belief is a conviction that something is real, whereas a value is a
standard of preference. Parsons (1951, pp. 379-383) has distinguished between belief systems and systems of value-orientation. Belief systems and systems of value orientation are both parts of the cultural tradition and, as such, there is pressure for them to form a consistent system of patterns. Belief systems involve an independent orientation to a "reality" which has properties independent of the actor who attempts to understand it cognitively. Patterns of value-orientation, on the other hand, formulate the directions of choice in the dilemmas of action. They are only partially determined by beliefs since they are ways of organizing the totality of interests involved in the system of action; interests which are cathetic and evaluative as well as cognitive. Value-orientation patterns are points at which organization relative to all the dominant factors of the action system come to focus.

Philosophical distinctions of values have been utilized by the anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists. The philosophical conceptions differentiate between intrinsic and extrinsic values; between instrumental (means) and inherent terminal (ends) values; implicit and explicit values.

Robinson and Shauer (1970) present a concise summary statement concerning the operational difference between attitudes and values: "Values differ operationally from attitudes only in being fewer in number, more general, central and pervasive, less situation bound, more resistant to modification and perhaps tied to developmentally more primitive or dramatic experiences" (p. 410).
Spranger's Typology

Spranger, in 1922, made a persuasive case for the existence of six fundamental types of subjective evaluation or Lebenformen. He states that his descriptions are not truly representative, rather they are "ideal types" of the kinds of people which are a part of the real world:

It would be wholly erroneous to believe that any of these types really exist as described by our wholly onesided method. They exist as little as we may expect to find a perfect cube, or a rigid body or a body falling in a vacuum. The construction of these ideal basic types of human nature serves only to clarify and bring order to the confusion of complex real forms (p. 8).

He does not contend that any given person belongs exclusively to any one type but that an individual may be found to embrace aspects of several types. (It may be said that Spranger holds a rather flattering view of man.)

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1931) operationalized Spranger's ideal types of men in their Study of Values. These types, or personality motives, were categorized and defined in the following manner:

1. The theoretic man most values the discovery of truth. He is empirical, critical, and rational, aiming to order and systematize his knowledge.

2. The economic man most values that which is useful. He is interested in practical affairs, especially those of business, judging things by their tangible utility.

3. The aesthetic man most values beauty and harmony. He is concerned with grace and symmetry, finding fulfillment in artistic experience.

4. The social man most values altruistic and philanthropic love. He is kind, sympathetic, unselfish, valuing other men as ends in themselves.

5. The political man most values power and influence. He seeks leadership, enjoying competition and struggle.
6. The religious man most values unity. He seeks communion with the cosmos, mystically relating to its wholeness.

**The Individual and Values: Socialization**

Formal institutions, as well as families and racial and cultural groups, operate to inculcate values. Newcomb (1965, p. 145) points out that although we may recognize many persons and groups, those who are psychologically central for us are relatively few in number, comprised of such as one's family, a clique or close friends, or one's ethnic or religious group.

Value orientations, resulting in part from the learning process, are of considerable importance to each individual. Allport (1960) speaks of these orientations in terms of a 'unifying philosophy of life':

... such a philosophy is not necessarily articulate, at least not always articulate in words. The preacher, by virtue of his training, is usually more articulate than the busy country doctor, the poet more so than the engineer, but any of these personalities if actually mature, participates and reflects, lives and laughs, according to some embracing philosophy of life developed to his satisfaction and representing to him his place in the scheme of things (p. 3).

The process through which values of the culture are taught is called socialization. Values as well as attitudes are acquired as a result of their being introduced and emphasized by society. An individual evaluates a situation prior to making a decision, taking into consideration attitudes and actions which may or may not be in agreement with societal expectation.

Newcomb (1965) elaborates upon the complexity of attitudes and situations:
Although behavior is strongly shaped by the character of the immediate situation, people differ in what they bring to the situation, and hence, within limits set by the situation, in how they respond to it. A very important part of what the individual 'brings to the situation' can be summarized, of course, in terms of the stored dispositions we are calling attitudes (p. 67).

In Thomas' theory of culture he stated that culture is composed of, or contains, "definitions of the situation" which have been arrived at, over a period of time, through the consensus of adults. He believed that these definitions were external to the individual, exercised control over him and had an existence of their own which was amenable to study in and of themselves. However, he credited the individual with having the power to form their definition. Volkart (1951) states: "The definition of the situation is begun by parents . . . is continued by the community, . . . and is formally represented by the school, the law, the church" (p. 8).

An individual finds himself, then, in a society made up of interacting individuals who hold specific values which they have learned through the socialization process. Bem (1970, p. 17) states: "In fact, most of us . . . share many of the same values, and our differences of opinion stem from the relative importance we assign to them." Values held in high esteem by an individual are internalized. Once a value is internalized, it becomes, consciously or unconsciously, a standard or criterion for guiding action, as well as developing and maintaining attitudes toward relevant objects and situations (Rokeach, 1968).

Value systems are learned through the socialization process; parents being most influential in childhood, and peers for the later adolescent.
The identification of the adolescent with his peers socializes him for the dating game. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) relates that the peer group serves as a comparative reference group. Individuals within the peer group have mutual and reciprocal influence upon each other.

III. Review of Related Literature

**Introduction**

Since it may be assumed that individuals usually form friendship bonds not because fate brings two or more individuals together and destines them to become friends, but that bonds are formed because of a conscious choice on the part of the interacting parties; the phenomena of friendship formation warrants empirical investigation.

Many variables influence interpersonal interaction. Numerous studies have shown that friendships are formed on the basis of similarity of socio-demographic characteristics such as age, education, race, occupation, etc. These socio-demographic characteristics, along with propinquity, insure extensive homogeneity. Within this homogeneous group, it is likely that value congruity will exist.

**Value Congruity**

Smith (1957), concerned with the causal relationship of friendship formation, presented partially completed AVL booklets to subjects and asked them to choose those persons perceived to be the most desirable social companions and work partners. Acceptance of both measures was found to be significantly greater for the hypothetical person with similar values.
Precker, in two studies (1952, 1953), found that college students chose peer groups, as well as advisors, whose rankings on 39 value categories were similar to their own. Izard (1960), utilizing the Edwards' Personal Preference Schedule, found pairs of friends to be significantly more alike than randomly matched pairs.

Byrne and Wong (1962) and Stein, Hardyck and Smith (1965) reported findings on the congruity configuration. They presented fictitious personality profiles of whites and Negroes to white subjects, some profiles being similar to and some different from the subject's own profile. The subjects evaluated positively those individuals having personality profiles similar to their own and evaluated negatively those having profiles different from their own, regardless of whether the profile belonged to a white or a Negro.

Stein, et al., (1965) had a group of high school students answer a questionnaire about teenage attitudes toward minority groups. Later the students were presented with the purported responses of four other students from "other parts of the country." One of the purported answers was identical to the subject's own, while the other three were varied so as to avoid any suspicion on the part of the subject. Information about the others' academic success, school program, and race was also added. The major differentiating factor in judgment of the other was similarity in belief; however, when information about belief was lacking, race emerged as the major differentiating factor.
**Assumed Similarity**

Fiedler, Warrington and Blaisdell (1952) asked a group of fraternity members to predict how their best-liked and least-liked fellow members would describe themselves. The results indicated that the best-liked persons were perceived as more like self than the least-liked persons.

Smith (1957), utilizing the Allport-Vernon "Scale of Values", asked subjects to complete the test booklets. Later, two partially completed test booklets (one identical to the student's original answers and the other systematically dissimilar) were completed by the subjects. They were asked to study the partially completed booklets and answer them as they felt that the hypothetical subjects would respond.

After testing the hypotheses, Smith (1957, p. 260) concluded that:

(1) The extent to which a person sees another as resembling himself in sequential aspects will determine at least to some degree the extent to which he accepts that person.

(2) The degree to which one person accepts another is related to the extent to which he projects his own values on to that person. A causal relationship was shown to exist with respect to the first conclusion.

Precker (1953), in research with students and their advisors on the operation of projection and identification, found that:

... we tend to attribute to objects of our choice those characteristics which we ourselves possess and those valuing which are characteristic of ourselves. There are two aspects of this: first we choose associates who demonstrate value-similarity, in one or more areas of behavior, and second, we fill the gap, so to speak, by attributing to them value-similarity in other areas (p. 361).
Peer Influence

Newcomb, et al., (1967), in research with a sample made up of students and alumnae, came to the following conclusion: "It is likely, then, that the student's college friends serve as key reference groups for change in attitudes and values, particularly in areas that are related to the dominant norms of the college community" (p. 164).

Feldman and Newcomb (1969) found that without exception, aesthetic values reached a higher relative importance for seniors than for freshmen, while religious values became of lesser importance to seniors than to freshmen. They reported that for the other four values, there was inconsistency in the direction and significance of change (p. 8).

Newcomb (1966), in his College Peer Groups, saw the college peer group as a very strong socializing agent. He stated: "College experience, then, prepares a new tabula rasa for socialization in the adult system of a complex society" (p. 111).

IV. Methodological Procedures

Engaged couples, both of whom were enrolled in courses on the same university campus, were the unit of analysis. Portions of the analysis in the present chapter required separate analysis for couples and for male and female.

In order to be able to compare results from the present study with those of previous research, correlations were used as one of the analytical tools. The author of the present work is aware that the technique is not the best to use under some circumstances since it does not use to greatest advantage directional differences in computation of means and deviations.
The data for the rank ordering of AVL's values of self with significant others was submitted to both a Spearman Rank Order and Pearson Product Moment Correlation. This procedure was followed in order to test Cronbach's suggestion that dyadic rank ordered data would yield similar results whether submitted to parametric or nonparametric statistical analysis.

Logically Formulated Hypotheses and Data Analysis

Before testing the formulated hypotheses related to the theory of the present chapter, a test of a methodological technique will be presented. The author felt that if the rank ordering of the six value statements were to yield results which did not differ significantly from the results obtained by use of the summated scores, the much simpler, easier administered instrument could be used in many more research projects.

Newcomb (1961) reported that he did not utilize the summated scores from Study of Values when he determined value congruity and value perception (as presented in Chapter III of the present work). In order to check the validity of utilizing such procedure, rank orders of the value statements from the questionnaire (See Appendix C) of the present study were correlated with the summated scores from the test booklet (See Table I).

The correlations for male self ($M_s$) on the six variables revealed that five of the correlations were significant: theoretical $p < .05$, political $p < .01$, and economic, aesthetic, and religious $p < .001$. 
Scores on the social value were not significantly correlated. Correlations were much stronger on those variables holding the two highest and two lowest rank positions in the male's pyramid of values. Four correlations on the male's ability to accurately perceive the female were significant, while two, political and social, failed to reach significance. Correlations of the male's perceptual responses for the female revealed a less clearly defineable pattern; he was consistent in perceiving her better on the same two values (whether rank ordered statements or booklet scores were used): religion and theoretical.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M_s$</th>
<th>$M_pf$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.3044*</td>
<td>.4589***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.5035***</td>
<td>.2947*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.4483***</td>
<td>.2709*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.0870</td>
<td>.0347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3309**</td>
<td>.1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.6052***</td>
<td>.6132***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance p < .05  
**significance p < .01  
***significance p < .001
Table II

Spearman Correlations of the Rank Ordering of Brief Value Statements vs. Summated Scores on AVL scores (Females)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$F_s$</th>
<th>$F_{pm}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.2780*</td>
<td>.1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.1200</td>
<td>.2813*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.4945***</td>
<td>.4107***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.3182**</td>
<td>.6049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3538**</td>
<td>.3534**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4072***</td>
<td>.5704***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations for female self ($F_s$) on the six variables revealed that five of the six correlations were significant $p < .05$ (See Table II). Scores on the economic variable were not significantly correlated. The strongest correlations were between the values which hold the foremost rank position in the female's pyramid of values. Correlations on the female's ability to accurately perceive the male's value orientation revealed five significant values. Correlation on the theoretical value was not significant. There was no apparent pattern indicated by the female's ability to accurately perceive the male's value orientation.

The transformation of theories into hypotheses permits one to empirically test the propositions. Hypotheses in the present chapter were
derived from the theory that individuals who choose to frequently interact in a dating relationship will hold values which are congruent.

The formulated hypotheses were derived from the theoretical context discussed in Chapter I, as well as that presented in the present chapter. The value system of each couple was identified by the self-perception technique. There was a total summated value score for each person as well as a difference score for each couple; therefore, value congruity for each couple was determined.

Hypotheses I-V of the present chapter were tested in order to determine if value congruity is predictive of friendship formation.

**Hypothesis I:** A rank ordering of means by both male and female for the AVL six values will reveal a great deal of similarity to those of the Allport studies (See Tables III and IV).

### Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means National AVL Sample</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means Present Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.22*</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>43.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>42.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.72</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Listed in decreasing order

It may be noted that for the male, two values retained the same rank order position in the national and present sample (political and
aesthetic), while theoretical and economical exchanged order from second and third in the national sample to third and second in the present study. The religious value appears to be less important for the present sample.

TABLE IV
RANK ORDERING OF MEANS FOR FEMALES ON AVL VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means National AVL Sample</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means Present Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic 43.86*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic 44.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>41.62</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>41.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>37.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Listed in decreasing order

Four of the value orientations appear to hold the same rank order for females in the present sample as in the AVL National Sample (Aesthetic, Political, Economic, and Theoretical), while religious and social values reverse positions between the national and the present sample. Religion was ranked in second position and social in the third position by the national sample, while the value positions were reversed in the present sample.

Correlations of the six values were compared with those from two previous studies in Table V.
### TABLE V
AVL CORRELATIONS FOR MARRIED COUPLES REPORTED BY
SCHOOLEY (1936), KELLY (1937), AND
CARROLL (PRESENT STUDY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Schooley (1936)</th>
<th>Kelly (1937)</th>
<th>Carroll (Married couples Phase 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>.357</strong></td>
<td><strong>.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>.381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations for the present study are stronger on the economic, aesthetic, social, and religious variables than the Schooley and Kelly studies, while they are less strong on the theoretical than both the Schooley and the Kelly study and less strong on the political than the Kelly study. The present sample reveals a tendency to greater value consensus.

*When average correlations on the six values are presented in the present work, the average correlation is the summed correlation for the separate values divided by six. This procedure is equivalent to correlations that would be obtained if the scores for each value were changed into standard scores with the means for each value at zero and each standard deviation equal to unity. Richardson (1940) in a similar analysis suggests, "On account of the inequality of the means for the several values, a combined correlation table made up of the raw scores would yield a spuriously high correlation" (p. 307).
In order to determine value consensus of the sample couples, the following hypothesis was tested:

**Hypothesis II:** Value orientations of engaged couples will be more congruent than those of couples who may be randomly matched (See Table VI).

**TABLE VI**

PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS OF NATURAL AND RANDOMLY PAIRED COUPLES ON AVL'S SIX VALUES (Phase 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Natural Pairing</th>
<th>Random Pairing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretic</td>
<td>.3438</td>
<td>.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.3561</td>
<td>.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.5208</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.2913</td>
<td>.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3762</td>
<td>.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4366</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis was supported since not any of the correlations between male and female approached significance when the couples were randomly paired. (Seventy-six couples were paired, with replacement, by use of a table of random numbers.) The two strongest positive correlations with the randomly paired couples were on the variables politics and religion, while there was a negative correlation on the aesthetic variable.

All correlations between fiancee and fiance were significant at the .01 level or higher. The two strongest correlations between self and fiancée, or fiancé, were aesthetic (.5208) and religious (.4366), while the two weakest were theoretical (.3438) and social (.2913). Correlations in Table VII reveal that the male perceived (assumed similarity)
the two strongest correlations between self and fiancee to be on the religious and aesthetic values, respectively, while he perceived the two weakest to be on the economic and theoretical values. The female perceived the two strongest correlations to be on the religious and aesthetic, while she perceived the two weakest to be on the political and theoretical values (see Table VIII).

Individuals in interaction may assume similarity which does not exist. In order to test whether the sample couples assumed greater consensus than actually existed, ego's self was correlated with his perception of alter.

**Hypothesis III:** "Assumed similarity" will reveal a stronger correlation than actual similarity at both Phase 1 and Phase 2 (See Table VII).

**TABLE VII**

CORRELATIONS OF MALE AND FEMALE'S SELF RESPONSES AND THE MALE'S SELF WITH HIS PERCEPTION OF THE FEMALE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_s:F_s$</td>
<td>$M_s:M_pf$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.3438</td>
<td>.2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.3561</td>
<td>.3290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.5208</td>
<td>.5319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.2913</td>
<td>.3632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3762</td>
<td>.3823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4366</td>
<td>.5764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.3875</td>
<td>.4102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$M_s:F_s$ = Correlations between male and female's actual selves (consensus)

$M_s:M_pf$ = Correlations between male's self and his perception of the female (assumed similarity)
The male perceived greater congruity than actually existed between himself and his fiancée at Phase 1 on the aesthetic, social, political, and religious variables, and on three variables at Phase 2: theoretical, social and religious. However, not any of the differences were significant at the .05 level. The absolute average correlational differences between actual and perceived similarity of the six variables at Phase 1 was .0227 and at Phase 2, .0224--these differences are quite small. Therefore, it may be concluded that Hypothesis III was not supported statistically; substantively, there was a tendency to perceive more consensus than actually existed. Responses for the female appear below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F_s::M_g</td>
<td>F_s::F_pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.3438</td>
<td>.3234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.3561</td>
<td>.4523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.5208</td>
<td>.5097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.2913</td>
<td>.4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3762</td>
<td>.4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4366</td>
<td>.6325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.3875</td>
<td>.4618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F_s::M_g = Correlations between female and male's actual selves (consensus)
F_s::F_pm = Correlations between female's self and her perception of the male (assumed similarity)
The female also perceived greater congruity than in actuality existed between herself and her fiancé; at Time 1 on the Economic, Social, political, and religious variables; and on all but two variables (theoretical and political) at Time 2. However, not any of the differences were significant at the .05 level. The average correlational difference of the six variables at Time 1 was .0743 and at Time 2, .1079. Comparing the average differences of the male of .0227 and .0224 at Times 1 and 2, respectively, it can be seen that the female has a slightly greater tendency to misperceive congruity than does the male. (Note differences in conclusion on ANOVA, Tables XV-XX.)

Tendency toward balance between Time 1 and Time 2 was tested by means of the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis IV:** Actual value orientations will be more congruent at Time 2 than at Time 1 (See Tables VII and VIII, also ANOVA Tables XV-XX).

By noting columns 1 and 3 in Tables VII or VIII, it may be concluded that there are stronger positive correlations "tendency toward consensus" at Time 2. The average correlation for Time 1 was .3875 and for Time 2, .4011 (a difference which is not significant). Therefore, Hypothesis IV was not supported. There appears to be a trend, though not a significant one, toward balance between Time 1 and Time 2.

**Hypothesis V:** Individuals will perceive their value orientations as being closer to their peers than to their parents (see Tables IX and X).

The male perceives himself to be: on the theoretical variable more like his friends and fiancée and least like his mother and father; on the economic variable more like his friends and father and least like
his mother and fiancée; on the aesthetic variable more like his friends and father and least like his mother and fiancée; on the social variable more like his fiancée and friends and least like his mother and father; on the political variable more like his father and friends and least like his fiancée and mother; on the religious variable more like his fiancée and friends and least like his father and mother.

TABLE IX

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS OF MALE SELF WITH MALE'S PERCEPTION OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS ON AVL'S SIX VALUES*
(Phase 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancée</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All four correlations for each variable are listed in decreasing order of their perceived consensus with the subjects' significant others.
**All correlations are significant p < .001 (Tables IX and X).
A similar set of correlations were derived for the female (see Table X).

**TABLE X**

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS OF FEMALE SELF WITH FEMALE'S PERCEPTION OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS ON AVL’S SIX VALUES (Phase 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretic</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>Self: Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>Self: Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Religious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
<td>Self: Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Father</td>
<td>Self: Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self: Fiancé</td>
<td>Self: Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The female perceives herself to be: on the theoretical variable more like her fiancé and friends and least like her father and mother; on the economic variable more like her friends and mother and least like her father and fiancé; on the aesthetic variable more like her friends and mother and least like her father and fiancé; on the social variable more like her fiancé and friends and least like her mother and father; on the political variable more like her mother and friends and least like
V. Conclusions

Summary of Findings

Allport's (1931) abbreviated statement of the six values—practical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious—were correlated with the summated scores from the test booklet. For the male, the correlations on self ranged from a low of .0870 on the social variable to a high of .6052 on the religious variable, and for the female a low of .1200 to a high of .4945. The male was not very accurate in his perception of the female on the brief statements. It appears that the female was more accurate in her perception of the male on the brief statements than she was when perceiving him on the array of statements.

All correlations of the naturally paired couples were significantly stronger than were those couples who were randomly paired. Correlations of males and females were significant p < .001 on all of the AVL values. These findings appear to support the theory that friendships are formed on value similarities. The data suggest that assumed similarity is more congruent than actual similarity; also that the female has a greater tendency than the male to perceive more value consensus than in actuality exists.

Of the "significant others" rank ordered on the six value continuum, in a large majority of the rankings, both males and females saw themselves more similar to their friends and engagee than their parents.
The male saw himself more like his friends than any of the other significant others in theoretical, economic, aesthetic, and political orientations, while he saw himself more like his fiancée in the social and religious orientations. The peer group, which included the fiancée, appears to have a much stronger influence on the male than either of his parents.

Males score higher than the females on theoretical, economic, and political values indicating more interest in abstract ideas, more emphasis on practical success, and more desire for influence and power over others.

The female perceived herself as being more like her friends in three value orientations—economic, aesthetic, and social—while she saw herself more similar to her fiancé on the theoretical and religious variables. She, as the male, perceives herself as being more like her peers than her parents; however, she ranked her mother's orientation nearest hers on one variable and second nearest on three others.

Females obtain higher average scores for aesthetic, social, and religious values than the males, indicating more interest in art, more emphasis on religion, and more concern for the welfare of others as goals for living.

When the means of the present study were compared with those reported by Allport (1970), it was found that even though some of the values were different in rank order from those reported by Allport, there was not a significant difference in the means.
Logical Induction

The hypotheses tested in this chapter had their genesis in the theory of Spranger. He theorized that man has a hierarchy of values and that, if one were forced to choose between alternative courses of action, he would choose those values held highest in his pyramid of value arrangement. Allport-Vernon-Lindsey operationalized the value orientation concepts of Spranger, compiling norms for different age, sex, occupation, etc., cohorts. As noted in Chapter II, the Study of Values instrument has been revised twice; perhaps, the instrument needs to be revised again which would provide new means, since the means of the present study appear to be congruent with changes of value emphasis of the present youth culture. It may be that separate means should be reported for freshmen and sophomores, and juniors and seniors. A large majority of the present sample were juniors and seniors. Means of the present data differed slightly from the collegiate norms of Southwestern at Memphis, the geographic setting closest to that of the present sample.

Parents are very important socializing agents during the formative years of one's life, but the peer group, especially those of the same sex, appears to be most important in socializing one to live in today's society, whose values and norms are in a stage of flux. The peer group also socializes one for the anticipatory role of married life, or to the transition from the family of orientation to the family of procreation.

Methodological Implications

One may conclude from the analysis of the present data that values are quite stable over time and that they are commensurable on the same
standard as other attitude data. By correlating response scores for ego at Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the testing, the reliability of the instrument was also verified.*

The Study of Values instrument proved to be effective and reliable in obtaining from ego his value orientation, as well as his perception of alter's value orientation.

The rank ordered data of ego's identification with his significant others was analyzed by both the Spearman Rank Order technique and the Pearson Product Moment technique, and the same conclusions were reached by both methods.

*The researcher is aware that there may have been some response contamination, since the subjects answered the same set of questions for both Phase 1 and Phase 2. However, it is highly improbable that the subject would remember how he responded for either of the three levels, especially since he responded to 45 items three different times within 1 ½ hours at both Phase 1 and Phase 2. Also, the fact that the subjects probably discussed between Phase 1 and Phase 2 many of the items of the questionnaire may have made them more aware of the value orientation of their prospective spouse than they would have been had they not responded at Phase 1.
CHAPTER IV

ACCURACY OF INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION

I. Introduction

The last chapter contained a definition of value orientations and the identification of individual value systems in the sample population. It was revealed that values are quite stable and that they may be identified by use of a "forced choice" questionnaire. When determining friendship formation and interpersonal interaction, more important than actual value similarity is an individual's perceptual accuracy of another's value orientations.

The process of interpersonal perception is both like and unlike other perceptual processes. The definition of interpersonal perception is far from clear; however, it is generally agreed that the term should denote something about our understanding and knowledge of other people and also how we use the information which we receive about others. Warr (1968, p. 2) suggests that "person perception is used to refer to the processes involved in knowing the external and internal states of other people." It is, to a large extent, our perception of reality, not reality itself, that influences and determines our behavior. Interpersonal perception not only concerns the judgments we make about people as objects but is primarily concerned with the impression we form of people as people.
The present chapter presents the theoretical setting; others' investigations of interpersonal perception; the methodology unique to the study of accuracy of perception; the hypotheses and analyses of data; and theoretical and methodological implications of the summarized findings.

II. Conceptual Framework

Interpersonal Perception

In psychological studies there has been a great deal of emphasis on the 'overt distal' and 'overt proximal' variables, while in sociology the emphasis has been upon 'covert distal' variables. The overt 'distal' and 'proximal' variables are located in the stimulus or sense organ, respectively, while the 'covert distal' variables exist in personality characteristics such as intentions, needs, and values.

A concentration of emphasis upon covert variables has led some to believe these investigations might appear to concern attitudes rather than perceptions. Warr (1968, p. 4) suggests that "the line between perception and attitude is clearly a blurred one . . . ." However, three clear distinctions may be made: (1) attitudes are generally taken to be relatively permanent structures which are in most instances fairly resistant to change. Perceptions, on the other hand, are transitory and flexible; (2) attitudes may have as their objects more general or abstract entities than do perceptions; (3) perceptions occur only in the presence of a stimulus, while the generalized nature
of an attitude allows it to persist when no stimulus is present. "There is clearly an interplay between attitude and perception. Perception is influenced by attitude; and change and development of attitude is dependent upon the way a source person and his message are perceived. Yet, the two concepts are separate" (Ibid.).

The way individuals behave in relation to each other is clearly in part determined by the manner in which they perceive each other. The way individuals learn to relate to others is presumably affected by their ability to learn to perceive others accurately. Laing, et al. (1966) sees perception as the transformation of alter's behavior into ego's experience, which involves the culturally conditioned learned structures of a perception. They further state: "In order for the other's behavior to become part of self's experience, self must perceive it" (p. 10).

Perception may be either "direct" or "indirect." Direct perception is a result of "face-to-face" interaction, while indirect perception may be formed in relationships other than "face-to-face" situations. Both types of perception involve communication medium of some kind. Communication and psychological literature is full of indirect perception statements and research; much less has been accomplished in the area of direct person perception. Various researchers, such as Feinsterheim and Tresselt (1953), Postman, Bruner and McGinnies (1948), and Paivio and Steeves (1963), have concluded that a person's needs and values do influence his accuracy of perception.
As stated earlier, values are internalized within the personality of an individual as a result of interpersonal perception, socialization, and the total learning process. One's values may influence interaction as well as the interpretation which one puts on attitudes and actions of others. The group takes an active part in the socialization process, as suggested by Thomas:

This defining of the situation is begun by the parents in the form of ordering and forbidding and information is continued in the community by means of gossip, with its praise and blame, and is formally represented by the school, the law, the church (Volkart, 1951, p. 8).

Laing, et al. (1966, p. 12) concurs that interpretation of behavioral interaction is a function of cultural conditioning.

If value congruity is so important in friendship formation and mate selection, then it becomes an important task to be able to perceive accurately. Rokeach (1960) reports that belief congruence may, under certain conditions, be more important than race in determining interpersonal preference.

If there is to be a science of interpersonal behavior, it will rest upon a cornerstone of social perception. If for this reason only, far more effort must be expended on the task of discovering how people come to perceive other people as they do" (Lindzey, 1959, p. 650).

Newcomb, et al. (1965) states that interaction is most rewarding when it is initiated with others who share many values with us.

There is abundant evidence that, other things equal, one can judge persons with whom one has a common background of experience more accurately than other persons. Members of the same age and sex categories, or of the same national, religious, or ethnic groups, have an advantage in judging one another (pp. 179-180).
Asch (1952, pp. 160-162) has referred to this set of phenomena by the phrase "the mutually shared field," which refers to the overlapping cognitive contents of two interacting persons. This mutual sharing of a common environment is also suggested by Cooley's looking-glass self, where one may look at himself by looking at another, or by looking at how he thinks he appears to others.

McDavid and Harari (1968), in a discussion of accuracy of interpersonal perception, suggest four essential sources that may contribute to the perceiver's overall perception and judgment of another:

(a) variables associated with the perceiver himself;
(b) variables associated with the person being perceived and judged;
(c) variables associated with the psychological relationship between the judged; and
(d) the situational context in which the perceptual judgment is made (p. 185).

Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka (1970) conclude their chapter on "Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior" by stating:

We do not know nearly enough about how they [two persons] come to share a common perception of the world. We need to know more about how people get to know one another; such knowledge would entail the matching of one person's perception of another with the other's perception of him . . . . Roles and norms, perceived as external forces, may lessen the tendency to search out the other's definition of the situation. We know all too little about the variables that lead one group of people to interact and develop shared meanings and another group to interact and not develop coordination of meaning (p. 102).

One's judgments are partially dependent upon what has gone on before in the sense of socialization as well as current stimulation; therefore, the dynamic aspects of the perceptual process are very
complex. A perceiver does not apply one discrete rule after another until he reaches a judgment, rather he applies decision rules within a framework which generates a type of Gestalt which arises from a combination of the inputs . . . "under a sustained interest in the structure of the other personality" (Allport, 1961, p. 546).

Cooley and Self Perception

Cooley conceived of the personality as developing within the primary group, especially the family. Personality or the "self" develops as a result of social interaction. The self idea is formulated by our interaction with others. Three principle components make up the "looking glass" concept:

1. imagination of our appearance to the other person
2. imagination of one's judgment of that appearance
3. sort of self feeling such as pride or mortification.

The technique of reciprocal perception (second level), as well as ego's perception of alter's perception of him (third level), as used in the present study will represent Cooley's "looking-glass-self."

"Definition of the Situation"

As suggested earlier, interpersonal perceptions are not formed in isolation. Not only is the perceiver and perceived an important influence on the accuracy of perception, but how one defines a situation has an impact upon one's interpretation of attitude, values, and behavior.
A satisfactory formulation of the confused statement that social behavior is determined not only by "attitudes" but also by the situation would be the proposition that behavior is a result of the interaction between "attitude" and a "definition of the situation" (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918). Rokeach (1968, p. 127) then states that "Behavior is a function of the interaction between two attitudes: attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation."

W. I. Thomas (1928) made a valuable distinction between objective situations and one's perception of these situations, emphasizing that the latter has been sorely neglected. According to Christensen (1964):

He demonstrated that reality factors (objective) get their meaning in and through interpretive factors (subjective) which today would in large part be labeled 'values.' 'If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences' (p. 987)

A further explanation may be found in Volkart (1951):

The situation is the set of values and attitudes with which the individual or the group has to deal in a process of activity and with regard to which this activity is the solution of a situation. The situation involves three kinds of data: (1) The objective conditions under which the individual or society has to act, that is, the totality of values--economic, social, religious, intellectual, etc.--which at the given moment affect directly or indirectly the conscious status of the individual or the group. (2) The pre-existing attitudes of the individual or the group, which at the given moment have an actual influence upon his behavior. (3) The definition of the situation, that is, the more or less clear conception of the conditions and consciousness of the attitudes (p. 57).

Self-perception, as well as others' perception, is a pervasive aspect of the present work. Self-perception is a product of social interaction since it represents an individual's ability to respond differentially to his own behavior and its controlling variables.
Socialization and Perception

Accuracy in the perception of others represents a complex set of skills which an individual learns in the socialization process (especially through Mead's concept of role taking) and also through his daily interaction with "generalized" and "significant" others. Crow (1957) feels that what one brings (culturally) to a situation determines to a marked degree one's perceptual ability. Woelfel, et al. (1971) suggests that the importance of "others" as mediators of culture and these "others" influence in the formation of attitudes, values, self-conception and other socio-psychological structures is central to a study of interpersonal interaction.

Gecas, Calonica, and Thomas (1972), in a paper read at the 1972 ASA meeting, suggests that: "The credibility and importance of evaluative reactions of others for the person varies to the extent that these audiences constitute significant others in the individual's social space" (p. 1). These audiences are made up of an individual's peers and parents.

Accuracy of Perception and Marital Adjustment

Accuracy of perception appears to be important in marital interaction. Luckey (1960) suggests that if one can predict the response of the other, interaction will be smoother and more satisfying. She also suggests that the couple's satisfaction may be more dependent upon the wife's ability to accurately perceive her husband. Kotlar (1965) and Taylor (1967) also support the premise that congruence of perception is
related to marital adjustment. (Numerous family sociologists, such as Burgess and Locke (1945), have documented the fact that the wife does the major adjusting in early marital life.) One of the objectives of the present study was to identify value systems of engaged couples as well as to determine whether the male or the female is the better perceiver of the other's value system. If marital adjustment is dependent upon accuracy of perception, then by comparing accuracy of perception of male and female, one can determine which sex will need to make the greater adjustment in order to interact adequately with the other.

**Similarity vs. Complementarity in Perceptual Ability**

It has often been suggested that value consensus or similarity between two or more individuals is an aid in producing accurate interpersonal perception. Similarity in some areas, however, may often cause one to project onto another inaccurate attributes. The "halo effect" is often operative in producing distorted or biased evaluations of individuals. The "halo effect" often represents an oversimplification of personality or a failure to recognize that people can be high in some desirable traits and low in others. The "halo effect" may consist of either positive or negative conclusions, but individuals who feel that they are in love and find themselves approaching marriage appear to be more prone to select the positive direction. Idealization and perceptual distortion during the dating period often leads to disillusionment in married life.
Summary Statements Concerning Accuracy of Interpersonal Perception

Some conclusions concerning accuracy of perception may be suggested: (1) Accuracy may be aided by similarity between ego and alter. (2) Accuracy depends upon having relevant cues with which to work; various experiences in interaction are the best teacher. (3) Social adjustment and intelligence can, under certain circumstances, aid in accuracy of perception. (4) Empathetic ability may be very influential in perceiving others in social interaction. (5) Projection of "response set" often leads to biased and inaccurate assessment of another. (6) The degree of acquaintance and contact between the perceiver and the perceived may affect accuracy of perception.

III. Synopsis of Related Research

Degree of Similarity and Accuracy of Perception

Degree of similarity between judge and judged tends to increase accuracy of judgment, whether similarity is in terms of sex, age, background, complexity, or personality characteristics (G. W. Allport, 1937).

Dymond (1949, 1950) probably conducted the first full-scale research on what she termed "empathetic ability." She had fellow students from small classes rate each other on six traits: superior-inferior, friendly-unfriendly, leader-follower, shy-self-assured, sympathetic-unsympathetic, secure-insecure. Each subject: (1) rated himself on each trait; (2) rated another person on each trait; (3) predicted alter's rating of himself; (4) predicted how alter would rate ego. She found
individual differences among her subjects on their ability to accurately perceive another but found that the more empathetic subjects tended to have higher IQ scores and that they revealed greater personal spontaneity. Hastorf, et al. (1970) suggested that Dymond and others doing similar research used as their subjects persons not well known to each other: "We argue that 'true' accuracy requires interaction, perhaps of relatively long duration" (p. 129).

Bender and Hastorf (1953) asked judges to predict the responses of four friends to a series of statements. Four deviation scores were then computed: (1) projection, (2) similarity, (3) raw empathy, and (4) refined empathy. They concluded that adjustment in perception scores should be made for bias produced by projection.

**Perception and Interpersonal Relationships**

Kotlar (1965) conducted a study of 100 couples, 50 of whom were considered to be adjusted in their marital relations, and 50 of whom were unadjusted. The major concern of the study was to compare an adjusted and unadjusted middle class sample in terms of the discrepancies between perception of self and perception by spouse. The findings indicated a positive relationship between congruence of perception and good interpersonal relations.

Udry (1963) recorded results of a study with a sample size of 47 married couples and 50 engaged couples. Congruity and mutual perception scores were obtained on 16 personality traits such as: outgoing, intelligent, mature, eccentric, insecure, etc. He found that in general
the perception of married respondents were more accurate and less projec-
tive than the engaged; however, he comments:

This fits our preconceived notions on the subject, but it is the
first data known to this writer which demonstrates it. Of
course it does not prove that the perceptions become more
accurate and less perceptive after marriage, because we don't
know what our married sample would have done before marriage.
The follow-up planned for the engaged sample should provide a
good test of this idea (p. 286).

Udry (1963, pp. 288-289) listed the following conclusions from his
study:

(1) Mates' perception of one another tend to exaggerate per-
sonality differences between the sexes for both engaged and
married couples.

(2) Mates' perceptions of one another involve a substantial pro-
jection of one's own traits, with this tendency most pro-
nounced among engaged individuals, especially females.

(3) Accuracy of perception is greatest among females for each
marital status; and the greatest in married sample for both
sexes.

(4) Greater accuracy of the married cannot be explained by the
autistic variable. (The autism scope was derived by summing
between each of ego's traits and each of his perceptions of
alter's traits.)

(5) Results indicate that there should be a distinction made
between complementary needs for males and females.

(6) There was no evidence that one's need structure leads one to
perceive traits in the mate opposite to one's own.

During 1954, 1955, Newcomb (1961) conducted a series of studies
in a natural setting on the processes through which strangers become
acquainted with one another. Seventeen men, all of whom were strangers
when entering the University of Michigan, agreed to live in a coopera-
tive house one full semester.
Each person completed (among other data gathering instruments) a Study of Values. The responses were used to measure attitudinal similarity as well as mutual perception. The following conclusions were reported: attitudinal similarity in the pre-acquaintance period serves as a good predictor of later attraction between people; personality factors and physical proximity are also important variables underlying attraction; generally individuals who are strongly attracted to each other tend to overestimate their similarity to one another; accuracy of perception tended to increase with extended length of acquaintance; perceived (or assumed) similarity was more closely related to interpersonal attraction than was real or actual similarity.

Norcutt and Silva (1951) asked 64 married couples to respond to a set of questions for himself and for how he thought that his spouse would respond. They concluded: "It is thus clear that a large proportion of the group are able to make genuinely successful prediction" (pp. 34-35). They also found that "The greater the difference between self ratings on any one item, the greater is the error of prediction" (p. 35) . . . suggesting that we judge others by analogy with ourselves.

In a slightly different type research, Postman, Bruner, and McGinnies (1948) administered the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values to 25 subjects, obtaining for each subject a hierarchy of his personal value orientation. They exposed the subjects to 36 words by tachistoscope and found that the subjects remembered much more readily those words which related closest to their own value orientation.
**Intensified Interaction and Accuracy of Perception**

Bieri (1953), in a constructive interaction situation, hypothesized that changes in interaction would be in the direction of perceiving the other individual as more similar to oneself as a result of increasing agreement with and knowledge about the other person. He found that in a constructed group situation in which mutual agreement on experiences and preferred activities existed, members came to perceive their partners as more similar to themselves (p. 66).

Passini and Norman (1966) found somewhat contradictory results when observing one's ability to perceive personality structure: "... And it is no less amazing that the longer periods of contact, extending to upwards of 3 years, resulted only in minor variations in this total structure" (pp. 44-45). They further stated:

> 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 (p. 48).

Degree of acquaintance, especially if accompanied by intensification of affection, makes for more favorable ratings of associates. Bruner (1959, p. 642) concludes that: "By and large length of acquaintance aids accuracy" of perception.

Bieri, et al. (1953) demonstrated experimentally that subjects who interact more frequently with each other come to assume greater similarity, while Newcomb (1961, p. 152) hypothesized that "with increased
acquaintance, judgments of reciprocation tend to become more accurate, as more information becomes available." His data supported this hypothesis. Research by Altman and McGinnies (1960) and Statland, Cottrel, and Laing (1960) may be interpreted as revealing that closer associations result in increased exposure of one person to another, permitting more accurate perception.

**Differences in Perceptual Accuracy of Male and Female**

Warr (1968) reviewed numerous research works on sex differences and concluded:

From the studies at our disposal we may say that as far as the judgment of emotion and accurate perception of self and others are concerned, the findings are equivocal; there is some indication that women assume more similarity than men. Most of the differences between male and female judges are found in experiments which allow subjects to give free descriptions of stimulus persons. From these studies we have some evidence that women tend to give fuller and more favorable descriptions, make more inferences, and may use different categories than do men. It should be emphasized, however, that the number of studies on which these very tentative conclusions are based is small and that significant differences in the field as a whole are rare and highly prized" (p. 190).

Norcutt and Silva (1951) found that even though the mean differences between married couples' ability to accurately perceive each other was not significant, in 37 couples, the husband showed superior insight while this was true in only 25 couples for the females.

Kerckhoff and Bean (1962), in a study testing the hypothesis that value consensus within a dyad is associated with positive perception of the partner, found that the female had a tendency to view her fiance more positively than her fiance viewed her; however, both sets of scores tended to be rather positive.
IV. Adaptable Methodology

Defining a measure operationally is only a preliminary step to the analytic studies which may be undertaken in hopes of testing or refining a scale in order to bring it closer to its intended construct. The present researcher was able to locate a small number of studies, such as those of Newcomb (1961) and Udry (1966), which had used the Study of Values instrument for testing reciprocal perceptions. Newcomb reports only the rank ordering of the six values, as obtained from his abbreviated statement of the six values; not the summated scores for each variable, as suggested in the Study of Values Manual.

Laing, Phillipson, and Lee (1966), in dyadic interactions, were concerned with three levels of perception: (1) direct; (2) meta; (3) meta-metaperspective. They state that it would be difficult indeed to reach an accurate level of comparison of perception unless the researcher had actual self data.

Support for the present method of analysis is found in Allen Edwards' The Measurement of Personality Traits by Scales and Inventories (1970) and Lee Cronbach's "Proposals Leading to Analytic Treatment of Social Perception Scores" (1958). Edwards explains that: "There are two major ways to obtain descriptions of individuals. One is to ask the individual himself to describe what he is like. The other is to ask his peers and associates or others who have studied or observed him to describe what he is like" (p. 1). An individual who is simply asked to describe himself is usually selective in what he chooses to reveal about
himself; if forced choice responses are used, he will probably quite accurately respond for that specific time, situation, and criterion.

Descriptions made by alter also have limitations, since they must be limited to those attitudes which alter has had an opportunity to observe. (It is assumed that all subjects in the present study have had an opportunity to observe each others' attitudes and actions related to the six values.)

As Edwards (1970) continues, he further advocates the approach utilized in this thesis:

If we are interested in comparing the personality of one individual with that of another and in finding out something about the way in which the two differ, we must have some common basis for the descriptions obtained of each individual. . . . If the same set of statements is used in obtaining the self-descriptions (of two individuals), then it would obviously be possible to compare similarities and differences in the self-description in terms of this particular set of statements.

Similarly, if the descriptions of personality are to be obtained from peer and associates, the use of a common set of statements for obtaining the descriptions would also permit comparisons of similarities and differences among different individuals (pp. 2-3),

Dyadic scores presented in the present work allowed the investigator to translate some of the socio-psychological ideas of Freud, Mead, Cooley, and Thomas into specific hypotheses, which became operationally measurable variables.

There is little consensus in the literature on the conceptual and operational definitions of person perception. Controversies have arisen over the methodological and interpretative operations of the research findings. Some of the major controversies (Cronbach, 1955; Cronbach,
have resulted from methodological errors and statistical artifacts which are so frequently present in many of the person perception investigations.

The most relevant methodological procedures have been presented by Cronbach (1955, 1958), Gage and Cronbach (1955), Cronbach and Gleser (1953), Crow (1954, 1957), Crow and Hammond (1957), and Laing, Phillipson and Lee (1966). A brief review of Cronbach's works will provide an understanding of some of the major errors in statistical analyses.

Interrelation Between Real Consensus, Assumed Consensus, and Perception

Cronbach (1958) offers one of the most instructive and critical reviews of methodological procedures on "social perception." Since one of the major objectives of the present study was to empirically develop and test a methodological technique which was perceived to be reliable for analyzing interpersonal perception, Cronbach's major criticisms of and suggestions for social perception research were subjected to empirical tests.

It seems appropriate to introduce Cronbach's contributions to the subject of interpersonal perception by stating his major concepts. The true measurement of reciprocal empathetic ability involves the manipulation of the following psychological entities:

(a) Ego's self-description
(b) Alter's self-description
(c) Ego and alter's prediction of each other
Cronbach (1955) defines the relationships of these three measurable responses as:

**RS (Real Similarity):** where \(a = b\) (see a, b, and c above)

**AS (Assumed Similarity):** where \(a\) or \(b = c\)

**ACC (Accuracy):** where \(a = c\) and \(b = c\)

Any two of these relationships are independent, while the others are a resultant of the other combinations. Cronbach (1955) suggests that a lack of understanding of the functional interrelationships between these three response types, or levels, provides the basis for much of the confusion and inconsistencies found in interpersonal perception research.

Difference scores are often utilized in discussing the ability of ego to accurately perceive alter. Both parties respond for themselves, and the differences between ego and alter are compared for congruity. Because of ego's need for consistency with his own attitudes, he will often "project" onto alter characteristics which alter may not possess . . . assumed (or perceived) similarity may then be distorted . . . accuracy of perception may be affected in the same way. Global, dyadic indices which formed the basis for earlier perception studies, often led the investigator to, perhaps erroneously, conclude that such concepts as projection, intuition, identification, etc., were intuitive and applicable to all perceptual situations.

When one looks at the "global" or Gestalt concept of analyses as opposed to the individual component technique, he is reminded of Piaget's description of how the child grows to an understanding of reality.

"First comes the naive, intuitively given impressions of global,
unanalyzed wholes. These wholes are seen as separate objects, existing as Gestalts and vanishing as soon as they are fractionated" (Cronbach, 1958, p. 377).

Analysis of variance was performed on the data to check for significant interactions. Since there were no significant interactions revealed, but previously obtained difference scores and correlations had indicated significant relationships between perceptual accuracy and sex, the analysis was broken out into separate ANOVA tables looking at the effect of couple, sex, level, and time on the subjects' ability to accurately perceive each of the six value dimensions.

Averaging the six value orientations generated scores whose measurements are relative to the magnitude of the other scores rather than being absolute in terms of some arbitrary scale.

In order to check for significant differences between correlations, the r's were converted to z scores. Again, an average of the six value orientations was utilized for obtaining the correlations.

Hypotheses and Data Analysis

The hypotheses of the present chapter were conceptualized within the interaction framework. Hypotheses VI - XI, which are related to mutual perception, were tested and the results appear in the present chapter.

Hypothesis VI: Of the independent variables, occupation, prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating and length of engagement; length of constant dating and length of engagement will explain more of the variation than the other stated independent variables (see Table XI).
In order to determine the best predictor variable of congruity and accuracy of perception, five independent variables—(1) father's occupation; (2) prior involvement of ego; (3) length of acquaintance of couple; (4) length of constant dating; (5) length of engagement—were tested in a stepwise regression model. The stepwise regression forward-selection procedure (which was used in the present analysis) involves the re-examination, at every stage of the regression, variables incorporated into the model at previous stages. This procedure provides a judgment of the contribution made by each variable with the idea that it was the most recent variable to enter the model. (Only those variables which contributed significantly to the variation \( p < .05 \) were retained in the present final regression model.) Table XI presents the conclusions drawn from the stepwise regression procedure.

Hypothesis VI was supported by data from both males and females. Length of constant dating improved the male's perception of the female on the theoretical value, while a longer engagement improved his perception of her on the: theoretical, aesthetic, and religious variables. Neither length of constant dating nor length of engagement improved the male's perception of the female on the other variables. (Length of acquaintance, length of constant dating, and length of engagement contributed significantly to value congruity between male and female.)

Data analysis of the female's responses indicated weaker support for Hypothesis VI. Length of constant dating and length of engagement contributed significantly to the female's ability to accurately perceive the male on the aesthetic variable, while length of acquaintance improved her perception of him on the social value. (Prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating, and length of engagement contributed significantly to value congruity (see Table XI).)
**TABLE XI**

**STEPWISE REGRESSION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES: OCCUPATION: PRIOR INVOLVEMENT: LENGTH OF ACQUAINTANCE: LENGTH OF CONSTANT DATING: AND LENGTH OF ENGAGEMENT ON CONGRUITY AND PERCEPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Male R²</th>
<th>Female R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congruity</td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>ns        ns        ns</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>&quot;        &quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>&quot;        *F₁       *M₁</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>&quot;        ns        *F₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>ns       &quot;        ns</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>&quot;        &quot;        &quot;</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ns = not significant

*F₁, F₂ significant F-value for male & female, p < .05 (congruity)

*X₁ = Father's occupation

*X₁ = Father's occupation

*X₁, F₁ significant F-value for male & female, p < .05 (congruity)

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior involvement

*X₂ = Prior implementation
The accuracy with which ego is able to perceive alter's value orientation is presented below:

**Hypothesis VII:** Alter's perception of ego's value orientation will differ from ego's self perception.

**TABLE XII**

**AGREEMENT OF EGO'S SELF PERCEPTION WITH HIS ENGAGEE'S PERCEPTION OF HIM**

(Average of Phase 1 and 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_s$</td>
<td>$F_{pm}$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$F_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>+0.23</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>+1.17</td>
<td>38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>44.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>+1.76*</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>41.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$*$significance $p < .05$

$M_s$ = Male's Self Perception

$F_s$ = Female's Self Perception

$F_{pm}$ = Female's Perception of Male

$M_{pf}$ = Male's "" Female

+value = overestimation

-value = underestimation

Analysis of the data does not support Hypothesis VII. The female perceived, with a great deal of accuracy, the importance to the male of theoretical and social values (in order of accuracy of perception.) She
significantly overestimated the importance to the male of the political variable \((p < .05)\) and underestimated on the aesthetic, religious, and social variables (in decreasing order of accuracy).

The male perceived the female, with a great deal of accuracy, on the religious, theoretical, and political values (in order of accuracy of perception). He overestimated her emphasis on the social and aesthetic values, while he underestimated her emphasis on the other four variables.

Pearson Correlation technique was also used to test Hypothesis VII. This analysis was performed in order to determine whether correlation or ANOVA is the more stringent or explanatory tool for looking at dyadic relationships (See Table XIII).

Results from the correlational analysis lead to different conclusions concerning ego's ability to accurately perceive alter's value orientation than results from difference of means tests. The correlations (ranked according to the strength of their relationship) between male self and female's perception of male \(M_{F}^{m}F_{pm}\) were: (1) religious, (2) aesthetic, (3) economic, (4) political, (5) social, and (6) theoretical. A dependent \(t\) which utilized the difference of means between the actual and perceived (Table XII) revealed that the female was better able to perceive (in rank order) the male on the following variables: (1) theoretical, (2) social, (3) religious, (4) economic, (5) aesthetic, and (6) political. . . the tests are not measuring the same thing.

Correlations (ranked according to the strength of their relationship) between female self and the male's ability to accurately perceive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Perceptual Accuracy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms:Fpm Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.5983</td>
<td>.5788</td>
<td>.5885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.6757</td>
<td>.7677</td>
<td>.7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.7629</td>
<td>.7784</td>
<td>.7707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.5779</td>
<td>.6088</td>
<td>.5934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.5962</td>
<td>.7148</td>
<td>.6555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.7641</td>
<td>.8019</td>
<td>.7830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.6625</td>
<td>.7084</td>
<td>.6854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Scores</td>
<td>.4742</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the female on the following variables were: (1) religious, (2) economic, (3) theoretical (4) political, (5) aesthetic, and (6) social. Different conclusions were drawn from the dependent analysis and the correlations. The male perceived more accurately (in rank order) the emphasis of the female on the: (1) religious, (2) theoretical, (3) aesthetic, (4) political, (5) economic, and (6) social variables.

The theory that increased interaction increases one's ability to accurately perceive another was tested by means of Hypothesis VIII.

Hypothesis VIII: Mutual perception of value orientations will reveal a significant increase from Time 1 to Time 2 (see Tables XIV-XX).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AVL'S SIX VALUES ON PERCEPTION OF MALE AND FEMALE (BY COUPLE AND INDIVIDUAL) FOR PHASE 1 AND 2 AND LEVEL 1, 2, AND 3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex (Error a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level 1 = Self Response
" 2 = Ego's Perception of Alter
" 3 = " 3 = " 3 = " of Alter's Perception of Him

**Since the sums for each individual on the six dependent variables had to add to 240, there was no variation among means for the couple nor couple X sex. This analysis was conducted in order to look at interaction.
The analysis of variance did not reveal any significant main effects or interaction effects on either first or second order interaction (the global technique). The analysis was further broken down, as suggested by Cronbach (1958), into component parts and separate analysis of variance run (see Tables XV - XX).

**TABLE XV**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTION ON THE THEORETICAL VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5567076.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1903893.52</td>
<td>25385.25</td>
<td>4.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172275.22</td>
<td>172275.22</td>
<td>29.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex (Error a)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>441416.45</td>
<td>5885.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>857.21</td>
<td>428.60</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1837.72</td>
<td>1837.72</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1238077.51</td>
<td>619038.75</td>
<td>220.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3153.20</td>
<td>3153.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1938.23</td>
<td>969.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17152.14</td>
<td>8576.07</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1786475.67</td>
<td>2808.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance p < .05
**significance p < .01
***significance p < .001

In the analysis of perception on the theoretical value, Table XV, the main effect, sex, produced a significant F-value, p < .001. The A effect, difference between couples, was also significant; both contribute significantly to value congruity and value perception. The first order
interaction, sex by level, was highly significant and will be discussed in connection with Hypothesis X. Six by level by time interaction was significant, p < .05. An inspection of the means revealed that the male's perception of the female on the theoretical variable had increased from Time 1 to Time 2 to a greater extent than any other relationship thereby producing the cell contributing most to the interaction.

Analysis of the results of the split-plot ANOVA on the economic variable appears in Table XVI. It was expected that the male would place more emphasis on the economic orientation than the female.

### TABLE XVI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTION ON THE ECONOMIC VALUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>6651576.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3003115.77</td>
<td>40041.54</td>
<td>6.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36271.18</td>
<td>36371.18</td>
<td>5.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex (Error a)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>470293.41</td>
<td>6270.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1035.40</td>
<td>517.70</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5264.20</td>
<td>5264.20</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1166907.21</td>
<td>583453.60</td>
<td>189.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2003.38</td>
<td>2003.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1188.98</td>
<td>594.49</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4099.92</td>
<td>2049.96</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1961396.74</td>
<td>3083.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance p < .05

***significance p < .001
In order to determine if an increase in interaction over time had significantly improved ego's ability to accurately perceive alter's emphasis on the economic value, the data were analyzed with the following results: the main factor, couple, contributed significantly to the variance $p < .001$, while sex contributed to a lesser degree $p < .05$. The male had a stronger orientation toward the economic value than the female. The first order interaction, sex and level, produced a significant $F$ . . . findings which will be discussed under Hypothesis X.

Table XVII reveals the emphasis and perceptual ability of ego and alter on the aesthetic variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XVII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTION ON THE AESTHETIC VALUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>8474924.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3901309.63</td>
<td>52017.46</td>
<td>18.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120719.58</td>
<td>120719.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>493807.50</td>
<td>6584.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18715.48</td>
<td>9357.74</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4673.78</td>
<td>4673.78</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2119350.06</td>
<td>1059675.03</td>
<td>375.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>349.72</td>
<td>349.72</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4261.61</td>
<td>2130.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16937.99</td>
<td>8468.99</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1794798.87</td>
<td>2822.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance $p < .05$

**significance $p < .01$

***significance $p < .001$
Results from the ANOVA, as presented in Table XVII, reveals a great deal of intercorrelation from both the main and interaction effects. Both main factors, couple and sex, contributed significantly to the variation on the aesthetic variable, p < .001. The female places more emphasis on the aesthetic value than the male . . . explanation for significant main effect of sex. Level as a factor of the subplot contributed significantly to the variance p < .05. Perception (level two) revealed a significantly smaller mean that either level 1 or 3, suggesting that there is more congruity between actual and perceived than true similarity. The sex by level interaction will be discussed under Hypothesis X. Both male and female contributed to the difference in means suggested by the significant second-order interaction, sex by level by time . . . the female had increased the accuracy of her perception of the male on the aesthetic variable, while the male had increased the accuracy of his perception of the female's perception of him.

There appears to be little influence on the variation of the social variable from either the main or the interaction effects (see Table XVIII).

An analysis of the summated scores on the social variable (see Table XVIII) indicated a significant F-value for the main factor, couple. The couples were not equal on either value congruity or their ability to perceive. Variability between couples was extensive at all three levels of perception. The sex by level interaction will be discussed under Hypothesis X.
### Table XVIII

**Analysis of Variance of Perception on the Social Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5891618.30</td>
<td>5891618.30</td>
<td>3.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2452412.05</td>
<td>32698.83</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27212.53</td>
<td>27212.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716439.55</td>
<td>9552.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Error a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10076.94</td>
<td>5038.47</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2406.02</td>
<td>2406.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>917717.54</td>
<td>458858.77</td>
<td>165.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160.57</td>
<td>160.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>406.83</td>
<td>203.42</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2252.78</td>
<td>1126.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1762533.49</td>
<td>2771.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significance p < .001

Data, which were related to the political variable, from the questionnaire were analyzed and the results are presented in Table XIX.

According to the results reported in Table XIX, the significant $F$-value for couple, a control variable, revealed that the couples were not equal in value consensus or value perception. An inspection of the means for the three levels revealed that the mean for Level 1 (difference between male and female self) was significantly smaller than the means for Levels 2 and 3, indicating greater perceived disparity than actual
disparity. Sex by level interaction was highly significant and will be elaborated in a discussion of Hypothesis X.

TABLE XIX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTION ON THE POLITICAL VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>5305624.22</td>
<td>28358.49</td>
<td>4.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2126886.72</td>
<td>28358.49</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23116.57</td>
<td>23116.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex (Error a)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>454312.59</td>
<td>6057.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19254.39</td>
<td>9627.19</td>
<td>4.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>494.01</td>
<td>494.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1172212.28</td>
<td>586106.14</td>
<td>247.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399.13</td>
<td>399.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>229.39</td>
<td>114.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>565.94</td>
<td>282.97</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1508153.21</td>
<td>2371.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance p < .05
***significance p < .001

A quick glance at Table XX reveals that couples, as a control variable, and sex, as the main factor, as well as level and time significantly affect the results of perception.

Both couple and sex as factors contributed significantly (see Table XX) to perception, indicating that they differ in their contribution to the total variation. The significant contribution which sex
makes to the variation can be explained by the fact that the female places considerably greater emphasis than the male on religion. Level 1 (male self compared to female self . . . actual consensus) revealed greater disparity than the perceived disparity; male and female differ significantly on the emphasis which they place on religion. Data analysis for Time 1 suggest greater disparity in actual emphasis which was placed on religion at Time 1 than at Time 2. The highly significant interaction between sex and level is presented under Hypothesis X.

TABLE XX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTION ON THE RELIGIOUS VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>8129208.43</td>
<td>18129.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4541873.01</td>
<td>60558.31</td>
<td>7.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60094.77</td>
<td>60094.77</td>
<td>7.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple X Sex (Error a)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>636286.48</td>
<td>8483.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37358.33</td>
<td>18679.17</td>
<td>5.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24637.59</td>
<td>24637.59</td>
<td>7.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>759322.24</td>
<td>379661.12</td>
<td>117.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3936.88</td>
<td>3936.88</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2960.96</td>
<td>1480.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Level X Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>324.83</td>
<td>162.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>2062413.31</td>
<td>3242.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significance p < .01
***significance p < .001
From the split-plot analysis of variance of perception scores on all six values—theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious—there was a significant interaction between sex and level on all the values. Perception significantly increased from Phase 1 to Phase 2 on only one variable, religion; therefore, Hypothesis VIII was not supported. Also, an analysis of the differences in correlations between Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table XIII) produced Z-scores which were nonsignificant.

Whether or not the types of interaction experienced during the early months of marriage has a significant influence upon perceptual ability was tested by means of Hypothesis IX.

Hypothesis IX: Those couples who are married at Time 2 will reveal a more accurate perception of their spouses than the couples who are "still" engaged at Time 2 (see Tables XXI and XXII).

### TABLE XXI
**CORRELATIONS OF ACTUAL AND PERCEIVED VALUE ORIENTATION OF (STILL) ENGAGED AND MARRIED COUPLES**  
(Males: Time 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Engaged Couples Actual Congruity (Mg:Fp)</th>
<th>Engaged Couples Perceived Congruity (Mg:Fpm)</th>
<th>Married Couples Actual Congruity (Ms:Fp)</th>
<th>Married Couples Perceived Congruity (Ms:Fpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.4885</td>
<td>.6163</td>
<td>.1106</td>
<td>.5567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.4534</td>
<td>.8159</td>
<td>.4710</td>
<td>.6865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.6533</td>
<td>.7861</td>
<td>.3961</td>
<td>.8113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.0742</td>
<td>.4091</td>
<td>.3822</td>
<td>.6885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.2869</td>
<td>.7779</td>
<td>.4556</td>
<td>.6742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4683</td>
<td>.8497</td>
<td>.4713</td>
<td>.7754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.4041</td>
<td>.7083</td>
<td>.3812</td>
<td>.6988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z Value  
$Z = .0549$ (Columns 2-4)
Table XXI represents the correlations between "still" engaged couples and married couples' ability to accurately perceive their mate on AVL's six values (female's perception of male). Results of the Z calculations revealed that there was no significant difference in perceptual ability of the married females over the "still" engaged females; therefore, Hypothesis IX was not supported.

The ability of the "still" engaged and married male to accurately perceive the female on her pyramid of values is presented in Table XXII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Engaged Couples</th>
<th>Married Couples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Congruity</td>
<td>Perceived Congruity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((M_s:F_s))</td>
<td>((F_s:M_pf))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>.4885</td>
<td>.6263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>.4553</td>
<td>.6982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>.6533</td>
<td>.5269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.0742</td>
<td>.2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.3869</td>
<td>.6440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>.4683</td>
<td>.6560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.4041</td>
<td>.5748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Value</td>
<td>Z = .1012 (Columns 2-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hypothesis was not supported by the data. Neither the males nor the females had significantly improved their perceivability after marriage. However, the average disparity in perception indicated a slight decrease for all males and females between Time 1 and Time 2 (see Table XIII).

Research findings on the superior ability of either the male or the female to more accurately perceive the other are inconsistent and often misinterpreted. Hopefully, a testing of Hypothesis X will do more than just add more confusion and inaccurate conclusions.

Hypothesis X: The male's ability to accurately perceive the value orientation of his engagee will be greater than that of the female (see Table XXIII).

An inspection of Table XXIII reveals the difference in perceptual ability of the male and the female and, also, on which of the six values each can more accurately perceive the other. Results from analyses of variance Tables XV - XX revealed a significant interaction between sex and level. The male was a more accurate perceiver of the female than she was of him on the religious, political, and aesthetic variables (in rank order), while the female was more accurate in her perception of the male on the social and theoretical variables (respectively).* They both perceived each other with the greatest accuracy on the theoretical variable. The male perceived with almost 100 percent accuracy the importance that the female places on religion. The female was quite accurate in her ability to perceive the importance to the male of the theoretical value.

*Only one of the differences between sexes was statistically significant.
### TABLE XXIII

**MEAN SCORES OF AVL'S SIX VALUES**  
(Average of Phase 1 and Phase 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Perception</td>
<td>Alter's Perception of Ego</td>
<td>Difference Between Actual and Perceived</td>
<td>Self Perception</td>
<td>Alter's Perception of Ego</td>
<td>Difference Between Actual and Perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($M_s$)</td>
<td>($F_{pm}$)</td>
<td>($M_s - F_{pm}$)</td>
<td>($F_b$)</td>
<td>($M_{pf}$)</td>
<td>($F_b - M_{pf}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>35.44</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>+2.52</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>-2.80</td>
<td>44.61</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>+1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>45.08</td>
<td>+2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>+3.32*</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance $p < .05$
Since the males perceived with greater accuracy than the female on only the political variable, Hypothesis X was not supported.

Since perception (Level 2) did not reveal significant results which explain the significant sex by level interaction (Tables XV - XX), the tables were further broken out into sex by Level 1 (real similarity) effects (see Table XXIV).

**TABLE XXIV**

**ACTUAL VALUE ORIENTATION OF EGO COMPARED WITH ACTUAL VALUE ORIENTATION OF ALTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Means (Average of Phase 1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M_S )</td>
<td>( F_S )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>35.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>44.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.95</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>38.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>41.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( M_S \) = Male Self  
\( F_S \) = Female Self  
*significance \( p < .05 \)  
** " \( p < .01 \)  
*** " \( p < .001 \)  
+ = Dominant value for male  
- = Dominant value for female

Results from the difference of means test indicate that the **highly significant interaction** found in ANOVA may be located in the differences
between male self and female self on the six values.* (It was expected that the sexes would differ on the emphasis which they place on Spranger's value types.)

Individuals often ask themselves what others think of them. Cooley believed that one sees himself both through the eyes of himself and the eyes of his associates. The researcher once heard Albert Ellis say that we often tell ourselves "nonsense stuff" about what others think of us. Hypothesis XI attempts to answer the question: Does one know how a significant other person views him?

Hypothesis XI: Ego will not accurately perceive alter's perception of him (Cooley's looking-glass-self).

A $t$ for dependent samples was run on the means for alter's perception of ego and ego's perception of alter's perception of him (see Table XXV).

In order to locate the cells contributing most to the variation, the sex by level interaction (Tables XV - XX) was broken out into separate difference-of-means tests (orthogonal type comparisons). The male was more accurate, though not significantly so, in his perception of the female than the female was of him (Table XII); he was also slightly more accurate on the third level of perception, i.e., his ability to predict how the female perceived him. Data from Table XXV reveals

*All correlations between male and female self were significant $p < .01$ at Time 1 (see Table IV). The difference of means tests reveals much more information than the correlations. Direction of differences reveals the values which rank highest on both sexes' pyramid of values.
TABLE XXV

COMPARISON OF EGO'S PERCEPTION OF ALTER'S PERCEPTION OF HIM WITH ALTER'S PERCEPTION OF EGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ppf</td>
<td>Fpm</td>
<td>Pmp</td>
<td>Pf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>42.74</td>
<td>+0.43</td>
<td>33.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>36.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>35.18</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td>+0.74</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>36.83</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>44.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>38.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>41.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = overestimation by ego
- = underestimation by ego
that the male overestimated the female's perception of him on the aesthetic, theoretical, and social variables, while he underestimated her perception of him on the political, religious, and economic variables (though not significantly so). The female was also slightly in error on her perception of the male's perception of her on all variables. She overestimated the male's perception of her on the economic, political, and religious values, while she underestimated his perception of her on the theoretical, aesthetic, and social variables. Results of the data failed to support Hypothesis XI.

V. Conclusion

**Critique of Findings**

Of the five independent variables—father's occupation, prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating, and length of engagement—four made a significant contribution to an explanation of value congruity and perception . . . prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating, and length of engagement.

Correlations obtained from data collected at Time 1 (N = 76) were compared with those collected at Time 2 (N = 35) for married couples. Results of the correlations failed to support the hypothesis that perceived value orientation would reveal a stronger correlation, both before and after marriage, than the actual value orientation. The female had a slightly greater tendency than the male to overestimate the emphasis of the value orientation of her fiancé; however, it appears that she had improved her perceptual ability at Time 2. The male quite accurately perceived his fiancée at both Times 1 and 2, with a tendency on his part
also, to overestimate actual congruity at both times. There was a significant difference between the male's self and the female's perception of him on the political variable.

The hypothesis that mutual perception of value orientations would reveal a significant increase from Time 1 to Time 2 was not supported, statistically, when the data were analyzed by analysis of variance as well as by correlations. Table XIV reveals that the level by time interaction did not approach significance.

Both male and female perceived a stronger consensus than actually existed between themselves and their engagee at Times 1 and 2. The male was slightly more accurate in his perception of his fiancée's orientation, as well as in his perception of her perception of him (third level of perception).

Theoretical Implications

The empirical propositions derived from the body of theory reviewed earlier in the chapter are indeed difficult to operationalize and interpret. Perception has a tendency to be situation bound and, even though values are known to be fairly stable, the perceiver may have difficulty accurately determining another's value.

Individuals who are in love, possibly because their own preconceived idea of mate selection is that mates should be similar in value orientation, may project onto their engagee a value orientation which is inaccurate. Findings of the present research tend to support Luckey's
(1964) conclusion that females tend toward higher self-disclosure than males. It is probably reasonable to assume that if ego has a fairly stable perception of himself, he prefers that others have the ability to accurately perceive him.

**Methodological Critique**

Methodologically, the measure of interpersonal perception has been accomplished in the past by various techniques, which include: assessment of difference scores; correlational analysis, including partial correlations; determination of ratio of expected to observed; regression analysis; and analysis of variance. The present analysis utilized most of these techniques.

The global ANOVA revealed insignificant interactions, because the direction of difference scores were practically canceling each other out and masking the differences of perception and value consensus over sex and level. When the component variables were separately examined in orthogonal comparisons, the direction for each component was revealed.

Utilizing the split-plot ANOVA design, the main effect (couple) was factored out since it was not perceived as being as important to the analysis as the interaction effects . . . More accurate comparisons could then be made between interactions which were perceived to be more important in explaining the contribution made to the variance. Since individuals were tested at Phase 1 and Phase 2, the split-plot design allowed couples to serve as their own control.
CHAPTER V

VALUE THEORY OF MATE SELECTION

I. Introduction

The foregoing chapter presented a series of hypotheses related to the identification, congruence and/or divergence, of engaged couples' value systems as well as the mutual accuracy of value perception for male and female.

The author of this thesis believes that the value theory of mate selection is most predictive of marital adjustment. Robert Coombs (1966) proposed that one of the reasons for the high association between homogamy and continuance of a relationship is the fact that value consensus produces a high degree of satisfaction. He believes that mates tend to be chosen on the basis of similarity-of-values, "for therein lies the emotional security" (p. 51). Socio-demographic dimensions insure to some extent similarity in background experiences, while the sharing of values tends to bring persons together both spatially and psychologically.

Values are emotive, meaningful, and directive for the individual who holds them. They are more than merely an overt statement of commitment--they relate strongly to a person's mode of conduct, to his
goals and aspirations—indeed to his whole style of life; therefore, they become important criteria for an evaluation of mate selection.

More important than value consensus, however, may be accurate perception of the other's value system. If the person views another as the other views himself, he will be better able to predict how the other will act and react. Couples often fall in love and are married without having a very accurate picture of their mate's value system. (Accuracy of perception was discussed in the previous chapter.)

It appears that in order to validly test the homogamy or heterogamy theory of mate selection, the researcher must look at both homogamy of socio-demographic variables as well as perceived homogamy/heterogamy as a process of mate selection.

Included in the present chapter is a discussion of value congruity and marital adjustment, homogamy and heterogamy theories of mate selection, review of related literature, methodology related to the analysis, presentation and testing of hypotheses, and conceptual and methodological implications.

II. Theoretical Setting

The expressed purpose of "assortative mating" studies is to determine who marries whom. There are two major theories in this area, either of which may incorporate the value theory of mate selection. The first theory is homogamy, which postulates that likes attract and marry likes; the second is heterogamy, which postulates that opposites attract and marry each other. Assortative mating theories have been concerned with
such variables as intelligence, religion, education, social class, ethnic origin, residential propinquity, race, as well as psychological and social characteristics.

One of the big weaknesses of the assortative mating theory is that a majority of the research projects have dealt with attitudinal structure after marriage rather than before. Attributes that may be altered by the adjustive interaction of the couple cannot be measured and then generalizations made to the situation before marriage. The "definition of the situation" as well as the actual attitudes change as situations and intensity of interaction varies.

Congruity of Values: General Theory

Within the past few years, several studies have been concerned with the relationship between actual or perceived similarity and dissimilarity among persons and the extent to which friendships and permanent dyadic relationships develop. From evidence in the literature, it seems reasonable to assume that the extent to which another person is thought to agree with one's judgment or values is related to the extent to which he is accepted by one. Persons do perceive those whom they like best as being more similar to themselves than those whom they like least.

Smith (1957, p. 225) concludes that "differences in ratings of the acceptability of individuals is a consequence of the rater's perception of differences in the degree to which these individuals share his values." It appears that the desire for similarity is so strong that a "liked person" who is quite dissimilar to self may be attributed attitudes which he may not possess.
Heider (1944, 1958) is most clearly the person identified with the theory of attraction between persons. In his theory, it is B's similarity to A which underlies A's attraction to him and further, if another individual's behavior is perceived as congruent with a person's values, the individual will tend to like the other person. Heider (1944, 1958) suggests that it is indeed satisfying to find support for one's own views. Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) disclose that those who have similar values will find interaction rewarding and therefore will continue to seek further contact.

Zimmerman (1960), in evaluating successful American families concludes that . . . "It is now clearly proved that when men and women marry assortatively (with similar backgrounds and values), they are most successful in family life" (p. 11).

Value Consensus and Mate Selection

There can be little doubt that persons tend to marry other persons of similar age, residence, race, religion, socio-economic status, and education. However, similarity in personality characteristics is a question which is less settled. Considerable evidence has been presented by psychologists and sociologists in favor of homogamy not only in structural characteristics, but also in attitudes, values, interests, temperament, neurotic tendencies, and a number of other characteristics.

According to Eckland (1968) class endogamy may be explained by: (1) similar values, which reflect within-class cultural similarity; (2) residential segregation along class lines (in the present work this is
noted in the discussion of propinquity); (3) the close relation between class and ethnicity-race; (4) family pressure to marry one's own kind; (5) educational differences which produce occupational strata. He summarizes the rates of homogamy (which he extracts from numerous studies) as follows: "Most studies in the United States report a high rate, over 99 percent, for racial endogamy, an overall rate perhaps as high as 90 percent for religious homogamy, and moderately high rates, 50 percent to 80 percent, for class homogamy" (p. 79).

Newcomb's theory of interpersonal attraction places in focus the emphasis of homogamy of certain aspects of one's personality: "Insofar as communication results in the perception of increased similarity of attitudes toward important and relevant objects, it will also be followed by an increase in positive attraction" (Newcomb, 1956, p. 579).

**Homogamy versus Heterogamy in Mate Selection**

One of the most significant findings of research on mate selection is that of homogamy, or the tendency to choose a marital partner with characteristics similar to oneself; while a very strong competing theory is that of complementary needs or heterogamy.

Essentially the "homogamy" approach to mate selection seeks to establish the patterns and explorations of mate choice in the realm of social facts, whereas the "complementary need" approach explores the individual personality for the factors which motivate the particular individual to choose a particular mate. Kernodle (1959) states that Burgess and Locke, as early as 1945, reported that approximately 100
studies had been made and "... in every case, with the exception of a few early inquiries using questionable methods, they found every difference over change expectation ... in the direction of 'like marrying like'" (p. 422).

Burgess and Locke (1953) suggest five factors which determine who marries whom: (1) propinquity; (2) conception of the ideal mate; (3) parental image; (4) homogamy; (5) personality needs. All of these may be referred to as cultural factors. Thus the phenomena of mate selection is viewed as a process of social interaction. Many studies also suggest that a couple's chances for a successful relationship are increased if their value orientation is similar. Similarity in such characteristics as race, area of residence, socio-economic level, education, and religious affiliation has frequently been noted. However, a different kind of homogamy is expressed by personal value consensus than by similarity in social characteristics.

The value or homogamy theory (Coombs, 1961) of mate selection suggests that individuals choose mates who have similar value systems to their own since this similarity supports one's own value system, as well as offers emotional satisfaction. Coombs (1961) writes that:

Because of this emotional aspect it seems reasonable to expect that persons will seek their informal social relations with those who uncritically accept their basic values, and thus, provide emotional security. Such compatible companions are most likely to be those who 'feel' the same way about 'important' things, i.e., those who possess similar values (p. 51).

The thesis is that value consensus fosters mutually rewarding interaction which leads to interpersonal attraction. It seems reasonable to assume that the sharing of similar values, in effect, is a validation
of one's self which promotes emotional satisfaction and enhances commu-
nication. To be sure, there are incentives for selecting dissimilar
partners, but for most persons these are outweighed by the disadvantages.

The propinquity theory complements the homogamy theory. Coombs
(1961) points out that:

One of the cardinal principles of sociology is that people tend
to become similar in values, norms, and other cultural aspects
to those with whom they interact. Segregation brings the
opposite effect, namely diversity. This understanding led
Bogardus to state: 'spatial relationships help to determine a
person's attitudes, values, and status. Sparseness permits the
growth of independent attitudes . . . .' Thus we see that although
space does play a part in mate selection, it is significant mostly
in terms of the underlying factor of human values (p. 52).

Those individuals living in close spatial proximity will be likely to
find that they are very similar in "social distance." If "social
distance" is great, Williams (1970) suggests that there will be a value
conflict. Coombs (1961), in a discussion of social distance and mate
selection, proposes that "social distance may be explained as a result
of divergent values and will probably be the means of eliminating many
potential mates from consideration" (p. 52).

Researchers such as Luckey (1960) and Laing, Phillipson and Lee
(1966) suggest that both congruity of values and accurate perception
are conducive to marital happiness.

In relation to mate selection theories, Udry (1963) recognizes
that:

The most widely accepted hypothesis at present is Winch's synthe-
sis of similarity and complementarity as a basis for mate
selection: persons select as mates those who are similar to them-
selves in social background characteristics, but whose personality
structures are complementary to their own (p. 281).
Robert Winch (1952) based his theory of "complementary needs" upon the hypothesis that maximum gratification occurs when the specific need-patterns of the couple are complementary rather than similar. He does not assume that all aspects of the complementary needs register at the conscious level, and it may be that this lack of conscious difference enhances the relationship. While the complementary need theory may contradict the widely held assumption of psychological homogamy, Winch admits that homogamy prevails in relation to social background factors, which serves only as a filtering process to limit the "field of eligibles."

Two of Winch's basic assumptions are called into question by Udry (1963). First, the assumption that the postulated patterns are reciprocally gratifying, with no empirical basis for the postulation. Second, it is assumed that measured traits are the basis for interaction and selection. "Yet social interaction theory is predicted on the assumption that we react to others on the basis of our perceptions of them. The literature on interpersonal perception makes it abundantly clear that interpersonal perception often involves seeing what is not there" (Udry, 1963, p. 282).

It seemed obvious to Udry (1963) that complementary selection theory should tie into a theory of perception, since obviously selection can only be based on the perceptions of the selectors.

Kerckhoff and Bean (1967, p. 185), in looking at "Role-Related Factors in Person Perception Among Engaged Couples," conclude that an instrumental-expressive differentiation of conjugal roles leads to an expectation of some dissensus in the "normal" pattern in married or
engaged couples, suggesting that this disparity is presumably approved by the role incumbents. "Both the power dimension and the instrumental-expressive differentiation are culturally defined factors which seem to influence the pattern of person perception within the premarital dyad" (p. 186).

Lott and Lott (1965) point out that compatibility requires similarity in certain characteristics and complementarity in others. "In other words, compatibility seems not to be an exclusive function of one variable or the other but a complex function of both" (p. 275).

... findings ... indicate that either similarity or complementarity between persons may function to increase their attraction to one another, depending upon the nature of the characteristic (value or personality trait) and upon a number of other as yet unspecified conditions (Ibid., p. 274).

Kephart (1972) declares that "whether similarity of value is in fact central to the mate selection process ... and, if so, precisely which classes of values are involved ... will have to be determined by continued research" (p. 320).

**Merger of Homogamy and Heterogamy**

Kerckhoff and Bean (1967) record some pertinent statements in relation to the controversy over homogamy versus heterogamy in mate selection:

the controversy is usually couched in terms which make it a conflict between those emphasizing social structural factors (race, religion, economic position) and those emphasizing personal factors (need patterns). Very little work on mate selection has considered the contribution made by cultural definitions of the conjugal relationship to the choice process or to marital satisfaction although some of the discussions of both structural and personality dimensions have implied cultural definitions (p. 186).
III. Review of Related Literature

Value Orientation and Family Research

There is a paucity of adequate theory and research on value orientation as it relates to mate selection and marriage adjustment. Schooley (1936), through use of Allport's *Study of Values*, concluded that: (1) husbands and wives tend to be homogeneous in their value orientation; (2) husbands and wives tend to grow more alike as they grow older together; (3) husbands and wives are able to judge whether or not they are similar or opposite in their value orientation. Schellenberg (1960), using the same scale as Schooley, in a study on "homogamy in Personal Values and the Field of Eligibles," concluded that there was no doubt as to the general finding of homogamy. Both also revealed that the married couples, in their sample, had slightly higher value convergence than their pre-married couples.

Keeley (1955), in a study of 237 married couples, summarized his findings:

Other things being equal, the degree of convergence will be highest in cases where the interaction is of a cooperative, shared sort; where the marriage is longest; where the more basic values are involved; where the values are mutually functional to the behavior of both husband and wife; where the couple has similar socio-economic backgrounds; where the role-taking ability of the couple is high; where the social distance between husband and wife is low; and where the marriage is the most successful (p. 345).

Kelly (1955) presented evidence which demonstrated that homogamy rather than complementarity existed with respect to personality characteristics.
Snyder (1964) conducted a study testing the assortative mating theory. Results from a study of 20 couples revealed rather weak support for the attitudinal similarity theory. Fifty-five percent of the couples indicated attitude similarity in fourteen areas of behavior, while 45 percent indicated dissimilarity. There was a 54, 51, and 40 percent similarity between self and peers, family and community, respectively. She concluded that: attraction might be the basis for increased perception of values or even an actual increase in consensus; or consensus might precede or produce attraction.

Warren (1966) utilized census data to test what he called the "conscious homogamy" theory. He presented a pattern of ratios which revealed that the pattern of ratios supported the conclusion that assortative mating, by educational level of spouses, was much more pronounced than by "socio-economic origin status."

Bowerman and Day (1956), in a study of college students who were regularly dating or engaged, reported that the findings of their study did not support either the theory of complementary needs or homogamy. They found only nineteen of 225 correlations significant at the .05 level and of these, one out of five were in the direction hypothesized by complementariness. (Perhaps, their findings suggest that the theoretical assumptions of the complementary need theory have a rather weak empirical base.)

Huntington (1958) reported finding a pattern of complementary differences in a sample of married couples, while Kerckhoff and Davis (1962) found a pattern of complementary differences in a sample of engaged couples.
As plausible, even compelling, as the theory of complementary need appears, very few researchers have found support for the theory. Among those which have tested the theory, yet failed to find support for it, are: Bowerman and Day, 1956; Schellenberg and Bee, 1960; Kernodle, 1959; Udry, 1963; Day, 1961; and Murstein, 1961.

Fensterheim and Tresselt (1953) concluded from their research that "the closer the value system projected into the stimuli (pictures) resembled the value system of a subject, the greater was the liking" (p. 97).

Kerckhoff and Davis (1962, p. 301) declared that incongruity of social characteristics act as a limiting factor early in the mate selection process, while couples may not be aware of value incongruity until later in the selection process. They concluded, from their research, that need complementarity operates as a selection factor in the final stages of the dating relationship, only after value comparisons have eliminated those whose values are extremely divergent.

A comparison of the correlations of the Schooley, Kelly, and Carroll studies (See Table III) indicates a trend in recent years toward greater value congruity.

**Congruity of Values and Perception in Marriage**

In a study by Norcutt and Silva (1951), husband and wives predicted each other's self-ratings; analysis of the data revealed that accuracy of predictions exceeded chance, and that successes were greater on those items in which husband and wife were most similar in their self-ratings.
The following research by Udry (1961) will be reported much more in detail than most of the articles, since its conceptual framework, as well as some of its reported methodology, is closely related to the present study.

Udry, et al. (1961), utilizing AVL's Study of Values, empirically tested, with thirty-four couples who had been married from 1-10 years, the following propositions: (1) The longer a pair has been married, the more the members will agree with one another. (2) The more frequent the interaction, the greater the agreement. (3) The longer a pair has been married, the more frequent the interaction, the more the understanding. (4) The more democratic the relationship, the greater the agreement. (5) The greater the agreement, the greater the understanding of the couple for one another. (6) The more democratic the relationship, the greater the understanding for one another. (7) The accuracy of perception of mates improves with time. (8) Perceived agreement declines over time in marriage.

Each couple completed the questionnaire for himself (self-perception) and for the way they thought their spouse would answer (other-perception). They then were asked to compare their answers. The questions on which they disagreed were discussed, and the couple reached a mutual response to those questions.

Scores were recorded as: agreement . . . the summed differences between male and female; understanding . . . (labeled as "misunderstanding score") obtained by summing the differences between the predicted score
and the actual score on each value for each spouse; \textit{perceived agreement} 
\ldots \textit{(labeled as "perceived disagreement score")} computed for each spouse by summing the differences between a person's own score and the score he predicted for his mate on each value; \textit{democracy score} \ldots \textit{computed for each value on the joint effort of the couples' discussion of the response}; a \textit{"raw influence score"} was recorded (equal influence produced a ratio of 1.0).

Results yielded data far from the researcher's expectations. In brief, not one of the nine hypothesized relationships was confirmed.

All correlations were below .15 \ldots \textit{those couples with the greatest "togetherness" did not agree more closely than did those with the least "togetherness," and, further, the degree of agreement was no greater in those married a long time. Furthermore, no relationship was found between "frequency of interaction" and understanding or between length of marriage and "understanding." Those with least "togetherness" could predict the responses of their spouses as well as those who spent the most time together, and those married the shortest time could predict the responses of their spouses as well as those who had been married for years (p. 389).}

The influence ratio was in no way related to the length of time married, frequency of interaction, agreement or understanding. Neither did Udry, \textit{et al}, find support for the proposition that interactors can best predict the responses of those who are most like themselves. The correlation between agreement and understanding was .03. The following table summarizes their findings (see Table XXVI).

The authors later hypothesized that married couples would have significantly more agreement than randomly paired cross-sex individuals; they found a significant and large difference.
TABLE XXVI
INFLUENCE OF INTERACTION BETWEEN COUPLES AND CONSENSUS

Coefficients of Correlation*
(N = 34)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement - Understanding</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Hours per week spent together</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Influence ratio</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Years married</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Perceived agreement</td>
<td>.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding - Hours per week spent together</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Influence ratio</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Years married</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Ratio - Hours per week spent together</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; - Years married</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years married - Perceived agreement</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age ratio - Influence ratio</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at .001 level; all others non-significant


The authors concluded that marriage partners select one another on the basis of the agreement they perceive. This hypothesis is supported only if it can be shown that there is substantial correlation between actual agreement and perceived agreement between partners. After all, if a couple cannot perceive their agreement, they have no basis for selecting one another. The correlation between actual and perceived agreement was .65, which in fact does lend strong support for the "selection hypothesis."
IV. Applicable Methodology

The questions posed in this section were: which is stronger, for those who have similar characteristics and values to be drawn together or for those with dissimilar characteristics to attract each other? The question to be answered was: which tendency is greater? A vast majority of the research that has been attempted on this score has been undertaken with married couples. The main fallacy of this approach lies in the fact that one cannot determine whether value consensus was antecedent to marriage or whether it was developed after marriage. The "balance theory" suggests that where there is great disparity between individuals (especially those who are in love), these individuals may attempt to bring their own attitude more in line with each other, consequently producing quasi-congruity, or if the bonds become weakened the relationship may end.

Likert-type logic was applied to the data of this study in determining the cutoff points for the upper and lower 25 percent of those couples with the greatest disparity and those with greatest similarity. An equal score on each of the six values represents complete consensus.* For those analyses in which absolute difference scores were utilized, it was assumed that there was little difference between underestimation and overestimation.

*The range for the average difference score was from a high similarity of 14 and a high disparity of 94. The average summated score ranged from a mean of 36.50 to 43.86 out of a total of 240. The absolute difference score for each couple was the average difference over all six values for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study.
Difference scores were utilized for the analysis instead of correlations. The group means are quite different from the individual means; therefore, correlations would not accurately indicate the relationship since the absolute difference scores would be lost in the correctional analysis. Standard deviations may reveal more when looking at a global index than the actual acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis. The variance within as well as the variance between may reveal more than the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis.

Ego's self score was subtracted from his perception of alter, and this value was then subtracted from the actual disparity score. This produced a score which represented the accuracy of ego's perception of the couple's actual difference. By comparing those couples who actually have great or little disparity with how they perceive their engagee, one can determine if they perceive themselves as complementary or homogeneous to each other.

Deduced Hypothesis and Data Analysis

The hypothesis to be tested in this section evolved from the propositions stated and tested in Chapters III and IV. Since conceptualizations in earlier chapters have suggested homogamy in friendship formation, and the lack of accurate value perception, the final data analysis chapter will test the idea of homogamy vs. heterogamy in mate selection.

Since homogamy is discussed in the present chapter and analyses will be performed utilizing socio-demographic facts, a description of the respondents is presented in this section.
**Socio-Demographic Description of the Respondents**

A large majority of the respondents were between the ages of 20-23, and a decided majority were either college juniors or seniors, 26.3 percent and 42.7 percent, respectively. Racially, only one couple was black while all others were white. Two males and one female were non-United States citizens.

Approximately 40 percent of both males and females were Catholic; 31 percent Protestant; 3 percent Jewish; and 9 percent other religious faiths. Twelve percent of the males and 5 percent of the females claimed no religious preference. Sixty-eight percent of the males and 79 percent of the females were regular participants in religious activities.

Slightly over 80 percent of both males and females lived with both natural parents, while approximately 55 percent were not employed during the school year. An overwhelming majority of the subjects' fathers were self-employed, salaried, managers, salesmen, or proprietors, while a decided majority of the employed mothers were in the same occupational categories, with the addition of clerical. Over 50 percent of the mothers were homemakers. The modal distribution of father's education was at the eighth grade level with four years of college being the next most frequent achievement level for parents of both male and female, 27.6 percent and 25.0 percent, respectively. It may be noted that 11.8 percent of the males' mothers had completed four years of college, while 21.0 percent of the females' mothers had achieved this educational level... Totally, 37.4 percent of the males' mothers had 1-7 years college, while 56.5 percent of the females' mothers had 1-7 years college.
The stated hypotheses of the present chapter were tested with couples before they were married; this analysis differs in a significant manner from that of Udry (1961), since perceptual congruity on important variables were tested before marriage.

Hypothesis XII: Accuracy of perception will be no better for those couples with a small disparity score than for those who reveal the largest disparity scores (see Tables XXVII and XXVIII).

Table XXVII represents the congruity scores for the upper and lower 25 percent of the males and the female's perception of the male. An analysis of the difference of means \( t \) test was run on the data.

Table XXVIII represents the congruity scores for the upper and lower 25 percent of the females and the male's perception of the female.

Analysis of the data supports hypothesis XII. The difference of means test (for the males) revealed a \( t \) of .56. The perceptual means of those couples with the highest disparity scores (upper 25 percent) and those with the lowest 25 percent disparity scores were compared. Those with less disparity perceived with slightly less accuracy. (Males' self was correlated with female's perception of male.) There was only a standard deviation difference of +.573 between upper and lower disparity couples. The within standard deviation was extremely high compared to the between.

When data of the female were analyzed, Hypothesis XII was again supported. A difference of means test of the actual and perceived congruity of the upper and the lower 25 percent was -.30, which is not significant at the .05 level. (Female self was correlated with male's perception of her.) The between standard deviation difference of -1.55 was larger
TABLE XXVII
CONGRUITY AND PERCEIVED CONGRUITY SCORES OF THE MALE
FOR THE UPPER AND LOWER 25 PERCENT OF THE DISTRIBUTION ON AVL'S SIX VALUES
(Average Scores for Time 1 and Time 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple #</th>
<th>Consensus Score $M_s-F_s$</th>
<th>Perceptual Disparity Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper 25% $M_s-F_{pm}$ (N = 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$M_s-F_s$ = Difference between male and female
$M_s-F_{pm}$ = Difference between male's self and the female's perception of him

$D_1 = 33.93$  \hspace{1cm}  $D_2 = 29.11$

$s_{d1} = 8.600$  \hspace{1cm}  $s_{d2} = 8.027$

$t = .56$  \hspace{1cm}  $df = 26$
### TABLE XXVIII

**CONGRUITY AND PERCEIVED CONGRUITY SCORES OF THE FEMALES**  
**FOR THE UPPER AND LOWER 25 PERCENT OF THE DISTRIBUTION ON AVL'S SIX VALUES**  
(Averages of Time 1 and Time 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple #</th>
<th>Actual Congruity $M_s - F_b$*</th>
<th>Perceived Congruity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper 25% $F_s - M_{pf}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6        | 34.0                          |                     | 18.0  
| 7        | 76.0                          | 47.0                | 32.0  
| 9        | 74.0                          |                     | 32.0  
| 11       | 17.0                          |                     | 32.0  
| 15       | 66.5                          | 27.0                | 22.0  
| 17       | 39.0                          |                     | 27.0  
| 21       | 35.5                          | 28.0                | 28.5  
| 33       | 26.0                          |                     | 35.0  
| 34       | 34.0                          |                     | 45.0  
| 35       | 35.0                          |                     | 31.0  
| 36       | 73.0                          | 30.0                | 37.0  
| 37       | 33.0                          |                     | 41.5  
| 39       | 65.0                          | 32.5                | 42.5  
| 42       | 64.0                          | 29.0                |  
| 44       | 83.5                          | 23.5                |  
| 45       | 27.5                          |                     |  
| 48       | 26.0                          |                     |  
| 49       | 22.0                          |                     |  
| 53       | 94.0                          | 28.0                |  
| 60       | 26.0                          |                     |  
| 64       | 75.0                          | 28.0                |  
| 65       | 69.0                          | 40.0                |  
| 66       | 72.0                          | 31.0                |  
| 70       | 17.0                          |                     |  
| 75       | 26.5                          |                     |  

$M_s - F_b$ = Difference between female and male  
$F_s - M_{pf}$ = Difference between female's self and the male's perception of her  

$d_3 = 31.04$  
$s_d_3 = 6.67$  
$t = -0.30$  
$df = 26$
than for the male but is still small compared to the within standard deviation. The males, within the couples with the greatest disparity, were more accurate perceivers of the female than the male within the couples with the greatest consensus.

The theory of homogamy vs. heterogamy in mate selection was tested by determining if the couples were aware of value disparity or value consensus among themselves.

Hypothesis XIII: The theory of homogamy as well as that of complementarity will be supported by the data.

Perception scores for those couples with the greatest real disparity appear in Table XXIX, while those couples with the smallest disparity scores (17-40) appear in Table XXX.

The absolute difference scores of those couples with the greatest disparity between self (males) and his perception of his fiancée, and those couples with the smallest disparity scores, revealed a $t$ of -.23, and for the same relationship of the females a $t$ of -.10. Neither of these values begin to approach significance; therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was supported. Both the homogamy and heterogamy theory of mate selection was supported. As one looks at the standard deviations of columns 3 and 5 (those couples revealing the greatest disparity, Table XXIX) and columns 3 and 5 (those couples revealing the greatest consensus, Table XXX), the standard deviation does not support the idea that accuracy of perception is more consistent within the high consensus couples than within the high disparity couples. There was less variation within the female sample with the higher consensus scores.

In order to further test the theory of homogamy in mate selection, the socio-demographic variables from the personal data sheets of male
# TABLE XXIX

**AVERAGE DIFFERENCE SCORES OF THE UPPER 25% of the couples . . . those with the LARGEST DISPARITY SCORES (64-94):**

**TIME 1 AND TIME 2**

**(ASSUMED CONSENSUS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple Number</th>
<th>Actual Disparity</th>
<th>Perceived Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms-Fs</td>
<td>Ms-Mpf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Difference</td>
<td>Actual Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ms-Fs = Difference between male and female  
Ms-Mpf = Difference between male's self and his perception of the female  

\[
\bar{D}_1 = 10.50 \quad \bar{D}_2 = 11.64 \\
\sigma_d_1 = 9.87 \quad \sigma_d_2 = 11.67
\]
### TABLE XXX

AVERAGE DIFFERENCE SCORES OF THE LOWER 25% OF THE COUPLES... THOSE WITH SMALLEST DISPARITY SCORES (17-40): TIME 1 AND TIME 2 (ASSUMED CONSENSUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple Number</th>
<th>Actual Disparity</th>
<th>Perceived Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M_g-M_pf$</td>
<td>$F_g-F_{pm}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\bar{D}_3 = 12.71$  $\bar{D}_4 = 12.57$

$\bar{u}_3 = 8.93$  $s_{d4} = 6.07$

$t = \bar{D}_1 - \bar{D}_3 = -.23 \pm 26$ df

$t = \bar{D}_2 - \bar{D}_4 = -.10 \pm 26$ df
and female were subjected to either Pearson correlations or chi square tests (See Table XXXI). The researcher would like to stress the fact that this analysis was done on the structural aspect of mate selection rather than the socio-psychological, or personality, aspect.

**TABLE XXXI**

**PEARSON r AND X² OF MALE AND FEMALES ON SES VARIABLES:**

FATHER'S OCCUPATION, FATHER'S EDUCATION, MOTHER'S OCCUPATION, MOTHER'S EDUCATION, FAMILY INCOME, RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE, RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT, AND PLACE OF STUDENT'S RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occupation</td>
<td>-.0817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td>.1535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Occupation</td>
<td>-.0916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education</td>
<td>-.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.2719*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (with parents, relative, or alone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.60*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significance p < .05

Among the structural independent variables tested, only income and residence contributed significantly to an explanation of the variation. The positive correlation of income, even though significant p < .05, explains only seven percent of the variance. Males not living on campus tended to live at a residence other than their parents' home, while females lived at home. The analysis yielded a negative correlation between father's and mother's occupation and between mother's occupation and
mate choice. The couples were quite similar in their religious preference and religious involvement.

V. Conclusions

There appeared to be a great deal of homogamy between male and female on the socio-demographic variable such as age, religious involvement, parental income, etc. The data presented in this chapter revealed a difference between the male and female and the highest educational attainment of their mothers. Findings from this research may be interpreted as supporting the findings of Kandel and Lesser (1969). In the present sample, 11.8 percent of the males' mothers had completed four years of college, whereas 21 percent of the females' mothers had achieved this level of education. Kandel and Lesser (1969) reported that they, as well as Furstenberg (1967, in Kandel), had found a higher level of agreement between mother-daughter on educational plans ($r = .532$) than mother-son on educational plans ($r = .427$). The correlation between mothers' education and adolescents' educational aspiration was .199, while the correlation between fathers' education and adolescents' aspiration was .177.

Hypothesis XII stated that those couples with small value disparity scores would be no better at mutual perception than those with greatest disparity. The difference of means test revealed that those couples with low disparity scores (those with high value consensus) were not more accurate in their perception than those couples with the greatest disparity.*

*Since the sample size was rather small ($N = 14$), further work is needed before conclusive statements can be made concerning the ability of "dissimilars" to accurately perceive each other.
The obtained $r$ of .56 was not significant; therefore, both the homogamy and the heterogamy theory of mate selection was supported by the data. Those couples with the greatest disparity (the upper 25 percent of the distribution) were almost as accurate in the perception of their engagee as those couples with the smallest disparity. Those couples whose value orientations were most incongruent apparently were aware that their mate choice was exogamous; conversely, those whose value orientations were congruent were aware that their mate choice was endogamous.

Of the eight socio-demographic variables tested, only three--family income, religious preference, and religious involvement--revealed significant homogamy among the couples.

**Theoretical Implications**

Numerous research findings have suggested that those persons with the greatest similarity in personality attributes will be more accurate perceivers of each other. Some have suggested that projection, alone, when one is perceiving another from a homogeneous background, could very well account for greater accuracy of perception.

Data from the present study support a theory that those who are dissimilar in value orientation are as accurate in mutual perception as those who are similar. Those who are very similar in their orientation appear to have a tendency to overestimate, in a global perspective, while those who are disparate may be more alert to the interpersonal differences.

Results from the present data support both the theory of homogamy and that of heterogamy in mate selection. Individuals probably choose
their mates as they do because of several influences such as similarity, a desire for complementarity, accessibility, parent and peer pressure, situational factors, etc.

In order to adequately test the theory of homogamy, or heterogamy, in mate selection, the researcher should be cognizant of the fact that "circumstantial" or "happenstance" similarity is not synonymous with conscious mate selection. Results from the present analysis suggest that those individuals who are divergent in their value orientation are aware of their divergence, while those who are very congruent are aware of their congruity.

Methodological Implication

By comparing the difference scores (on specific attitudes) of ego's self and alter's perception of him for those couples with the highest disparity and those with the lowest disparity score, one can empirically test the theory that those who are very similar are better perceivers than those persons who are very dissimilar. Numerous personality characteristics, as well as socio-demographic attributes, can be correlated with accuracy of perception.

The methodology utilized in this thesis for empirically testing the homogamy or heterogamy theory of mate selection appears to offer a method which is superior over other methods which are frequently utilized, such as the correlation of socio-demographic variables, and upon reviewing the correlations conclude that the couples choose each other homogamously or heterogamously.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Introduction

It is the expectation that the theory presented in this work is more than mere speculation. Hopefully, it has integrated isolated bodies of data from more than one discipline or subdiscipline into a coherent and consistent framework which will lend itself to ordering of facts in a meaningful way. Lachman (1956) writes that it is "... that which integrates isolated bodies of data into a coherent and consistent framework, which permits the specification of relationships between islands of empirical data . . ." (p. 50).

Within the framework of the propositions developed herein, i.e. that two people who agree on attitudes, values, roles, etc., will tend to both like each other and quite accurately perceive each other, the researcher sought evidence among engaged university students to support the theoretical assumption. Consensus and interpersonal perceptions are difficult phenomena to measure. In the present study little emphasis was placed on actual consensus; while more emphasis was placed upon the relative importance to an individual of AVL's six values. Self-perceived identification with the individual's "significant other," with major emphasis on one's engagee, was explored. Actual and assumed congruity of value orientation was analyzed.
Family sociologists suggest that value homogamy and accuracy of value perception are predictive of marital success. The present study evaluated ego's ability to accurately perceive alter and then utilized ego's awareness or lack of awareness of similarity and/or disparity to determine if the majority of those who were choosing exogamously were doing so with an awareness of their differences.

This chapter contains: (1) A summary of the findings as they relate to the stated objectives of the study; (2) a discussion of the implications of these findings for the major theoretical framework as presented in Chapters III, IV, and V; (3) limitations of the study; and (4) recommendations for further research in the area of "interpersonal perception" and mate selection.

II. Summary

Findings

The research reported in this thesis tested, in a field situation, a technique for the measurement of values and empathetic sensitivity. This chapter summarizes, briefly, both the manner in which the investigator accomplished the stated objectives and the major conclusions evolving from the research.

Objective (1): to identify and compare the value foci of a selected sample of engaged couples.

Chapter III outlined a Gestalt of values derived from Spranger's typology. A hierarchical arrangement of the six values--theoretical,
economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious—was obtained for each subject. The means from the present sample were compared with the means of the AVL sample. The correlations revealed no unexpected relationships; therefore, only cursory comments of the findings are presented. Males in the present sample ranked political orientation first, just as the national sample did, while the theoretical and economic value ranks changed positions from second and third in the AVL sample to third and second, respectively, in the present sample. Religion appeared to be slightly more important in the national sample than the social focus, while the reverse was true in the present sample.

Females in the national sample ranked the aesthetic orientation first, religious second, and social third, while the present sample ranked social in second position and religious in third position. Even though religion holds a rank position which differs for the male and the female, in both samples, both sexes placed religious orientation in a less important position and social orientation in a more important position than did the national sample. Since a large majority of the present sample were juniors or seniors, the results tend to support Feldman and Newcomb's (1969) findings that the upperclassman places less emphasis on the religious value than the freshmen. *

A comparison of data reported by Schooley (1936) and Kelly (1937) and data from the present study appears to suggest that males and females reveal a higher level of value consensus today than in the 1930's.

*The AVL means are not stratified on university class standing.
Random matching of the couples revealed that there probably were some propinquity factors which were influential in bringing couples together. "Natural Pairing" revealed a significant correlation p < .01. Random pairing produced correlations which were very weak . . . the strongest correlation was on the political variable with a probability of .09.

It was hypothesized that "assumed similarity" would produce stronger correlations than real similarity . . . the hypothesis was not supported statistically. The data revealed a tendency for both sexes to overestimate value similarity. The female revealed a slightly greater tendency to overestimate value consensus than the male. Real congruity did not indicate a significant change from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

Value orientations were perceived by the respondent to be more congruent with his peers than with his parents. Ego identified himself more clearly with his peers (who were defined as his closest friends) than with his engagee.

Objective (2): To determine the ability of an engaged person to accurately perceive the value system of his engagee.

In order to test the influence of five independent variables—(1) occupation of father; (2) prior engagement involvement; (3) length of acquaintance; (4) length of constant dating; and (5) length of engagement—on value perception, the data were analyzed by use of stepwise regression. Four of the independent variables contributed significantly to an explanation of the variance: prior involvement, length of acquaintance, length of constant dating, and length of engagement.
Ego was unable to perceive, with 100 percent accuracy, alter on any of the six values: (1) theoretical; (2) economic; (3) aesthetic; (4) social; (5) political; and (6) religious. Both sexes perceived the other quite accurately on the theoretical variable. The male perceived the female's emphasis on the religious and theoretical variables with highly significant accuracy. The male was most inaccurate in his belief that the female ranks the social value higher than she does. The female was most inaccurate in overestimating the male's emphasis on the political variables (p < .05) and underestimating the importance to the male of the religious variable. The female perceived the male quite accurately on the economic and theoretical variables.

The male was only slightly more accurate in his estimation of how the female would perceive him than the female was of her perception of how the male would perceive her. Not any of the differences between alter's perception of ego and ego's perception of that perception approached significance.

Objective (3): To determine at Phase 1 (before marriage) and Phase 2 (7-9 months later) the degree of congruency on the value orientations of engaged and/or married couples.

Data from the present study revealed a tendency toward more value consensus than do those studies reported in the 1930's. Emphasis which male and female placed on Spranger's six values was highly correlated (p < .01). Data of the present study did not reveal a significant trend toward "balance" between Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study. There was a
tendency toward greater congruity at time 2, but the increase is too small to attempt to explain statistically.

Objective (4): To determine whether 4-9 months of marriage significantly improves an individual's ability to accurately perceive his spouse's value orientation.

Value perception revealed a slight, but not significantly, increase from time 1 to time 2. Those couples who had married between time 1 and time 2 had only very slightly more accurate perception than those couples who were still engaged at phase 2 of the testing.

Those couples who revealed the greatest value disparity were as accurate in perceiving their engagee as those couples who revealed the greatest congruity.

Data from the present study, even though suggestive, failed to offer significant support for either the homogamy or heterogamy theory of mate selection (further research is needed in this area).

Objective (5): To develop a methodology for eliciting and analyzing idio-graphic as well as perceptive responses for: (a) ego (self-identification . . . 1st level), (b) alter (perception . . . 2nd level), and (c) ego's perception of how alter would respond for him (meta-perception . . . 3rd level).

The Study of Values instruments proved to be effective in identifying one's value system, providing a basis for comparing ego's value orientation with alter, determining accuracy of reciprocal interpersonal perception, and also for comparing how ego feels that alter sees him
(empathetic ability). The author of the present work feels that the instrument can be administered several times, in a longitudinal study, with a time interval of several months and that there will be very little recall between administrations of the test on how one answered in the three levels.

Separate and global ANOVA tests for the six values—theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious—revealed that different conclusions might be drawn depending upon whether the researcher is interested in global value perception or perceptual ability on specific values. The global analysis (see Table XIV) revealed a non-significant interaction between sex and level of perception, but when separate ANOVA tests were made, the results indicated a significant difference between male and female on either their perceptual ability or value disparity on specific values.

It appears from the conclusions of the present study that the summated scores, obtained from several questions related to each value, are more accurate in determining one's value emphasis than a rank ordering of definitional statements of the value types. Questions which utilize the forced choice distribution of numerical values (such as 1-4) tend to eliminate some of the tendency toward "response set" and "halo effect."

Correlation coefficients were not the most appropriate statistical tools for analyzing either value consensus or interpersonal perception. ANOVA in interpersonal perception research gives considerable more information than the conventional series of profile correlations of difference measures. The difference score or correlation is useful as an index of
similarity for a single pair, but neither appears to be as powerful a
technique as the ANOVA for studying a series of pairs or for comparing
one such series of pairs with another with respect to value consensus.
By using the split-pot randomized block design, randomized blocks con­trolled the couple source of variation, while the split-plot improved
the interaction evaluations.

Results from the global analysis of variance support Cronbach's
suggestion that interpersonal consensus and congruity should be analyzed
on an individual component basis rather than holistically. High or
positive consensus or perception on one variable and low or negative
consensus or perception on another variable may cancel each other, thereby
producing results which are virtually impossible to accurately interpret.

It seems that a very lucid manner for summarizing findings of the
present study is to present them in a schematic form which resembles the
schema suggested by Asch (1952) in his discussion of interaction as a
transactional process. Asch saw acts of others, as they turn toward
each other, as interpenetrating and therefore regulating. Two or more
individuals, when in interaction, refer their actions to the other and
the others' actions to himself "indicating" to himself the expectation
of alter relative to specific situations.

Interpersonal perception in interaction situations almost invariably
involves some sharing of a mutual field. Much of this common "field
sharing" is a result of cultural influences which are enhanced by pro­
pinquity . . . indeed by a great deal of homogamy in one's social, edu­
cational, religious, occupational, etc., associates.
Figure 1 reveals the degree of consensus between male and female on the six values. The values which reveal the greatest congruity (in rank order) are social, religious, economic, political and theoretical. The couples are most disparate on the aesthetic variable.

Figure 2 reveals the self perception of the male and his perception of the female (assumed similarity). By comparing this figure with Figure 1, one can see that the male is aware of value divergence between himself and his fiancé. The female (Figure 3) is also aware of the variables on which she and her fiancé diverge but to a lesser extent than the male.

Means, as presented in Figures 4 and 5, reveal that the female's self and the male's perception of her (Figure 5) is more accurate than the female's perception of the male (Figure 4). The one variable which reveals noticeably inaccurate perception, on the part of the male, is social while the female is noticeably inaccurate in her perception of the male on the political, aesthetic, economic, and religious variables.

The third level of perception is summarized in Figures 6 and 7. The male is slightly more accurate than the female in this level of perception; however, both sexes appear to have very good insight into how alter perceives them.

III. Discussion and Conclusions

Data from the present study reveal that there is homogeneity of values among couples who are engaged to be married. The two strongest correlations between self and fiancée/fiancé were on the aesthetic and
FIGURE 1
ACTUAL CONGRUITY

MEAN SCORES ($M_s - F_s$)*

- Male's Self Perception
- Female's Self Perception
- Male Dominance on Value
- Female Dominance on Value

*Male's Self Perception plotted against Female's Self Perception
FIGURE 2
ASSUMED SIMILARITY

MEAN SCORES (Mₘ - Mₚf) *

- Male's Self Perception
- Male's Perception of Female
- Male Perceives Self to be Dominant on Value
- Male Perceives Female to be Dominant on Value

*Male's Self Perception Plotted Against Male's Perception of Female
FIGURE 3
ASSUMED SIMILARITY

MUTUALLY SHARED FIELD

MEAN SCORES \((F_s - F_{pm})^*\)

- Female Self
- Female Perception of Male
- Female Perceives Self to be Dominant on Value
- Female Perceives Male to be Dominant on Value

*Female's Self Perception Plotted Against Female's Perception of Male
FIGURE 4
ACCURACY OF PERCEPTION

MEAN SCORES ($M_s - F_{pm}$)*

- - - - Male's Self Perception
- - - - Female's Perception of Male
- - - - Overestimation by Female
- - - - Underestimation by Female

*Male's Self Perception Plotted Against Female's Perception of Male
FIGURE 5
ACCURACY OF PERCEPTION

MUTUALLY
SHARED
FIELD

MEAN SCORES ($F_s - M_{pf}$)

- Female's Self Perception
- Male's Perception of Female
- Overestimation by Male
- Underestimation by Male

*Female's Self Perception Plotted Against Male's Perception of Female
FIGURE 6
MALE'S ESTIMATION OF FEMALE'S PERCEPTION

MEAN SCORES \( (F_{pm} - M_{pfp}) \)

- - - - Male's Perception of Female's Perception of Him
- - - - Female's Perception of Male

[Diagram showing social, economic, aesthetic, religious, and political fields]

**Overestimation by Male of Female's Perception of Him**

**Underestimation by Male of Female's Perception of Him**

*Male's Estimation of Female's Perception of Him Plotted Against the Female's Perception of Male*
Figure 7
Female's Estimation of Male's Perception

Mean Scores ($M_{pf} - F_{pmp}$)*
- - Female's Estimation of Male's Perception of Her
     Male's Perception of Female

Overestimation by Female of Male's Perception of Her
Underestimation by Female of Male's Perception of Her

*Female's Estimation of Male's Perception of Her Plotted Against Male's Perception of Female
religious variables; it may be noted that the aesthetic variable holds
the strongest emphasis for the female and the weakest emphasis for the
male. This emphasis is probably a regional one, especially for the
religious variable. Strong tradition in the south perhaps gives both
male and female an appreciation for beauty and harmony, producing a
strong emphasis on the aesthetic variable. Since a majority of the
respondents for the present sample were upperclassmen, it was expected
(Feldman, et al., 1969) that the aesthetic value would hold fairly high
rank among both sexes.

An explanation for greater congruity in the present study than in
the Schooley and Kelly study may suggest that the female has become more
of an equal to the male on those values traditionally attributed to the
male in his "instrumental role," and conversely the male may have taken
on more of the "expressive role." Since the "women's lib" movement is
still in its infancy, the strongest impact of role reversal for the
female probably has not been witnessed.

The fact that both males and females see themselves closer in
value orientation to their friends than to their parents (or engagee)
indicates that the peer group has a very important socializing effect upon
the individual who must fit into a society which is witnessing rapid
change in societal norms and roles. The peer group may also be seen as
providing anticipatory socialization for marriage. Parents are seen as
not "valuing" the same experiences and attitudes to the same extent that
a youth's peer group values them. Since male and female do differ in the
emphasis which they place upon AVL's six values, it was not expected that they would identify more closely with their engagee than with their closest friends.*

Data of the present study suggest that the female who had at least one prior engagement revealed more value congruity with her engagee. Length of acquaintance did not improve either the male or the female's ability to perceive their fiancé, while it did appear to improve their value congruity. Length of constant dating and length of engagement explained a significant amount of the variance, especially at the perceptual level for both sexes. Length of engagement explained more of the variance than any other variable. The fact that not any of the independent variables which were tested improved either sex's ability to accurately perceive the other on the economic value suggests that this variable has very low visibility. The fact that length of constant dating and length of engagement significantly improved perception may indicate that this temporal variable improves insight into reality.

Males and females of the present study quite accurately perceived the value orientation of their engagee. Accuracy with which they perceived each other may be explained by the fact that youth today are sharing in a realistic manner their cognitive and affective attitudes and feelings. Perhaps they are interacting with more individuals in more

*The foregoing discussion assumes that both male and female identified the "majority of their best friends" as someone of the same sex.
diverse situations which as Newcomb (1965) suggests, in itself has a tendency to produce greater accuracy in interpersonal perception.

Explanation concerning accuracy of perception, especially the tendency for the male to more accurately perceive the female, may be purely speculation; however, by calling upon information from research in other disciplines, such as psychology, as well as utilizing that which is available in sociology, it appears that the male may not be so much the more accurate perceiver but that the female may be the better revealer.

It is possible that the male is more accurate in his perceptions than the female because he has been socialized differently. From his childhood he is socialized for an occupational role which requires that he compete with others, and in order for him to be competitive, he may consciously attempt to sharpen his perceptual ability.*

One cannot explain better perception on the part of either male or female by suggesting, for example, that the male perceives the female more accurately on those values stereotypical of the female, such as aesthetic, social, and religious. The male perceived the female more accurately on the economic and political variables, as well as the aesthetic and religious variables. Correspondingly, the female perceived the male more accurately, not on the stereotypical male values of theoretical, economic, and political, but on the theoretical and social

*This proposition could be tested by administering a test such as the one used in this research project to both males and females, asking them for reciprocal responses for two of their closest friends, one of the same sex and one of the opposite. The instrument would also be administered to ego, whereby accuracy of perception could be determined for both the same and opposite sexes.
variables. Neither can it be concluded that ego perceives alter more accurately on the variables which hold highest rank for him. The theoretical value orientation is ranked high by the male; therefore, according to some theorists (Udry, 1966, p. 236), he should be able to more accurately perceive the female on this variable. The female is low on this variable, yet she is a better perceiver on this variable than the male. The theory of more accurate perception of alter on the variables which ego himself ranks highest may have weak plausibility for the female, however, since she ranked social second to the apex of her value pyramid and perceived the male quite accurately on this variable. Mutual perception is considerably more accurate on the theoretical variable than on any other variable. This probably can be explained by the fact that emphasis on this variable has high visibility for "student" couples.

Newcomb (1965) suggested that women were more perceptive than men in making judgments of others. His explanation was that a woman's world is that of people and that her role in society dictates to her that she be highly sensitive to the wishes and expectations of others. Perhaps Reisman's (1950) "other-directed" value is a motive for both male and female. Beach (1961), in a free response approach to cognition, found that the female's descriptions of others yielded, totally, a greater amount of information than descriptions presented by the male. If the female describes others in more detail, it may be assumed that she reveals herself more in detail. The female is purported to be both more fluent and more expressive than the male; therefore, it may be postulated that she is a better revealer than the male.
The female, perhaps because of her tendency to overromanticize her affectional relationship, has a greater tendency than the male to overestimate the actual congruity between herself and her affianced.

The above conclusions, it must be emphasized, cannot be generalized to other attitudes and other populations. Perceptual ability may vary, depending upon: what attitude ego is perceiving; the situation under which perception occurs; and the object of his perception. More research is needed on interpersonal perception before adequate explanations can be offered on the variables that are related to accuracy of perception and especially perceptual differences between sexes.

Assumed similarity of value orientation revealed only slightly greater consensus than actual similarity. Results from the present study reveal that the female has a tendency to "assume" greater congruity than the male. Since it is an established fact that the female makes the major adjustments in the early months and years of marriage (Christensen, 1964, p. 680), perhaps it is because she has not been "realistic" in her judgment of her fiancé; consequently, she has to adjust her "idealism" so that it is more in line with "realism."

Researchers have pretty well established the fact that the female has a greater tendency toward personal disclosure than the male. Should the male be more willing to disclose his own cognitive and affective world to his fiancée?

The hypothesis that value orientations would be more congruent at time 2 than time 1 was not supported. There was a tendency toward greater
consensus at time 2. If couples do become more alike in their values as they interact over a long period of time, the present study probably did not allow a long enough time interval between Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the testing for the change to occur. Perhaps 2-5 years after marriage one could observe Newcomb's ABX theory of interaction or Heider's balance theory operating; however, Newcomb (1961) found that tendencies toward balance remained relatively constant with increased acquaintance.*

The present data suggest that continued interaction, whether it be marriage or an extended time of interaction during the engagement period, had a tendency to produce an increase in accuracy of perception (though not significant). These conclusions do not support earlier findings of Udry (1961). He reported that among married couples, neither length of interaction nor type of "togetherness" activities increased perception.

The fact that accuracy of perception, likewise, had not significantly increased from time 1 to time 2 may be accounted for by the fact that there was not a sufficient time interval between time 1 and time 2 for accuracy of perception to improve, especially since Newcomb (1961) reported almost universal improvement with increased acquaintance. Udry (1963) matched samples of married and engaged couples and found that the married couples were more accurate mutual perceivers than the engaged couples.

Ego's perception of alter's perception of him (third level of perception) did not differ significantly from alter's perception of him.

*If value congruity is predictive of marital success, couples who divorce within the first few years of marriage may have found greater value disparity, or a misperceived value congruity, instead of a tendency toward balance.
Differences between the sexes and their perception of alter's perception of them were very small.

Neither the theory of homogamy nor the theory of heterogamy in mate selection was clearly supported by the present data. It is clear to the author that either endogenous or exogamous marriages can be concluded from socio-demographic variables. In order to support mate selection in terms of homogamy or heterogamy, it cannot be determined from actual congruity but must be determined by a comparison of perceived congruity or incongruity. It appears very logical to assume that if two close friends are very similar or different and yet are unaware of their similarity or differences, they have made no choice on personality attributes but may have become friends unconsciously or because of uncontrollable circumstances. The present sample did reveal a smaller within sample variance of perception in the couples most similar (lower 25 percent) than those couples who were most dissimilar (upper 25 percent), which may indicate that those who are more similar may, if they are aware of the similarity, be more accurate in their perception just from pure projection. Smith (1958) reported that his subjects projected greater similarity onto similar persons than onto dissimilar persons.

IV. Limitations

This study had its limitations, some of which may have been more easily anticipated than others. The following is a list of the most obvious limitations:
1. The sample could have been more representative of all engaged persons had the sampling frame been all engaged persons in Baton Rouge rather than just those on the L.S.U. campus who agreed to participate in the research project.

2. Generalizations concerning value congruity and value perception are limited by the non-random, non-representative sample.

3. The choice of analytic techniques was limited to some degree, since an attempt was made to make the present analysis comparable (for comparative purposes) to previous research on interpersonal perception.

4. Limitations of the Study of Value instrument are well known. Since it measures only the relative strength of each value, someone who is moderately religious but disinterested in the other five value areas could score higher on the religious scale than the very religious person who has strong interests in the other five areas. This fact renders difficulty in interpreting findings. However, in the present study, the major emphasis was on the mean congruity for an array of responses rather than on specific individual differences, as well as on perceptual ability.

V. Recommendations

Inasmuch as the present investigation was considered to be exploratory and limited by lack of randomness as well as representativeness of the sample, the following recommendations appear to be feasible for future studies.

1. A larger sample which would include all stages of friendship formation or dating relationship should be drawn.
2. The strength of the interpersonal relationship should be tested.

3. In order to look at possible differences in perceptual ability, type and intensity of interaction should be obtained from each couple.

4. A longitudinal study, at least three years following marriage, should be a part of the present study. This would allow the researcher to determine if accurate perception, as it relates to mate choice, can be used as a predictor of success or failure in marriage.

This investigation has determined that interpersonal perception is indeed a complex phenomena and that it may have sociological significance both as a micro and macro concept as it relates to dyadic relationships and subsequently to institutional stability. It is hoped that the findings presented herein will serve to stimulate further research in value orientations as well as in interpersonal perception.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Eckland, B. K. "Theories of Mate Selection," *Eugenics Quarterly,* 1968, 15, 71-84.


APPENDIX A

COUPLE IDENTIFICATION
Appendix A:

Win A Valuable Gift Certificate
Just fill out this form

Are YOU:
Married
Engaged
Pinned
Honeym.
Untouchable

Your name and ID number

His or her name and ID number

Drop Form In Your "Hope" Chest
(Research endorsed by Department of Sociology)
APPENDIX B

FIRST LETTER TO COUPLES
April 9, 1971

Dear Engagee:

You and your fiancée (fiancé) have been chosen to be included in a study of engaged couples which is endorsed by the LSU Department of Sociology.

It is necessary that the questionnaire be administered in person, therefore, I need to know what time you and your fiancée (fiancé) could meet with me and a number of other students for group administration. I will schedule these meetings at your convenience if you will give me the time when you can best meet. The total time for completing the questionnaire should not exceed 1-1 1/2 hours. It is important that I get a response from all persons who are mutually engaged and currently attending LSU.

Please confer with your fiancée (fiancé), circle the date and time on the enclosed card that you can jointly meet with me, and return the card within five days. Time schedules and locations of the meeting place are listed on the self-addressed card.

Betty Smith and Rosalind Lasaveo received two of the gift items given following registration. There will be a drawing again from those who participate in filling out the questionnaire and two $10.00 gift certificates will be given.

A summary of the results for you and your fiancée (fiancé) will be sent to you at the completion of the study, if you are interested. This information could provide many hours of interesting discussion for you.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Geneva B. Carroll
Teaching Assistant

Enclosure
Mrs. Geneva B. Carroll  
Department of Sociology  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Your Name ____________________________
Name of fiancé (fiancé) __________________
Your phone number _____________________
Tentative wedding date ____________________

Times of Questionnaire Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Circle One</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon., April 19</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 A.M.</td>
<td>T-Boyd 322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue., April 20</td>
<td>1:30-3:00 P.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., April 21</td>
<td>11:00-12:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., April 22</td>
<td>10:30-12:00 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frid., April 23</td>
<td>8:00-9:30 A.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat., April 24</td>
<td>10:30-12:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Himes 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Return Within 5 days
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX C

Confidential Personal Data - Phase 1

C.1 Card no. ___________

C.2-4 Couple no. ___________

Name _______________________

C.5-6 I Age ___________

C.7 II Sex: Male _____ Female _____

C.8 III Year in University (please circle one)
1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or more

C.9 IV Race:
1. White
2. Black
3. Other ________________

C.10-11 V Religious preference (please check one for self and parent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>self (a)</th>
<th>parent (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Baptist</td>
<td>1. Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic</td>
<td>2. Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Episcopal</td>
<td>3. Episcopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Presbyterian</td>
<td>5. Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>7. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. None</td>
<td>8. None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.12-13 VI Religious involvement for self (please circle two answers, 1 under A & 1 under B)

A.1. Attend church on Sundays and other days of obligation.
2. Attend church once weekly.
3. Attend church once or twice weekly.
4. Attend church only on special occasions such as Christmas and Easter.

B.5. Frequently hold office in church or church related organizations.
6. Infrequently hold office in church or church related organizations.
7. Never hold office in church or church related organizations.

C.14 VII Normal residence when not in school (please circle one)
1. Live in home of natural parents.
2. Live in home of natural mother.
3. Live in home of natural father but adopted mother.
4. Live in home of relative or other persons.
5. Other ________________________________

C.15 VIII Present gainfully employment status for self (please circle one)
1. Not employed.
2. Work less than 10 hours weekly.
3. Work 11-15 hours weekly.
4. Work more than 15 hours weekly.

C.16-17 IX Occupation of father or head of house in which you are living or have lived most of your life. (Please write the answer in the space below. Give the specific job. For example, list carpenter, not construction worker, or college teacher, not teacher.)
1. _______________________________________

C.18 X Education of father (please circle last year completed)
1. Grade school: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
2. High School: 9, 10, 11, 12
3. College: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

C.19-20 XI Occupation of mother or female head in whose house you are presently living or have lived most of your life. (Please give the specific job such as legal secretary, not secretary, if homemaker list as such.)
1. _______________________________________

C.21 XII Education of mother (please circle last year completed.)
1. Grade School: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
2. High School: 9, 10, 11, 12
3. College: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

C.22 XIII Income of family (please state to the best of your knowledge the approximate total income of your parent, or parents, if both are employed.)
1. ________________________________
C.23 XIV Prior involvement status for self (please circle one)

1. Engaged or definite plans for marriage once before.
2. Two or more previous engagements.
3. One or more previous marriages.
4. None of the above apply.

C.24 XV Length of acquaintance with fiancé (fiancé) (Please circle one)

1. 3 months or less
2. 3 months to 1 year
3. 1 to 2 years
4. 2 to 4 years
5. 4 to 10 years
6. more than 10 years

C.25 XVI Length of constant dating with fiancée (fiancé) (please circle one)

1. 3 months or less
2. 3-6 months
3. 6 months to 1 year
4. 1 to 3 years
5. 3 to 6 years

C.26-27 XVII Date of engagement (approximately when did you become engaged?)

1. Month _________ Year _________

XVIII Name and address of relative or friend who will always know where you are living if you should move in the next few years.

First Name Middle initial Last Name

________________________________________  __________________________  ______________________

Street address _____________________________________________________

City or town ___________________________ State __________

Phone no., if known __________________________
In your opinion how would your parents, the majority of your close friends, you, and your fiancée (fiancé) rank the following orientations. (Working vertically use 6 as most important and 1 as least important (6-5-4-3-2-1). Please place numerals in all five blanks in the six spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Fiancée</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values the discovery of knowledge; aiming to organize, criticize, and evaluate research and published materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes that which is useful; judging things by their tangibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys beauty and harmony; finding fulfillment in artistic expression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be unselfish and generous; valuing others as ends in themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires influence and power; enjoying competition and struggle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks a unifying philosophy through ultimate values and contact with a higher Being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY OF VALUES SCALE

Sample Items

Part I (30 questions—choose one answer and note strength of preference)

1. The main object of scientific research should be the discovery of truth rather than its practical application.
   (a) Yes  (b) No

4. Assuming that you have sufficient ability, would you prefer to be:
   (a) a banker?
   (b) a politician?

15. At an exposition, do you chiefly like to go to the buildings where you can see
   (a) new manufacturing products?
   (b) scientific (e.g., chemical) apparatus?

Part II (15 questions—rank order highest preference with a 4, next highest with a 3, next with a 2, and least preferred with a 1)

3. If you could influence the educational policies of the public schools of some city, would you undertake

   _____ a. to promote the study and participation in music and fine arts?
   _____ b. to stimulate the study of social problems?
   _____ c. to provide additional laboratory facilities?
   _____ d. to increase the practical value of courses?

12. Should one guide one’s conduct according to, or develop one’s chief loyalties toward

   _____ a. one’s religious faith?
   _____ b. ideals of beauty?
   _____ c. one’s occupational organization and associates?
   _____ d. ideals of charity?
Sample Answer Sheet

C.1 Card no. ____________

C.2-4 Couple no. ____________

C.5 Sex: Male _____ Female _______

C.6 Responses for: (please circle one)

1. Self
2. Fiancée or fiancé
3. How you think he/she will answer for you

Part 1

C.7 01. R S T X Y Z
     a___ b___

C.15 02. ___ a___ b___

C.23 03. a___ b___

C.31 04. a___ b___
       ↓
       30.

Part 2

C.31 01. R S T X Y Z
     d___ b___ c___ a___

C.39 02. b___ c___ d___ a___

C.47 03. a___ d___ c___ b___

C.55 04. c___ d___ a___ b___
       ↓
       15.
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO COUPLES OFF CAMPUS
During the spring semester, the two of you filled out a questionnaire for me. The summary data from the first administration is at the computer center here on the campus and hopefully will be ready to mail to you as soon as I receive the second completed questionnaire. I cannot share the first results with you in this mailing because of the bias which it might introduce in your second answer. I am asking all couples who were a part of the first sample to answer the identical test booklet questions, as before, whether they are presently married, engaged, or if they have broken their engagement and would like to participate a second time, this is encouraged. All the couples who have returned to the campus have been contacted, and everyone has agreed to complete the questionnaire a second time.

I have completed my course work for the Ph.D. in Sociology and hope to be able to analyze the results from the second administration in much less time. I plan to share the results, from the second administration, with you also. You recall that I am not comparing you as a couple with other couples, rather I am considering each couple as my sample unit.

Remember that your responses for any one question in Part I of the booklet must equal to 3, also that alternative a, b, c, and d of Part II may not appear in logical sequence across the columns. It probably will take you less time to complete the questionnaire this second time. Most of the students here on campus have completed it in 50-60 minutes. Please do not discuss the responses with each other while you are working on the questionnaire.

Will you please complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. The results from the second administration are very important for my final analysis of the test questions. If any portion of your mailing address is incorrect, please correct it.

Thank you again for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Geneva B. Carroll
Teaching Assistant
APPENDIX E

REPORT OF RESULTS--PHASE 1
November 24, 1972

Dear Couple:

Thank you so very much for your cooperation on my dissertation research project. I have received very good response on my follow-up questionnaire.

You will note on the graph that I have plotted your response for self with a solid line (Red = male; black = female) and the perception of you by your fiancée (fiancé) in broken lines utilizing the same color coding. The two solid lines indicate how congruent you are in your value orientations, while the broken lines indicate the degree of perception each has of the other.

A student may consider himself either high or low, compared to national average, if his score falls outside the following limits. Such scores exceed the range of 50% of all male or female scores on the value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-48</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-48</td>
<td>33-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-39</td>
<td>35-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-43</td>
<td>38-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-46</td>
<td>33-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-48</td>
<td>39-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above averages are presented only as a point of interest and should not be utilized to look at yourself as a deviate from the norm. It might have some utility in helping you to see your major emphases.

Thank you again and much success to you.

Sincerely,

Geneva B. Carroll
APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP STUDY - Phase 2

C.1 Card no. ____________________________________________

C.2-4 Couple no. ________________________________________

Name _______________________________________________

C.5 Sex: (Please circle one)
1. Male
2. Female

C.6 1. Date of marriage (Please circle one or answer in 7)
   (Please circle one)
1. April
2. May
3. June
4. July
5. August
6. September
7. Not yet married, approximate wedding date
   (Please circle one)
1. within 3 months
2. within 6 months
3. within a year or more

C.7 2. Occupational status at present. (Please circle one)
   1. Student (full time)
   2. Student (part time)
   3. Student part time - employed part time
   4. Employed part time
   5. Full time employment
   6. Full time employment - part time student
   7. Full time student - part time employment

C.8 3. Occupational status of spouse (fiancée, fiancé)
   1. Student (full time)
   2. Student (part time)
   3. Student part time - employed part time
   4. Employed part time
   5. Full time employment
   6. Full time employment - part time student
   7. Full time student - part time employment
Below you will find a continuum let the left extreme represent the best possible situation and the extreme right the worst possible situation, where would you locate your marital relationship (or dating relationship)? (Please place an X above the line)

Everyone expects and desires certain things out of marriage (or an intimate dating relationship). Taking a positive view of marriage (or intimate dating relationship) what would you define as the best possible, or happiest situation. (State in brief concise form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best</th>
<th>Worst</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now taking the other side of the picture what would you consider to be the worst possible, or most unhappy, situation:

Where do you think your relationship will be five years from now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.10 Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX G

KIRKPATRICK-CANTRIL SELF-ANCHORING SCALE
STUDY OF VALUES (SAMPLE ITEMS)
Kirkpatrick-Cantril Self-Anchoring Scale

The Kirkpatrick-Cantril self-anchoring scale was chosen (for a five-year follow-up study) because of its simplicity and utility in assessing an individual's evaluation of his own relationship with his engagee or spouse.

A Kirkpatrick-Cantril type of self-anchoring scale has utility in obtaining a statement of one's own perceived idea of where he is located in relation to a specified dimension, on a continuum.

A self-anchoring scale is simply one in which each respondent is asked to describe, in terms of his own perspectives, goals, and values, the top and bottom, or anchoring points, of the dimension on which scale measurement is desired and then to employ this self-defined continuum as a measuring device (Kirkpatrick and Cantril, 1960, p. 1).

The concept is a direct outgrowth of transactional theory.

The transactional theory may be summarized in the following few statements. Its key point is that each of us lives and operates in the world and through the self, both as perceived. What is perceived is inseparable from the perceiver; perception is the awareness of a world of reality. Kirkpatrick (1960) states:

Thus the 'reality world' of each of us, being a product of a unique organism with unique past experiences and purposes, is always in some degree unique. Since each of us behaves in terms of his 'reality world', the only world he knows, it follows that the key to an understanding of human behavior is to take into account the unique reality world of the individual (p. 1).

In order to operationalize the self-anchoring concept, the following instructions were given each respondent:
Below you will find a continuum. Let the left extreme represent the best possible situation and the extreme right the worst possible situation, where would you locate your marital relationship (or dating relationship)? (Please place an X above the line.)

Everyone expects and desires certain things out of marriage (or an intimate dating relationship). Taking a positive view of marriage (or intimate dating relationship), what would you define as the best possible, or happiest situation: (State in brief, concise form).
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