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ABSTRACT

A paper-and-pencil measure of role-playing ability was first constructed and then submitted to a variety of validational studies. This role-playing ability measure was designed as a skills-based instrument. Items were chosen for the proposed Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale on the basis of categories of skills theoretically relevant to role-playing ability. Items were selected according to judgments of experts, item analyses of responses from students, and performance ratings in an Improvisational Situations Test (IST); a test developed especially for the present research. The process of item selection provided a 34-item Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. This RPA was then demonstrated to have both convergent and divergent validity. This was accomplished in a number of ways. Respondents in one sample answered the RPA and scales deemed theoretically similar as well as those deemed theoretically dissimilar. Their responses provided much of the evidence for the RPA scale's validity. Responses of community actors provided further evidence of such validity. In addition, peers tended to rate high RPA scorers as good actors. All data, except for those from the community actors, indicated clear sex differences in responses to the RPA and similar scales. Nonetheless, the RPA was shown to provide both reliable and valid measurement of role-playing ability.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the following research was to construct a paper-and-pencil scale for the measurement of role-playing ability. Such a scale would provide an efficient alternative to the traditional method of rating actual performance in improvised situations (e.g., Bronfenbrenner and NewComb, 1948; Harrow, 1952; McReynolds and DeVoge, 1978; Moreno, 1946a; Rotenberg and Sarbin, 1971; Symonds, 1947). It would also provide a more effective alternative to others types of questionnaires used by researchers as approximate measurements of role-playing ability (Coe and Sarbin, 1966; Geller, 1978; Middleton, 1978). This first chapter will serve to clarify the criterion and concepts involved in the measurement of role-playing ability. The second chapter will present a standardized procedure for assessing role-playing ability in improvisational situations. This procedure was used in the selection of items for the self-report inventory of role-playing ability. The construction of the inventory is described in Chapter III. The fourth chapter will then detail the various studies of validation. And the fifth chapter will present a recapitulation of the results of this research as well as a discussion of their implications for future research.

An overview of the research procedure. Due to the great number of studies and different samples used during the process of constructing
and validating the role-playing ability scale, discussion of the process can become confusing at times. In order to attenuate this potential confusion, an overview is presented here as a series of steps leading from the initial item selection to the final validational studies and analyses of data which point to future research possibilities. The research presented in this thesis, then, followed the following general steps:

1. Item selection based on dramatic and psychological literature. Much of the background information regarding role theory is presented in Chapter I. Discussion of the item selection from pertinent literatures is presented in Chapter III.

2. The 60 items arrived at by the above process were submitted to 8 expert judges from the theater department at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. These 8 judges (6 males and 2 females) judged the items for their ability to discriminate between good and poor actors, as described in Chapter III, page 50.

3. The same 60 items were subjected to item analysis after being answered by a class of 94 undergraduates, as described in Chapter III, page 52.

4. A comparison of the results of the judgments of the experts and the answers of the undergraduates resulted in the selection of 32 items to be submitted to further item analysis, as described in Chapter III, pages 51 and 52.

5. Items intended to assess role involvement were added to the above 32 items to form a new pool of 52 items. These 52 items were then submitted to a Final Item Selection (as this stage of the process will be referred to hereafter). This Final Item Selection consisted of two steps.
   a. A sample of 133 undergraduates in psychology answered the 52 item pool of role-playing questions (along with three other scales, to be discussed shortly). T-tests were performed on each item, comparing the answers of those who scored in the top 20.1% of the total distribution of scores with those who scored in the bottom 20.7%, as described in Chapter III, page 56. This provided 47 items which distinguished between high and low scorers.
b. the second part of the item selection involved first asking for volunteers from the sample of 133 students who would allow themselves to be rated on their performance in a test of actual role-playing ability in improvisations. From the volunteers, 20 were chosen on the basis of their scores on the overall 52 items (11 were high scorers and 9 were low scorers). These 20 subjects were then rated on their performance on an improvisational situations test. The improvisational test—the original version used for this part of the Final Item Selection—is described in Chapter II.

The ratings of the 20 volunteers in the improvisational situations test were then correlated with each of the 47 items which discriminated between high and low scorers in the whole sample. These correlations were then used to make the Final Selection of 34 items to compose the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale, as described in Chapter III, pages 56 to 69.

6. The same sample of 133 undergraduates who filled out the 52 item version of the role-playing scale at the Final Selection of Items also completed tests of extraversion, neuroticism, social desirability, and self-monitoring. This allowed the final version of the RPA to be compared with these additional scales for preliminary analysis of the scale's relationship to other traits and abilities. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter III, pages 67-72.

7. The final version of the RPA was also subjected to a test of internal consistency, as reported in Chapter III, pages 66-67. The sample used was that of the Final Selection of Items.

8. A variety of further studies was then conducted to provide evidence of the RPA's validity and reliability. Several samples of subjects were used in these studies. The sample which provided the largest amount of data consisted of 115 undergraduates in psychology who answered a packet of questionnaires among which was included the RPA. In addition, each of the 115 subjects was rated on his or her performance in the Improvisational Situations Test (IST). And for this reason this sample is hereafter referred to as the Improvisational Sample.

9. The Improvisational Situations Test used during this stage of the testing of the RPA was a revised version of that used in step 5a above. The revisions and the final version of the IST used at this stages are reported in Chapter II.
10. The RPA was again measured for internal consistency using the answers of the 115 subjects in the Improvisational Sample, as indicated in Chapter IV, page 83.

11. An entirely different sample of 20 students from an undergraduate class in psychology was used to measure the RPA's test-retest reliability, as described on page 83 of Chapter IV.

12. Evidence of the RPA's convergent validity was provided through the correlations of responses of subjects to the RPA and their rated performances in the IST. The Improvisational Sample of step 8 was used for this purpose, and the results are indicated on pages 85-94 in Chapter IV.

13. Subjects in the Improvisational Sample were also asked to have peers or relatives rate them on their acting ability, and these ratings were compared with their responses to the RPA for further evidence of convergent validity, as described in Chapter IV, pages 87-88.

14. Further evidence of convergent validity was obtained by asking community actors and actresses to answer the RPA, another scale intended to assess self-monitoring behavior, and several questions intended to provide some measure of acting experience. There were 36 subjects in this sample. As reported on pages 90-97 in Chapter IV, these same subjects were also asked to indicate the degree to which they depend upon both "deep" and "surface" acting techniques (discussed in detail in Chapter I, page 12). Their responses provided strong evidence of convergent validity.

15. Returning to the Improvisational Sample, the various scales answered by subjects provided data relevant to divergent validity. The various scales used are described in Chapter IV, pages 99-106.

16. A comparison of the correlations between ratings in the IST and each of the scales administered to the Improvisational Samples (Step 8) is provided on page 107, Chapter IV.

17. A comparison of the correlations between the scales and the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale is presented on pages 107-112. Some of the scales—notably those unrelated to acting, the "nonacting" scales—were differentiated from the RPA at this step in the analysis.

18. A comparison of the RPA with the remaining scales which provided measures of abilities similar to acting and were thus
referred to as the "acting" scales is described on pages 113-118, Chapter IV. Actually these "acting" scales and the RPA were compared through their correlations to a few of the "nonacting" scales. This allowed all but the measure of self-monitoring to be differentiated from the RPA.

19. A comparison of the various scales administered to the Improvisational Sample and the peer ratings of acting ability reaffirmed patterns of relationships between the scales already noted, as indicated on page 118, Chapter IV.

20. As noted above in step 14, community actors were asked to answer both the RPA and the measure of self-monitoring behavior. Their responses to these questionnaires and the measures of acting experiences and preference for acting style provided evidence of the RPA's differentiation from the self-monitoring scale. These results are reported in Chapter IV, pages 120-124.

21. The responses of subjects from both the Final Item Selection (n=133) and the Improvisational Sample (n=115) to the RPA were combined to provide a sample of respondents large enough to provide normative data concerning scores on the RPA. These results are provided in TABLES 24 and 25 in Appendix J.

22. The results of factor analyzing the responses from this combined sample are discussed on pages 134 to 139.

Relevance of Role-playing Ability

Moreno (1972 was one of the first theorists to become interested in individual differences in the ability to play or enact roles. He was also interested in discovering reasons for these individual differences, as well as the potential psychological and social consequences of such differences. Much research remains to be done in these areas, and a paper-and-pencil scale would make such research both more accessible and more feasible. Moreno himself relied on ratings of improvised situations (1940, 1946a). Such an approach can be quite cumbersome, difficult to score, and time consuming (as noted by McClelland, 1951).
The potential consequences of differences in role-playing ability take a variety of forms. Sarbin (1950), for example, suggested the good hypnotic subject may also be a good role player. Averill (1980) suggested emotional experience may relate to the ability to assume the appropriate emotional "role." Other possible consequences come quickly to mind—are leaders more adept at role playing? Are therapists? Does role-playing ability have some direct relationship to a capacity for role taking (the ability to imaginatively put oneself in the place of another; to be discussed in more detail below)? If so, might not investigations into the relationship between role-taking ability and empathic capacity, for example, be more readily assessed and studies by investigating individual differences in role-playing ability? (For a discussion of research related to role-taking ability and empathy, as well as altruistic behavior in general, see Staub, 1979; and for a discussion of the attendant difficulties of measuring role-taking ability, see Shantz, 1975.)

Definitions

At this point an examination of terms is in order. Confusion among theorists—whether anthropologists, sociologists, or social psychologists—about the exact definition of the fundamental concept role has likely contributed to the general decline in research on role theory, at least in social psychology. Therefore, several of the relevant terms will be defined and discussed.
Behavioral role. In his own attempt to bring some order to the confusion surrounding role terms, Biddle (1979) suggested a variety of distinctions between, and definitions of, these terms. He began by defining role very broadly, namely, as

those behaviors characteristic of one or more person in a context. (p. 58)

He later refers to this definition as that of the "behavioral role."

Social role. Biddle's behavioral role is much less restrictively defined than has been generally the case. As Biddle and Thomas (1966) noted,

perhaps the most common definition is that role is the set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be (p. 29; cf. Coutu, 1951; Linton, 1945; Turner, 1956)

This definition might be termed the "social role."

Comparison of behavioral and social roles. It should be noted that the emphasis of the social role is placed on prescriptions for behavior. On the other hand, the emphasis of the behavioral role is placed on characteristic behavior. Furthermore, the social role definition emphasizes social position rather than people as in the definition of behavioral role. These are important differences. The social role definition tends to emphasize abstract, mental concepts, whereas the behavioral role definition concentrates on actual behavior.

Actually, a confusion between these two concepts has marked the development of role theory over the past 50 years, during which time the theory was elaborated by two parallel but relatively independent
traditions. As might be expected, the social role definition has been emphasized and studied most extensively by sociologists and most social psychologists. On the other hand, and during approximately the same time period, an alternate tradition has taken what might be termed the "psychotherapeutic" approach. This latter approach, originated by Moreno (1934, 1946a, 1960), emphasized actual role behavior, as in Moreno's psychodramatic technique wherein an individual plays herself, or someone close to her, in a variety of dramatic situations.

Other therapeutic approaches grew out of Moreno's work. The Gestalt therapy of Perls (Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman, 1973), which was directly influenced by Moreno's techniques as well as by individuals prominent in theater, makes extensive use of recreating and "reliving" dreams or traumatic events through role playing. Kelly's construct theory of personality suggests a therapeutic approach, fixed-role therapy, which was also heavily influenced by Moreno's seminal work as well as by Kelly's own dramatic experiences (Kelly, 1955, Vol. 1, pp. 360-363). Certain forms of behavior therapy (e.g., Bandura's, 1976, "participant modeling") also depend on similar role-playing techniques.

Role playing. Since Moreno (1946b) did originate improvisational tests, it should not come as a surprise that the emphasis of the research presented here, as exemplified by the final scale and the improvisational situations test presented in Chapter II, was on the assessment of the ability to play behavioral roles. Thus, the
definition of role playing as used in this research would read as follows:

The correct imitation of behaviors characteristic of people in a context. (paraphrase of Biddle's, 1979, definitions of behavioral role and role playing.)

Role taking. The concept of role taking originated with the work of Mead (1934). Mead meant the term to indicate the imaginative assumption of the viewpoint of the other in order to better coordinate one's own behavior with theirs. The term has come to mean, in its simplest form, the capacity for imaginatively putting oneself in the place of another. As such, role taking is obviously a concept which focusses on mentation. Role playing, on the other hand, as used here, focusses on physical activity. Role taking, through its characteristic mental activity, lends itself to the assessment of the sets of prescriptions or expectations said to define behavior in a social role. Role playing, on the other hand, is related to the actual physical acting out of behaviors associated with roles, whether social or behavioral roles; that is, whether the behaviors are actually prescribed (as in social roles) or simply characteristic (as in behavioral roles).

Role-playing ability. The ability to authentically imitate behaviors characteristic of people in a context does not necessarily rely on the ability to place oneself imaginatively in the place of another. Which is to say, role-playing ability does not necessarily rely on role-taking ability. The imitation of behaviors characteristic of
people in a context more simply relies on the observation of these characteristic behaviors, the retention of them, and, most importantly, the performance of those behaviors. While the tendency to observe and retain behaviors conducive to authentic imitation is obviously a mental rather than a physical activity, it should not be confused with role-taking ability. There is no necessary connection between imaginatively placing oneself in the place of another and the ability to imitate the other's behaviors.

This clarification of the distinction between role taking and role playing leads to another problem related to the assessment of role-playing ability. This is the problem of pretense versus authenticity. The purpose of the present research was to construct a scale for the measurement of authentic role-playing ability. But how are pretense and authenticity to be distinguished? And, further, how should authenticity be assessed?

**Pretense Versus Authenticity**

In the 1960's some researchers (e.g., Brown, 1962; Kelman, 1967) suggested that role playing might serve as an acceptable alternative to the practice of deception in psychological research. Criticisms of this suggestion (e.g., Aronson & Carlsmith, 1968; Freedman, 1969) tended to be based on what was thought to be the lack of "realism" which role playing supposedly entailed (for cogent critiques of the various criticisms, see Hendrick, 1977; Mixon, 1977). It would seem that this tainted reputation for lack of "realism" stems in part from the term role playing itself. It was the supposed lack of seriousness
associated with the word playing which led Sarbin and Allen (1968) to propose the substitution of the phrase role enactment for the traditional phrase role playing:

One of the meanings sometimes attributed to the dramaturgical model is that the conduct of an actor in a dramatic role is divorced from "reality," that he is merely play acting. Because the audience knows that in fact the actor is not Hamlet, but is only playing the role of Hamlet, his performance is assigned to a class of action called "playing a role." There is an equivocation here that centers around two meanings of the work "play." Sometimes the word carries the meaning of "sham" as in games of "let's pretend," in which one acts without self-involvement, or acts for the purpose of deceiving the audience. However, it is illicit to assimilate to this meaning all the uses of the word "play" which denote some role enactment. This equivocation comes about through inventing two categories to account for conduct: play and work. The latter is seen as genuine, serious, and self-involving; the former as sham, without serious intent, and nonself-involving. Not infrequently, too, play is seen as having pejorative connotations, particularly when implicitly contrasted with work. This suggests a false dichotomy. Play of any kind can be highly self-involving and may represent work, as in the case of a virtuoso playing the violin or a professional football quarterback playing in a championship game. To avoid the overgeneralization and equivocation that role playing is akin to sham behavior, we use the term "role enactment." (p. 489)

The use of the phrase role playing was retained in the present research for several reasons. One reason was its more general usage. Another reason was to avoid confusing the ability to perform appropriate behaviors--role-enactment or role-performance skills--with the ability to become involved in that performance. The authentic role player should be able to combine performance and involvement in the performance. It was the concern of the present work to distinguish between simply "play acting" or "shamming" behavior, as Sarbin and Allen describe it, and genuine, self-involved playing out of a role--between pretense and the authentic assumption
and playing out of a role. The term role enactment placed too much emphasis on simple performance. Role playing, however, retains the dramatic connotations.

**Surface versus deep acting.** Perhaps this distinction between pretense and authentic role-playing can best be illustrated by reference to a similar distinction made by actors when discussing their techniques for successful performance. One school of actors, notably the British, contend that all that is needed for a believable performance is detailed mimicking of appropriate gestures, facial expressions, use of voice, posture, and other similar surface manifestations of the character being portrayed. Thus, this school of thought might be called the school of surface acting, a school similar to Sarbin and Allen's "play acting," where the emphasis is on pretense rather than authenticity.

Another school of thought, however, particularly that represented by the Stanislavsky system (1936), decries the surface mode of acting as too superficial and unbelievable. What is missing in the surface mode of acting is an element of spontaneity (just as Moreno suggests, 1944). How is this spontaneity of expression attained? Mainly through exercises intended to help the actor somehow clothe himself in the role of the character being portrayed, to become involved in and assume that role. This mode of acting might, thus, be called deep acting, as opposed to the surface acting of the British school. The primary difference between the two modes is that the deep actor is more immersed, involved, in the role of the character being
portrayed, while the surface actor concerns himself more with maintaining complete control over every facet of the expressive presentation of the character's outward behaviors. The deep actor does not concern herself so much with the control of her surface behavior since this will emerge spontaneously as long as she is properly involved in the role.

Impression management. Sociologists, particularly Goffman (1959, 1963, 1974), and more recently social psychologists, particularly Snyder (1974, in press), have devoted extensive time to the study of what might be called the surface aspects of role-playing behavior. The term most generally used for this behavior is impression management, which derives from the work of Goffman (1959). Indeed, Goffman employed the dramaturgical metaphor to describe how

the individual...presents himself and his activity to others, the ways in which he guides and controls the impression they form of him. (p. xi)

Snyder has taken Goffman's concept of impression management and postulated individual differences in the motivation for and ability to monitor one's impressions. He has called individuals so able and motivated, self-monitors (1974). He has further suggested that individuals high in such tendencies

endorse a rather pragmatic conception of self—a theory that construes their identities in terms of the specific social situations and interpersonal settings of their lives. By contrast, other individuals may regard themselves as rather principled beings who value congruence between their actions in social situations and relevant underlying attitudes, feelings, and dispositions. (in press, p. 3-4; italics in original)
These latter individuals, whom Snyder suggest have a principled conception of self, would be those who are unable and unmotivated to self-monitor their impressions.

Thus, again, there emerges a dichotomy between pretense, or pragmatic self-monitoring of impressions, and the principled and genuine expression of the individual self-concept in whatever role a person may be placed. Since the present work is concerned with the spontaneous and authentic assumption of a role as it is played out, some further aspect would seem necessary when defining the criterion of role-playing ability, something above and beyond the skillful presentation of surface behaviors.

Role involvement. This further aspect was suggested by Sarbin and Allen (1968) when they associated genuine performance with involved performance. Indeed, they elaborated on this point in the same paper, outlining an important aspect of performance of a role which they referred to as organismic involvement.

Suffice it to say here that for every role enactment, the observer has a set of expectations of the proper range of involvement. If the involvement appears too much or too little, the enactment may be judged as unconvincing. (p. 496)

At a funeral, for example, some mourners are expected to cry more than others. Sarbin and Allen further suggested an eight level dimension of intensity of organismic involvement. These levels were, first, zero involvement, second, casual role enactment, then ritual acting, engrossed acting (which they characterized as "the stage actor who 'takes the role' literally"; p. 493), classical hypnotic
"role taking," histrionic neurosis, ecstasy, and, finally, bewitchment.

Thus, the further aspect which might, at least theoretically, transmутe the surface role playing of pretense into the deep, immersed role playing of the authentically assumed role would be the ability to become involved in the role. The self-monitoring capabilities necessary for successful impression management entail a distancing of self and role. Control, for the self-monitor, would act as both the primary motivator and a fundamental skill for successful impression management. The genuinely immersed role player, on the other hand, behaves more like the deep actor who knows both how to become involved in the character being portrayed and how to maintain control over that involvement, thus maintaining the proper level of involvement. As Stanislavsky (1936) pointed out, not only does the deep actor need to have some involvement in the role, but there is an equal need not to become overinvolved and behave out of character for the context of the role. Sarbin and Allen (1968) also implied the need to control the level of organismic involvement in order that the role play be convincing. Thus, control is important for both the surface acting associated with self-monitoring and for the deep acting associated with the authentic assumption of and immersion in a role. The difference lies in the use to which the control is put. For the self-monitor the control is needed to avoid involvement, to guide and coordinate the surface behaviors necessary for the management of the impressions desired to be given off. Spontaneity is shammed by the self-monitor. But the authentic role player assumes the role, wears the part to be
played like a mantle, and wishes to present not the well-orchestration pretense but rather the spontaneous authenticity. This deep role player can only achieve such spontaneity by becoming involved to the proper degree with the role being played. And this proper degree of involvement is what the authentic player controls.

The true mourner at the funeral has a true sense of the acceptable level of involvement allowed him and "automatically" assumes, then spontaneously plays, the role of mourner at the appropriate, authentic, level of involvement. The self-monitor, on the other hand, maintains a constant level of awareness of how others are perceiving her. Her behavior is not necessarily a reflection of her actual level of involvement in the event. The genuine mourner's behavior is a true reflection of his involvement in the event, however. And therein lies the major difference between the authentic role playing as defined in the present research and the pretense of surface role playing as exemplified by the self-monitor concerned with managing the impressions she gives off.

Summary

The proposed paper-and-pencil scale for the assessment of role-playing ability, like the improvisational situations test to be discussed in the next chapter, is intended to assess skills relevant to Biddle's (1979) behavioral role. By this definition, role playing indicates the correct imitation of behaviors characteristic of persons in a context. The emphasis in this
definition is on characteristic behaviors rather than sets of prescriptions, as in Biddle's social role. Actually, a social role is a more narrowly defined type of behavioral role, and thus the behavioral role is the more apt--because more general--domain of study for the research presented below.

There is no necessary connection between role playing and the sociological concept of role taking. Role taking is a thoroughly mental activity, while role playing is both mental and physical with an emphasis on the physical. Furthermore, the mental activities involved in role taking are different in some respects from those involved in the role playing. The role taker imaginatively places herself in the place of the other. The role player need not do that to successfully perform the characteristic behaviors of the other in a context. The role player's performance, however, would likely be enhanced by a tendency to attend to and remember those characteristic behaviors. Actually, the final performance might very well be independent of the ability to attend to and remember such relevant behaviors. These points are addressed in more detail in chapter three. The main point to remember here is that role taking and role playing are distinct though related phenomena.

The final point concerns the import of the word "correct" in the definition of role playing as "correct imitation." By correct the present research means to say "authentic." Authentic role playing, as intended by this research, presumes an appropriate level of involvement in the role. Thus, the authentic role player
is in contrast with Snyder's (1974) self-monitor who exemplifies a "shamming" or need to control the impression one makes on others through pretense. The authentic role player would not only be proficient in role-appropriate behaviors but this proficiency would also derive from an authentic involvement in the role being performed rather than some sort of attempt to go through all the "right" motions, as judged by one's audience. The authentic role player does "what comes naturally" in a role because he or she is somehow "inside" the role, involved in it. And this "natural" and spontaneous playing out of behaviors characteristic of a person or persons in a context constitutes the criterion for both the paper-and-pencil scale and the improvisational situations test of the next chapter. Whether or not either or both of the two tests reflects this authentic role-playing ability needed to be demonstrated. And the following research was conducted with that end in mind.
CHAPTER II
IMPROVISATIONAL SITUATIONS TEST

A specially designed Improvisational Situations Test (IST) was used as part of both the construction and validation of the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. A clear understanding of this improvisational test would thus greatly facilitate the discussion of the RPA's construction and validation. Improvisational situation tests make use of ratings of actual performance in improvisational situations as a means of assessing role-playing ability. Moreno (1946, 1972) was the first to suggest standardizing such tests for testing and training purposes. They have, subsequently, been used for such diverse purposes as choosing leaders (Symonds, 1947), to train salesmen, nurses, and foremen (Bavelas, 1947; Harrow and Haas, 1947), and to assess the ability to handle interpersonal conflict (McReynolds, et al., 1976). Unfortunately, previous situations tests such as these were designed to address specific populations and were used for specific purposes. None of them made use of standardized situations nor of standardized rating scales.

Since such a general improvisational test of role-playing ability could provide persuasive validation of a paper-and-pencil scale of the same ability, such a test was constructed for use in the present research. Indeed, a standardized improvisational situations test could prove useful not only as a source of validation for the
RPA but in its own right as well. A careful examination of the design, construction, and reliability of the scale used in the present research is therefore in order. This chapter presents such an examination.

First, a study by Harrow (1952) which served as the primary model for the construction of the present test will be discussed. Her method of constructing her own situations test served as a specific historical precedent for the construction of the present test. After a short presentation of her approach, the evolution of the final form of the test used in this present research will be discussed. The form of the test differed somewhat between its use in the construction of the RPA scale and its use in the cross-validation of that scale. These differences, and the reasons for them, will be dealt with. And then, finally, the various tests of inter-rater reliability, test-retest and alternate-form reliability will be presented.

Harrow’s Situations Test

In 1952 Harrow tested Moreno’s contention that participating in psychodramatic therapy increases role-taking ability, on a group of institutionalized schizophrenics. Her measure of what she called "role-taking ability in action" was an improvisational situations test of her own design.

The role test which was constructed specifically for this study consists of three social roles (mailman, father and friend),
which the patient is asked to portray in action and words, and three interaction situations (situation with a woman, situation with hospital attendant and future situation), which the patient is asked to enact with another person. (p. 132)

The next step was to select a list of the most important and meaningful categories of personality traits and interaction qualities which would be apparent on such a test.... The following eight categories were chosen which seemed to describe the most significant and at the same time the most readily observable aspects of role-behavior.

A. Interaction with and emotional responsiveness to others: This refers to the amount and quality of communication, emotional, verbal, and physical with another real or imagined person.

B. Realism: This refers to the individual's clear perception of the actual emotional and intellectual qualities of the world around him, as evidenced by his sharing or paralleling the perceptions of most other people....

C. Emotional intensity: This refers to the amount and quality of emotional energy expressed by the individual in response to feelings within him or in response to other people.

D. "Affiliative interaction": This refers to feelings, words, and actions indicating empathy and positive emotional interaction with another person....

E. Ability to adapt spontaneously: This refers to the ability to meet new situations in a flexible manner....

F. Personal security and comfort displayed in role....

G. Ability to take and act out a role: This specifically refers to the subject's ability to put himself in the place of another person...., and to show in action what this other person might do or say....

H. Ability to apprehend and describe a role: This refers to the subject's verbalization of what he thinks a mailman, etc., might do or say, as opposed to role enactment. (p. 133-134)

Besides demonstrating general design considerations, Harrow's study also illustrates the specificity of all improvisational situations tests to date. Her eight categories were obviously intended to assess role-behavior of schizophrenics, not people in the general population. In addition, her method of rating each situation depended upon a specific list of behaviors associated with each particular situation. Thus, while suggestive in her approach, her instrument
falls far short of a general test of role-playing ability.

The Original Improvisational Test

The original version of the Improvisational Situations Test differed slightly from the final version, as did the experience and training of the raters and the administration of the test. Since there were only 20 subjects involved in the improvisational testing during the process of scale construction, only two raters were used, one male and one female. Their preparation consisted of acting out the improvisations for each other and discussing their own ratings. The experiences of these two raters during the administration of the Test to the 20 volunteers (see Chapter III) led to both the development of the final version of the test and the training of the raters for the Improvisational Sample where the final version was used (step 9 of the overview presented in the first pages of Chapter I).

There are five situations in the test, each of which will be described below. Each subject was rated for her performance on each situation. In each situation the subject was rated on seven different dimensions relating to various modes of expression as well as overall performance. These, too, are detailed below. Each dimension can be rated from 1 to 5, with 1 the lowest and 5 the highest rating. Each of the five possible ratings on this scale indicates a particular level of effectiveness, and these, also, will be described below. The total score of each subject was thus comprised of ratings from 1 to 5 on seven dimensions for five situations with a total possible
range of between 35 and 175. When the test was used in its original version as part of the process of constructing the RPA scale, these total scores were used. At that time only two raters were used and their ratings were highly correlated, and thus reliable. During the cross-validation process, however, five different raters were used, two at a time for each subject, and one of the raters' scores were less reliable than the others'. So the scores of each subject in the cross-validation process were standardized according to the raters who judged the subject's performance. The resulting scores were equivalent to the simple totals but more reliable for purposes of the cross-validation process.

The situations. Subjects were rated individually by two raters (one male and one female) on their performance in five situations. The performances took place in a small soundproofed room which was carpeted and had an observational mirror on the wall behind the raters' seats. This mirror was covered over on the observational side. The furniture consisted of two chairs and a long table near one subject and two chairs and a small table for the raters. Subjects were told that they were going to be asked to show how they, or someone else, would most likely act in each situation. They were asked to act as lifelike as possible but to feel free to do whatever they wanted with each situation, moving around in the room, using whatever they wished for props, as long as they kept to the general description of each situation. Each situation concluded either when the raters
decided they had enough information to go on or the subject felt she could no longer continue. Most situations lasted no longer than two minutes. Subjects were also informed that the raters, unless directly involved in a situation, would not react to the improvisations and that the subjects would preferably act as if the raters were not present.

The five situations were described to the subjects in the following order and manner:

**Situation 1:** Simply be someone talking to someone on the phone.
**Situation 2:** You are a cashier in a grocery store. You have five more minutes before your shift is over. Your last customer arrives with a shopping cart loaded with groceries. You not only have to ring up the sales but have to bag the groceries as well.
**Situation 3:** You are a teenager asking a parent for a favor. Play both the teenager and the parent.
**Situation 4:** Choose one of us [the two raters] to play the part of a friend, any friend, to have a conversation with, about anything. Give a brief description of the situation to us and maybe tell us a little about the friend. Then begin.
**Situation 5:** You are an elderly person at a flea market. You are selling furniture and knick-knacks. One of your items for sale is an old oak rocking chair. (You can use that chair there as the rocker [indicating a chair in the room].) Unfortunately, your spouse has decided that (he/she) does not want to sell the chair after all. But before you can move it out of the way, we [both raters] come along and show an interest in your chair. You try to shift our attention to some of your other merchandise, keeping our attention but not selling us the chair.

The rated dimensions. Each of the five situations was rated according to the subjects' performance on seven dimensions relevent to role-playing ability. These dimensions are discussed in greater detail below in connection with the final form of the Improvisational Situations Test (IST). For the present it is enough to note that
the original rating sheets listed the seven dimensions of interest in the following order: use of language, voice quality, facial expression, hand gestures, body posture and movement, sense of scene, and overall rating.

Original rating scale. Each of the above seven dimensions was rated on a 5-point rating scale, with a rating of one considered low and a rating of five, high. The two extremes of the scale were intended to indicate rare instances of performance in each of the seven dimensions. A rating of one indicated an essentially non-functional performance. The subject who sat rigidly, barely moving, during the improvisation, for example, would receive a rating of one on Body Posture and Movement for that particular situation. A rating of five, on the other hand, indicated someone whose performance was not only entirely believable but was somehow distinctive as well. This rating was reserved for the performer who brought more than was expected to the situation but did so in a manner which was perfectly believable. The subject, for example, who, during a telephone conversation, receives news which impels him to throw his head back in disbelief, jump up from his chair, and pace animatedly about the room, all the while carrying on an animated conversation over the telephone, would be a likely candidate for a rating of five in Body Posture and Movement.

It was reasoned that the average subject placed in the position of being asked to perform five situational improvisations for an audience of two would not be likely to give perfectly flawless
performances. Thus, the unquestionably acceptable and believable performance was accorded a rating of four, rather than the average three. A rating of three was awarded for performances which demonstrated a fair degree of comfort and convincingness. This average, acceptably believable performance rating indicated that the subject was able to forget his or her self-consciousness in front of the raters and enter into the improvisation, as least in the dimension being rated, with a good amount of believability. A rating of two indicated a barely acceptable performance, someone who presented himself erratically in the dimension being scored and did not manage to meet some of the requirements of the situation. This subject, however, as opposed to the individual who rated a one, did succeed in his attempts, even though minimally, to perform the improvisation.

The original labels for the five levels on the rating scale, in order from a rating of one to a rating of five, were as follows:
(1) EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, UNBELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE; (2) SOMETIMES BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE, BUT STILL UNCOMFORTABLE AND BELOW AVERAGE; (3) AVERAGE, GENERALLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE; (4) BELIEVABLE, COMFORTABLE, ABOVE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE; and (5) EXTREMELY HIGH, THOROUGHLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

The Final Improvisational Test of Role-playing Ability

The above described version of the IST was that used in the Final Item Selection with a sample of 20 volunteers from the larger
sample of 133 subjects (Step 5b of the overview presented at the beginning of Chapter I). That first version of the IST was changed in a variety of ways before the final IST was used to test the 115 subjects in the Improvisational sample (Step 9). Changes were made primarily in the situations themselves (both in the order of testing and in the substitution of a new situation for the second in the original version), in the order and labeling of the seven dimensions, and in the labeling of the 5-point rating scale. A further change occurred in the training of the raters. The results of the original testing indicated a high degree of correlation between all seven of the dimensions. This had not been the intent of the rating device. So the raters during the final use were trained to make finer distinctions between the dimensions than had originally been the case.

Changes in the situations. Many more of the original 20 subjects than anticipated reported they had had experience in situations similar to that of a cashier in a grocery store. Therefore that situation was dropped from the version of the IST used with the Improvisational sample (Step 9), and the following was substituted:

You are a teacher in an elementary school. You are trying to explain something at the blackboard. But every time you turn your back to the class there is a disruption amongst the students.

A second change concerned the order of the situations. The new order was as follows:

1: Telephone conversation.
2: Conversation with friend.
3: Teenager and parent.
4: Teacher.
5: Elderly person at flea market.

This change in order allowed a number of different objectives to be met. The situations, for example, become increasingly more complex. In addition, the first two situations are well within the experience of all potential subjects. These two situations were intended to serve as warm-ups, to help subjects become relaxed and accustomed to performing the improvisations. Furthermore, none of the situations involves roles subjects would not have had some exposure to, yet there is an increasing likelihood that subjects would not have had direct experience participating in the roles appropriate to the final situations, from parent to teacher to elderly person. A final criterion for the situations included in this test was suggested by the work of Averill (1980), who hypothesized a relationship between emotional experience and role-playing ability. Since one of the long-range goals in constructing a measure of role-playing ability was to test this hypothesized relationship, the situations were designed not to call for any specific emotional behavior. In other words, an attempt was made to assess role-playing ability independently of emotional reactivity.

Changes in the dimensions. In the final version of the IST the order of the dimensions on the rating sheet was changed to reflect what experience on the first version indicated was easiest for raters to attend to and remember (see Appendix E). Placing the
interaction or sense of scene dimension first in the final version, for example, was intended to help raters not only record their impression of that dimension quickly before it faded but also to allow them to differentiate more readily between that dimension and the others. And placing the use of language in the sixth rather than the first position was justified because it was the easiest dimension to distinguish and remember. These seven dimensions, followed by a short description of each, are presented below in the order they appeared on the rating sheets (for a copy of the actual rating sheets see Appendix E):

A. SENSE OF SCENE--INTERACTIONS WITH OBJECTS AND OTHERS IN SPACE. This relates to the way in which the subject interacts with real or imagined objects or people in each situation. This interaction necessarily implies a use of space as well. This means that the subject interacts with objects and people realistically. For example, a telephone is dialed as if it were actually present, or imaginary others are interacted with as if they were present.

B. BODY POSTURE AND MOVEMENT. Whether a subject holds his or her body rigidly or moves it naturally and appropriately in the situation.

C. FACIAL EXPRESSIONS. These should relate to the scene and character portrayed.

D. VOICE QUALITY OR EXPRESSIVENESS. This needs to be distinguished from the use of language. What is judged here is the quality of voice, how it is modulated in relationship to what is being expressed by the character in the scene.

E. EXPRESSIVENESS OF HAND GESTURES. These should be natural and relevant rather than rigid or stereotypic, like finger tapping or picking at clothes.

F. APPROPRIATE USE OF LANGUAGE. The language should suit the character in the situation.

G. OVERALL RATING OF ASSUMPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER IN THE PARTICULAR SCENE PORTRAYED. Here not only the above six dimensions are taken into account but the overall effectiveness of the performance as well.
Changes in the rating scale. In order to reduce ambiguity and provide more uniformity in the 5-point scale changes were made in the labels.

Thus, a rating of one indicated an EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE. A rating of two was a BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE. While a three indicated an AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE. An UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE received a rating of four. And the DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE was rated a five. The phrases appearing in capital letters appeared as labels for the 5-point scales accompanying each of the seven dimensions on the rating sheets used in the Improvisational Situations Test (see Appendix E).

The raters. During the cross-validation process five different raters judged the performances of the subjects in the improvisations. Each subject was rated by two raters, one male and one female. The five raters were divided into three teams, with one female rater taking part in two different teams. For purposes of reference, the raters shall be designated by their sex and their team membership. Thus, there were male A, male B, and male C on teams A, B, and C. And there were female A and female B, with female B also taking part in team C.

For most of the sessions the members of each team worked only with each other. However, in order to correct for possible interactive patterns which might evolve between fixed partners, an
attempt was made to switch partners of the teams a few times. The total number of individuals rated was 115. Of these, Team A rated 58 subjects, Team B rated 28, and Team C rated 12. In addition, Female A and Male B rated 13 individual sessions together, Female A and Male C rated 3 together, and Female B and Male A rated 1 together.

Each rater was provided with a manual designed to explain the improvisations, the rating device, and the general manner of conducting the sessions. A copy of this manual is included in Appendix L. Each team also received six hours of training. An informal approach to the sessions was stressed, with the emphasis on helping subjects feel at ease. Raters were cautioned against inadvertently reinforcing or punishing responses. The manual provided specific illustrations of what types of behaviors might be considered typical of the different dimensions at the various levels of the 5-point scale for each of the situations. These illustrations were based on experiences from the use of the improvisations during the construction of the scale. In addition, during the training session one rater would role play one of the situations while the others would rate the performance. The various ratings would then be discussed in detail. An emphasis was laid on differentiating the seven dimensions of the rating device from each other, as well as the 5 levels of the scale.

During the actual sessions, the last sessions of each day was often viewed and rated independently of the two raters by use of the
one-way mirror. These extra-observations occurred more frequently during the early part of the study. The ratings of the raters and the observer would then be compared and discussed afterwards. Ratings were not changed. These discussions were merely used to provide additional supervision for the raters.

During the sessions, the two team members rating that day alternately assumed the part of "guide" for the sessions. This "guide" brought the subject into the room, introduced the subject to the other rater, and presented the general instructions while the other rater checked the subject's questionnaire (see chapter four) for missing or mis-entered information. The "guide" also described each situation to the subject and generally ran the entire session. The other rater then became "guide" for the next subject, and so on for the day.

Assessment of Situational Experience

As indicated above one of the objectives of the ordering of the situations in the IST was to decrease the subjects' familiarity with the situation being portrayed. The rating sheet for the Final Version of the IST which was used to rate the 115 subjects of the Improvisational sample (Step 9) included a question subjects were to answer after each of the last four situations--Have you ever been in a situation like this one before? This was intended as a check of how well the improvisations reflected situations within each subject's experience. The results indicated, as expected, that each
of the last three situations became increasingly outside the experience of most of the subjects. One out of the 115 subjects reported not experiencing a situation like the second, talking to a friend about any topic of interest. Eight of the 115 said they had not been in the situation of asking a favor of a parent as a teenager, as in situation three. Eighty-seven had not been in the position of teaching or instructing children. And eighty-four had not been in the position of selling something, which was the characteristic of the fifth situation on which nearly all subject concentrated (ignoring, for the most part, that they were also to be an elderly person in this situation).

**Reliability of the Improvisational Instrument**

Tests of inter-rater reliability and test-retest reliability were performed on the Final Version of the Improvisational Situations Test. Thus, all of the results reported in this section are from data related to the Final Version.

**Inter-rater reliability.** Table 1 reports the mean score awarded by each rater, the total number of sessions rated by each, the standard deviation of the scores awarded, and the correlation of the scores awarded by each member of a team with those of the other team member.
Table 1
1st Inter-rater Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Total Sessions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Team r</th>
<th># of Team Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female A</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>102.04</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male A</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female B</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.81</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male B</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.27</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109.47</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female A &amp; Male B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardization of ratings. When the original version of the IST was used in the Final Item selection (as reported in Chapter III) scores on the IST were actually the average of the total ratings awarded each subject by both raters. The use of each rater's raw ratings for each subject was made possible by the high level of correlation found between the ratings of the two raters used. This was not entirely the case when the final version of the IST was used to rate the 115 subjects of the Improvisational sample on role-playing ability in action (Step 9).

A completely average score of 3 on all seven dimensions for all five situations in the Improvisational Test would earn an individual an overall expected score of 105. As Table 1 indicates average scores awarded by all raters were very close to this expected average score. Male C. however, awarded a noticeably higher average
score than the other raters. An analysis of variance using raters as factors and improvisational ratings as the dependent variable yielded an $F(3, 111)=.079$, indicating no significant differences between the raters on their scoring. However, due to the noticeable difference between the mean scores awarded by most of the raters and the mean score awarded by Male C (which may have, at least partially, been a result of the small number of total sessions in which he participated), the decision was made to standardize each rater's improvisational ratings of subjects. Thus, the results reported in the fourth chapter on the cross-validation of the RPA scale made use of these standardized scores. (It should be noted that for both the original and final versions of the Improvisational Situations Test the scores awarded by both raters to the subject were averaged. Thus, during the Final Item Selection the raw scores of each rater were averaged to provide the rating of each subject on the IST. This was at Step 5b. When the IST was used with the Improvisational sample at Step 9, it was the standardized scores awarded by each rater which were averaged and provided the rating of each subject on the Final Version of the IST.)

Reliability of the instrument. A measure which combined both test-retest and alternative form methods of assessing reliability was devised to check the reliability of the Improvisational Situations Test itself. Subjects from the original cross-validation study were asked to volunteer to participate in the retest for a $5.00 payment.
The retests were run no sooner than 2 months after the last of the 115 subjects had been run in the cross-validation study. An alternative form was deemed necessary in this retest because rehearsal would logically improve performance on the original five situations. Therefore five new situations were devised. These situations were worded and presented as follows:

**Situation 1:** Be someone playing with their pet.

**Situation 2:** Choose one of us to play a friend. Think of some area or activity of special interest to you. Imagine that your friend doesn't share this interest. Try to persuade them to share your interest.

**Situation 3:** Be a student asking your teacher to extend the due date on a paper. Play the teacher as well.

**Situation 4:** (This was the cashier situation used in the original form of the test during the construction of the RPA scale.)

**Situation 5:** You are the tour guide in a museum, any sort of museum you like. You are taking both of us on a tour.

Sixteen subjects who had taken part in the original cross-validation study also took part in this retest study. Subjects were assigned to raters who had not rated them before. Most of the sessions were run by the original teams A and B. Team C ran one session, and Female A ran three sessions with Male C.

Since useful means and standard deviations for each rater's awarded scores could not be found for the few sessions run during the retest study, the averaged total performance ratings of the two raters were used as the measure of performance for each of the sixteen subjects on both the original improvisational test and the retest. That the use of these totals rather than the standardized scores was not unwarranted is indicated by the correlation of .99
between the averaged totals of these sixteen on the original test and their standardized scores on that test. The mean of the total scores for these sixteen subjects on the first testing was 101.72, with a standard deviation of 12.92. The mean score on the retest was 103.22, with a standard deviation of 12.49. And the correlation, or reliability, of the two sets of scores was .48.

A reliability of .48 was an acceptable, if not overwhelming, indication of the reliability of the test instrument. There were a variety of possible reasons the reliability was not any higher. The task, first of all, is inherently susceptible to rehearsal effects. And even though these were moderated somewhat by the new set of situations, the subjects were at least more familiar with the demands of the task and had more of an idea what to expect during the testing. Furthermore, the retest was neither simply a retest nor an alternate form of the original test. Rather the two approaches were combined. And, finally, the raters were not as familiar with the situations in the retest as they had become in the original testing. Thus, in the light of these considerations, a reliability of .48 is quite acceptable.

**Summary**

This chapter has addressed the rationale, design, and tests of reliability of a standardized Improvisational Situations Test devised for purposes of helping to construct the RPA scale and then providing cross-validation of the final scale. Moreno (1946, 1972)
has been credited with originating the idea of testing role-playing ability through the use of improvisational situations. Harrow's (1952) test of Moreno's suggestion that psychodramatic therapy can increase role-taking ability provided an instructive example of the construction of a situations test. Unfortunately, like so many other such uses of situations tests, her use of it was far too oriented to the population and concept of interest to make it useful as a more general test of role-playing ability in action.

Due to the usefulness of such a general improvisational test in the present research and the lack of such a measure in the literature, a standardized Improvisational Situations Test was designed as part of this research. The complete instrument consists of five different situations, which increase in complexity of behavior and decrease in experiential familiarity of subjects, and subjects' performance in these situations is rated on seven different dimensions, each dimension scored on a 5-point scale. Subjects' scores are then considered either the total score over each of the seven dimensions for all of the five situations or, if more than one rater is involved, an average of one standardization of these total scores for each rater.

The completed instrument evolved from a consideration of the literature, a logical analysis of the requirements of such an instrument, and the actual use of a preliminary form of the test. The final version was then tested for both inter-rater reliability and test-retest reliability (using an alternate form). The inter-rater reliability ranged from .495 to .86, with an average of .71. And the
test-retest reliability was found to be .48, an acceptable level of reliability considering the various confounding factors at work.

While the question of reliability of the instrument was thus established, the question of validity has not yet been directly addressed. Indeed, the literature as a whole has tended to posit implicit validity in situations tests (as measurements of role-playing ability) rather than actually establishing validity. This issue will be addressed, at least partially, in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALE

This chapter will detail the steps taken to construct the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. First an overview of the entire construction process will be presented, and then each step will be discussed in more detail. The initial step was to review the relevant literature which included both psychological and theatrical sources. A consideration of the comments from this literature led to the conceptualization of role-playing ability as a skill which might best be measured by assessing an individual's capacity for a wide range of activities--both cognitive and behavioral--all of which would theoretically relate to the authentic playing out of a role. These various capacities were divided into hypothetical categories, and items which suited each were then either taken from relevant literature or written specifically for the present research. This provided a preliminary questionnaire consisting of 60 items (see appendix A).

The process of rigorous item selection could then proceed, again in several steps. The first step was to enlist the help of expert judges (faculty and graduate students in the Department of Theater). These judges, in a procedure described below, indicated 25 of the 60 items they believed best differentiated the person high in acting ability from the person low in acting ability. As a supplement to the
judgements of these theatrical experts, an item analysis of the 60 items was conducted using data from a sample of 92 students in a 300-level undergraduate psychology class. As a result of both the data from the class and logical considerations seven items not chosen by the theatrical experts were added to the 25 chosen by the experts. Thus, of the original 60 items, 32 were retained for a second round of item analysis.

Most of the 32 items selected by this method appeared to place more emphasis on what, in Chapter I, was called "surface acting" as opposed to the "deep acting" posited by the present study to characterize authentic role-playing ability. Therefore, items were also added to tap the dimension of involvement. These additional items were adapted from research on hypnotizability, which according to Sarbin & Allen (1968) represents a high degree of role involvement. Specifically, 20 items, some selected from the various scales devised to assess hypnotic involvement (cf. As, O'hara, & Munger, 1962; Davis, Dawson, & Seay, 1978: Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974) and some written in accord with suggestions by Hilgard (1979), were added to the 32. This new total of 52 items was then subjected to a final item selection.

As noted in Chapter I (Step 5a and 5b) the final item selection consisted of two phases. First the 52 items were subjected to an item analysis (Step 5a). The 47 items which this analysis indicated discriminated between high and low scorers were then correlated with the ratings of the 20 volunteers in the original version of the Improvisational Situations Test (IST--Step 5b).
The final 34 item Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale is presented in Table 2 below. A measure of reliability (Step 7) was found to be .86. Sex differences were noted in this final scale also, particularly on items measuring more cognitive activities. And, finally, it was found that scores of the subjects in the Final Item Selection on the 34 item RPA scale were uncorrelated with social desirability and with neuroticism, moderately correlated with extraversion, and more strongly correlated with self-monitoring (Step 7). Each of the above steps in the initial scale construction will now be described in detail. Cross-validational studies will be reported in Chapter IV.

Sources

Acting literature. Schyber (1961, 1962a, 1962b) wrote an excellent series of three articles dealing with the art of acting. One of the primary themes of the articles was a consideration of what makes a good actor. In dealing with this theme Schyber presented the views of a variety of people involved in the theater down through the ages. The following quote is illustrative of the comments garnered from Schyber's work and applied to the present research:

Not only his voice but also his movements, carriage, eye expressions, bodily rhythm, tempo, strength, and weakness in intonations and turns of phrases, must all--through imitation and characterization--simultaneously convey an impression of a concrete verisimilitude and--by means of intuition, imagination and soulfulness--of a higher truth which is immediately convincing, whether the actor is speaking or is silent. (1962a, p. 111)
And, of course, the work of Stanislavsky (1936, 1949, 1961) was of major concern in the initial stage of item selection. This was especially so since Stanislavsky's acting system devoted a good deal of time to techniques designed to help an actor become authentically involved in a role. Edwards (1965), for example, cited six "subjective techniques" derived from Stanislavsky's system:

- observation
- affective memory or recall of emotions
- imagination
- relaxation
- and concentration. (p. 251)

**Psychological literature.** One of the major psychological sources for the rationale, design, and item selection for the RPA scale was the work of Sarbin in the area of role theory (Coe and Sarbin, 1966; Rotenberg and Sarbin, 1971; Sarbin, 1950; Sarbin and Allen, 1968). The 1968 essay he wrote with Allen on role theory presented an extensive analysis of the skills an individual might require in order to provide a convincing enactment of a role and was particularly useful throughout the construction process of the RPA scale. Sarbin's contributions were so extensive, as a matter of a fact, that his name will appear repeatedly below as his influence is cited.

One of Sarbin's primary interests in role theory centered on the hypothetical relationship between an individual's ability to become involved in a role and the same individual's susceptibility to hypnosis. Indeed, Sarbin and Allen (1968) cited "classical hypnotic role taking" as the next higher level of organismic involvement after "engrossed" or "heated" acting (see Chapter I).
Thus, after the initial attempts to assess role involvement by the use of items from Elms' (1966) Empathic Fantasy Scale and Lee-Teng's (1965) Role-taking Scale failed (as reported below), it was logical to turn to a psychological tradition which hypothesized a relationship between hypnotizability and deep, "imaginative involvement."

The set of items intended to assess role involvement which were submitted to the final item selection were derived from the work of major representatives of this tradition, particularly Hilgard (1979), but also As, O'hara, & Munger (1962), Davis, Dawson, & Seay (1978), Shor (1960), and Tellegen & Atkinson (1974).

Bandura (1971) suggested the successful performance of observationally learned behavior involved first attending to relevant behaviors, then the retention of those behaviors, and then the rehearsal of those behaviors--before they are actually performed. His analysis also proved useful in the development of categories and items for the RPA scale.

**Original Categories**

Sarbin and Allen (1968) suggested that role skills might be "broadly divided into cognitive and motoric skills" (p. 515). Primarily for ease of conceptualization this suggestion was followed as items were selected and devised for the present questionnaire. It must be emphasized, however, that, first, the divisions as conceived for this research were not exactly those suggested by Sarbin and
Allen, and second, the divisions were intended primarily as an analytical device and were in no way meant to represent hard and fast distinctions between the items. Indeed, many of the items might justifiably be placed in either category.

When Sarbin and Allen (1968) spoke of the motoric component of role-playing skills, they meant the following:

Enactment of the role requires appropriate posture, movement, facial expression, and tone of voice....Rather precise control and flexibility are necessary for successfully executed social behavior. (p. 517)

This notion led to the idea of asking individuals to report on the degree to which they have successfully performed behaviors relevant to role-playing ability. And so, rather than referring to this general class of items as motoric, the present research referred to them as performance items.

Sarbin and Allen's (1968) conceptualizations of cognitive skills differed considerably from that used in the present research. They suggested that cognitive skills would include the "ability to analyze a social situation and accurately infer the role of the other" (p. 515), skills very similar to role taking. The cognitive items referred to in the present research do not assess the cognitive skills suggested by Sarbin and Allen. Rather they include both items for the measurement of the tendency to seek out and retain cues helpful in the ultimate performance of roles (skills more similar to those suggested by Bandura, 1971) and items meant to assess the ability to become involved in a role.
A complete list of items, grouped according to subcategories, is contained in Appendix A. A brief discussion of each of these categories will be presented here.

**Performance items.** The general class of performance items included seven subcategories: general tendency to perform well, self-control, convincingness, preference for spontaneous and expressive behavior, lack of self-consciousness in behavior, imitation and implicit rehearsal, and self-role congruency. Examples of items from each category are included on the following page.

Most of the above subcategories are self-explanatory. However, several deserve brief explanation. As indicated by Biddle's (1979) definition, imitation is inherent in role playing. Not so obvious, perhaps, is the notion that successful mimicking of others generally necessitates some amount of rehearsal, as Bandura (1971) suggested. Thus, measures of imitative ability imply a concomitant measure of rehearsal of some relevant behaviors.

The measures of spontaneous and nonself-conscious activity differ from similarly labeled cognitive categories (see below) in that they relate to more overt activity.

As Sarbin and Allen (1968) have noted, and as other commentators generally note (cf., Stanislavsky, 1936; Shyber, 1961, 1962a, 1962b) an able role player needs to demonstrate a certain degree of self-control. A similar concept concerns the ability of the role player to convince others with the performance. Items to measure both of these domains were included among the performance items.
Related to convincingness is the category of self-role congruency. Sarbin and Allen (1968) suggested two similar circumstances which could have an influence on an individual's ability to successfully perform a role. First, if one has had experience playing that role before, or has at least been exposed to its performance, performance should come more easily than if one has not had such experience. This was part of the reasoning which lay behind the presentation of the situations in the Improvisational Test as described in Chapter II. Second, the closer a role comes to one's self-concept, the more readily it should be performed. Thus, most graduate students would probably feel more comfortable role playing a junior executive interviewing for a job than they would playing a "hillbilly" factory worker. These two influential circumstances were combined under the label Sarbin and Allen applied to the second of the two—self-role congruency—and several items intended to present a range of compatibility and experience with particular roles were created for the first item selection.

Examples of items for each category follow.

**General tendency to perform well.**

People tell me I am a good storyteller.

**Self-control.**

I am good at telling jokes with a straight face.

**Convincingness.**

I would make a poor poker player, because I'm not very good at bluffing. (scored in the negative direction)

**Preference for spontaneous and expressive behavior.**

I'd rather demonstrate something than just explain it in words.
Lack of self-consciousness in behavior.

I can usually "put on a show" and liven things up without being self-conscious about it.

Imitation and implicit rehearsal.

I can imitate at least three different well-known people.

Self-role congruency.

If asked to play the part of a tightrope walker with hiccups, I could do a convincing job of it.

Cognitive items. The general class of cognitive items included five subcategories: attention to relevant behaviors, memory for relevant behavior, preference for spontaneous versus planned behavior, lack of self-consciousness, and role involvement. The first two of these subcategories were suggested by Bandura (1971). The third was suggested by Moreno's (1944) work, as well as the theatrical literature, which indicated that spontaneity could be an important factor in successful role playing. Lack of self-consciousness would also seem related to spontaneity.

Except for two items created specifically for the preliminary selection of items, the role-involvement items were gleaned from Elms (1966) and Lee-Teng (1965). While some of these items could be considered to measure role-taking skills (these were included in this original selection of items to test them for relevance to the ability to role play), most of the items on the two scales reflected either involvement items or relevant but unclassifiable cognitive items.
Examples of items for each sub-category follow.

Attention to relevant behaviors.
I like to watch people for movements and mannerisms that set them apart from other people.

Memory for relevant behavior.
I have a good memory for voices and the way people talk.

Preference for spontaneous versus planned behavior.
I prefer to plan things out rather than depend on acting spontaneously. (scored in the negative direction)

Lack of self-consciousness.
I feel uncomfortable being the center of attention. (scored in the negative direction)

Role involvement.
After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters. (from Elms, 1966)

I am sometimes able to get so absorbed in a fantasy that I forget about my present self and become someone else in my imagination. (from Lee-Teng, 1965; rewritten into the first person)

General cognitive items.
It's hard for me to act as if I'm a different kind of person than I really am. (from Elms, 1966; scored in the negative direction)

As I participate in different situations, (e.g., being in class, being at a party with close friends, being home with the family) I sometimes feel that I change from the one situation to the other, so that I am not quite the same person in the different situations. (from Lee-Teng, 1965; rewritten into the first person and with slight modifications in the situations)

Initial Item Analyses

The preliminary questionnaire now consisted of 60 items (see Appendix B). These items were at this stage accompanied by a
dichotomous answering system—the subjects answered "yes" if the item described them and "no" if it did not. The 60 items were first submitted to expert judges for their opinions on the validity of the items. Then 15 filler items were added and submitted to an undergraduate class in psychology for an additional analysis using a sample from a less specific population than the expert judges. From the results of these two samples and logical considerations, 32 items were chosen for further analysis.

**Expert judges.** Eight volunteers from the theater department at the University of Massachusetts served as expert judges. These judges included three faculty members of the department (all male), four graduate teaching assistants (one female), and one former graduate student (female). The judges were fully informed as to the purpose of their participation. They were asked to judge each of the 60 items in the preliminary questionnaire as to how well they believed it would contribute to distinguishing people with acting ability from those without acting ability.

The method for accomplishing this judgment of the items, involved each expert answering the full set of 60 items twice, once as he or she believed someone with acting ability might answer the items and once as he or she believed someone without acting ability might answer the items. These two conditions were counterbalanced, so that half of the judges answered one condition first and the other answered the other condition first. Furthermore, the items were not
numbered, which facilitated a random arrangement of the pages on all of the questionnaires administered.

The instructions for the acting ability condition read as follows:

Picture yourself and others you know who are good actors. Then answer each of the following 60 items, circling "yes" or "no," from the perspective of a person who has good innate acting ability, but not necessarily a lot of training.

The instructions for the nonacting ability condition read as follows:

Picture someone who is well-educated and intelligent (perhaps an astronomer, sciologist, or historian) but who has little or no acting ability. Then answer each of the following 60 items, circling "yes" or "no" on each item, as you think that person would answer.

The eight judges reported generally answering the acting condition from their own viewpoint while choosing the viewpoint of an intelligent friend with little or no acting ability from which to answer the nonacting condition.

McNemar's test for correlated proportions (Hays, 1963, p. 741) was used to determine which of the 60 items in the preliminary questionnaire the theater people judged to differentiate significantly (at the .06 level) between the two conditions (the standard level of significance was not used because with so few subjects too few items attained significance at the .05 level, and .06 was considered close enough for this first item selection). This item analysis revealed 25 items which discriminated between the two conditions, according to the expert judgements of the actors. These items are indicated in Table 2 on pages 60-64 of this chapter, and in Appendix B.
Undergraduate class. Because it was felt that the expert judges might have applied criteria which could be either too stringent or too narrowly related to a theatrical understanding of role-playing ability when making their judgments, the questionnaire (with 15 added fillers) was administered to 94 students in a 300-level undergraduate class in psychology. A comparison of the top 15% of the scorers (n=18) and the bottom 17% of the scorers (n=17) revealed 7 more items which not only discriminated between the high and low scorers but also, on a priori grounds, seemed to be indicative of acting ability. These 7 items over-and-above the 25 indicated by the expert judged were thus retained for further analysis. (These 7 items are indicated in Appendix B.) In all, 32 items of the original 60 were chosen for a second round of item analysis.

Role involvement. It was at this point that it became obvious that the original selection of items intended to measure role involvement were not being chosen by either the expert judges or the students. This led to a search for new items which resulted in the incorporation of several items based on the work of Hilgard (1979) and related researchers (As, O'hara, & Munger, 1962; Davis, Dawson, & Seay, 1978; Shor, 1960; Tellegen & Atkinson, 1974). In all, 20 more items intended as measures of deep, "imaginative involvement" were added to the 32 already obtained, giving a new total of 52 items for a second round of item analysis. (These additional 20 items are indicated in Appendix C.)
Actually, eight of the items from the original 60 were compatible with the concept of "imaginative involvement" as delineated by Hilgard (1979). Some of the items from Lee-Teng's (1965) Role-taking scale had been borrowed from As (et al., 1962) and, to a lesser extent, Shor (1960). Only one of these items had been included in the 32 chosen by the expert judges and students. The other seven were, however, retained as well.

In addition to these eight involvement items, 13 more from As (et al., 1962), Shor (1960), Tellegen and Atkinson (1974), and suggestions provided by Hilgard (1979) were added to the new list of items to be analyzed in a second item analysis. There were thus now a total of 21 involvement items in the new list, out of a total of 52. The 52 items included the 25 items chosen by the dramatic judges, 7 items from the students, 7 items from Elms and Lee-Teng related to involvement, and 13 additional involvement items. All of the 21 involvement items are indicated in Appendix C.

Second Item Analysis

Method. To the 52 items included in the second stage of the item selection were added 11 filler items. Appendix D lists all fillers in this second questionnaire. Appendix B indicates the items included from the first item selection, and Appendix C lists the involvement items included in the final selection. The items were assembled in a random order. And rather than the "yes or no" answering format of the preliminary questionnaire, more choice was
provided by including a 4-level rating system. In this system, 1=Disagree, 2=Disagree more than agree, 3=Agree more than disagree, and 4=Agree.

This new 63 item questionnaire was combined with five other questionnaires and administered as a packet to 133 undergraduate students in psychology (female=81, male=47, sex unknown=2). The second questionnaire in the packet was form B of Eysenck's Personality Inventory (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1968). The purpose of including this inventory was to discriminate the role-playing scale from both extraversion and neuroticism. The third questionnaire in the packet was Snyder's Self-monitoring scale (1974). This scale was included to differentiate the impression manager from the able role player. The fourth questionnaire in the packet was the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability scale (Crown & Marlowe, 1964), which was included to demonstrate the lack of influence of social desirability in the items of the role-playing questionnaire. Finally, Gough's (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) Adjective Checklist was included as a potential source of personality information. Unfortunately, this last set of data has so far proven more potentially forbidding in its analysis that useful and so remains, as yet, unexamined. Thus, four scales were effectively dealt with in this stage of the research; the role-playing ability scale, Eysenck's inventory, Snyder's Self-monitoring scale, and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.

Recruitment. Subjects were recruited from the undergraduate pool of
psychology students with the following notice:

We are looking for subjects to participate in a study of interests and abilities in a wide range of activities. Subjects will be asked to answer pencil and paper questionnaires for a period of 1 or 2 hours. We are collecting data on a variety of personality scales. Some of these scales have been newly constructed. The data collected will help to check on the adequacy (clarity, etc.) of the items used in these scales, and to relate them to a variety of already-validated personality measures.

There will be additional opportunity for some interested individuals to participate in one or two additional studies for which they will be paid.

**Improvizations.** After the questionnaires were answered by the subjects, they were provided with the following follow-up recruitment statement:

One of the scales included in the questionnaire that you have just completed is designed to assess role-playing ability. Much psychological research, not to mention psychotherapy and other psychological procedures, use role-playing as a technique. A scale to measure a person's ability in this area could thus be of considerable value.

In order to validate the above scale, and to see how it relates to everyday behavior, we plan two further studies. If you would like to participate in these studies, for which you would be paid, please print your name and telephone number below.

(The second study alluded to in this statement was a concurrent study of frequency of emotional experiences.) Volunteers who were recalled received $5.00 for their help in both studies.

It was decided that those volunteers who scored in the top and bottom 25 percentiles of the overall distribution of the role-playing ability scores would be asked to return for the Improvizations Test (the original version, as described in Chapter II).

The scores of the 133 students on the 52 items in the second
version of the role-playing ability questionnaire ranged from 97 to 183, with a mean of 135.5, a median of 133.7, and a standard deviation of 17.5. Sixteen of the 33 top 25 percentile and 16 of the bottom 25 percentile volunteered to return. Eleven of the 16 High scorers who volunteered actually showed up for the improvisations (33% of the top 25 percentile and 69% of those who volunteered). Nine of the 16 Low scorers who volunteered actually showed up for the improvisations (27% of the bottom 25 percentile and 56% of those who volunteered). In all there were 8 males (40% of the 20 total in the improvisations), 5 of whom were High scorers (45% of the High scorers) and 3 of whom were Low scorers (33% of the Low scorers).

**Item selection.** As a measure of the internal consistency of each of the 52 items in relation to the overall scale, t-tests were performed comparing the mean score on each item of the students scoring in the top 20.1% of the total distribution with the mean score of the students in the bottom 20.7% (n=27 for the bottom or Low scorers and n=28 for the top of High scorers). Using a one-tailed probability of .05 for the significance level of the difference between the mean scores for the High and Low scorers on each item yielded 47 items which met the criterion for internal consistency.

Internal consistency does not guarantee external validity, though it does provide an indication that the scale as a whole is measuring some unified underlying dimension. As a means of further refining the scale, the 47 items which demonstrated the tendency to
differentiate between High and Low scorers as indicated above were further compared with the rated performance of the 20 volunteers in the Improvisational Situations Test. Obviously the improvisations could only serve as an approximate criterion of external validity. There were, after all, only 20 subjects involved in the testing, and these were chosen from volunteers who scored at the extreme ends of the 52 item questionnaire. Furthermore, the Improvisational Test used at this stage, while based on traditional measure of role-playing ability, had not yet been tested for reliability or validity. Thus, while such a test could serve as an approximate criterion of external validity during the refinement of the item selection, the correlations of improvisational scores with the items could not be taken as absolute measures of the validity of the items. Such correlations would, however, certainly yield useful information related to external validity.

Of the 47 items found to be internally consistent on the basis of the overall group analysis, 32 correlated at least .30 with the improvisational test scores of the 20 volunteers. It was decided to use these 32 items in the final version of the scale. Also, due to the provisional nature of the improvisations as a criterion for external validity, two other items which were among the 47 discriminative items but correlated less than .30 with the improvisational ratings were added to these 32 items. These two items were added for specific reasons, as explained below.

The first of the two items added was the following:
I have a good memory for voices and the way people talk. This was one of the two memory items included in the original selection of items. The other item was among the 32 included in the final scale which had been found to correlate at least .30 with the improvisational ratings of the 20 volunteers. And while this second memory item above correlated only .19 with the improvisational ratings, it did differentiate between High and Low scorers (of all 133 subjects) with a probability of less that .001. Since it was thought desirable to have more than one memory item included in the scale, this second one was included in the final version of the scale.

The second item added was the following:

I have a serious interest in creative activities such as pointing, writing, designing, and the like.

Hilgard (1979) indicated that individuals who have the ability to become "imaginatively involved" fall into a variety of general types. One of these types was represented on the preliminary scale by only the above item. This item differentiated between High and Low scorers (of all 133 subjects) with a probability of less than .001. And since its correlation with the improvisational ratings, at .26, was close to the arbitrarily set limit of .30, this item was also included in the final version of the role-playing ability (RPA) scale.

The RPA Scale

Table 2 on the following pages lists the 34 items of the final version of the Role-playing Ability scale according to categories. Also included is a variety of information concerning internal
consistency, external validity, and item discriminitive power. Sources for those items not written specifically for the RPA are indicated in the notes at the end of the table. Those items originally selected by the expert judges are noted there as well. The 4 of the 7 items which discriminated between the class of 94 students (Step 3) are also indicated.

The first datum reported under each of the final items is the t-value for the differences between the mean scores of the 28 High and 27 Low scorers. Also included is an indication of the level of probability associated with each t-value. These values served as a measure of internal consistency. All 34 items were chosen from the pool of 47 items which significantly differentiated High from Low scorers.

The second datum under each of the items is the degree of correlation found between each item and the improvisational ratings of the 20 volunteers. These correlations served as indicators of external validity for the items.

The next datum under each of the items serves as an indication of the degree of "difficulty" each item represents. The percentage of the total 133 students who answered each item in the direction of low role-playing ability is the degree of difficulty associated with the item (Anastasi, 1968). That is, after items were recoded so that high scores indicated high role-playing ability, those students who scored "1" or "2" on a particular item were divided by the total sample population of 133. Thus, the higher this ratio, the more
subjects scored in the low, non role-player direction-and the greater the "difficulty" of the item.

The fourth datum under each item provides another indication of the discriminative power of each item. This index was found by first determining the percentage of High scorers who scored in the direction of High ability role players. Next, the percentage of Low scorers who also scored in the direction of High ability was determined. The percentage of Low scorers scoring in the high direction was then subtracted from the percentage of High scorers scoring in the high direction. The result provides an index of discriminative power (Anastasi, 1968).

And, finally, a further indication of internal consistency is provided by the last datum under each item. This information is derived by correlating each item with a modified total score—the total minus the score for the item being considered. Thus, each item is correlated with the total for the remaining 33 items. This is the corrected item--total correlation.
Table 2
Final Role-Playing Ability Scale and Data Relevant to Item Selection

Each item is followed by the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE ITEMS</th>
<th>Attention to relevant behaviors.</th>
<th>Memory for relevant behaviors.</th>
<th>General Cognitive Skills.</th>
<th>The ability to become involved.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to watch people for movements and mannerisms that set them</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
<td>4.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apart from other people.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When talking with people, I pay more attention to what they say than how they say it.</td>
<td>2.80*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have a good memory for the way people move, gesture, and make facial expressions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good memory for voices and way people talk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cognitive Skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to imagine myself as being various types of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often try to guess what people are thinking before they tell me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ ^a \text{Hi vs Lo} \]

\[ ^b \text{Improvisations} \]

\[ ^c \text{Difficulty} \]

\[ ^d \text{Power} \]

\[ ^e \text{Item-Total \_} \]

\[ ^f \text{m} \]

\[ ^g \text{n} \]
Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi vs Lo</td>
<td>Improvisations</td>
<td>Difficulty Power</td>
<td>Item-Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11**</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.86**</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.69**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.50**</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24**</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.61**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48**</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ability to become involved, cont.

When I dance I often lose myself in the music and the movement. h, i, m

I do not let other people's troubles bother me. j

After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters. f

I have a serious interest in creative activities such as painting, writing, designing, and the like. i

While watching a movie or show I sometimes become so involved that I feel myself participating in the action. h, k

When I read a novel, I become very involved, experiencing what's going on, joining in with the action and characters. h, i

I am sometimes able to get so absorbed in fantasy that I forget about my present self and become someone else in my imagination. k

I am able to exclude everything from my mind, construct a new, imaginary world, and feel for a time that it is real. i

I like action movies more than movies that concentrate on plot or character development. j
The ability to become involved, cont.

I have had the experience of imagining something so hard that it became almost real, for me.\textsuperscript{i}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi vs Lo Improvisations Difficulty Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.66**</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERFORMANCE ITEMS

Involved performance.

I have had the experience of telling a story with elaborations to make it sound better and then having the elaborations seem as real to me as the actual experience.\textsuperscript{h,k,n}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.73**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General tendency to perform.

I am good at playing the game of charades (acting out a concept in pantomime so that others can guess its meaning).\textsuperscript{n}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.33**</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When telling a story I like to play the parts of all the different people involved.\textsuperscript{m}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.45**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People tell me I am a good storyteller.\textsuperscript{m}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.61**</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have participated in a high school or college play or other amateur theater productions.\textsuperscript{m}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.38**</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imitation and implicit rehearsal.

I can imitate at least three different well-known people.\textsuperscript{m}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13*</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am good at mimicking accents.\textsuperscript{m}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25**</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with Improvisations</th>
<th>Item Difficulty</th>
<th>Discriminative Power</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi vs Lo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imitation and implicit rehearsal, cont.

I like to imitate the way people talk, move, gesture, and make facial expressions.\textsuperscript{m}

4.32** .39 .46 .53 .40

Convincingness and control.

People always seem to know when I'm not telling the complete truth.\textsuperscript{m}

4.25** .41 .42 .49 .23

I am good at faking things.\textsuperscript{m}

4.22** .50 .46 .49 .29

I can make just about anybody believe anything I say or do.\textsuperscript{n}

3.89** .44 .40 .41 .26

Preference for expressive behavior.

When telling a story I'm more interested in presenting the facts rather than creating a mood.\textsuperscript{m}

3.88** .30 .28 .41 .27

Self-role congruency.

If asked to play the part of a tightrope walker with hiccups, I could do a convincing job of it.\textsuperscript{m}

9.95** .63 .49 .82 .53

If asked to play the part of a "hillbilly" factory worker whom everyone makes fun of, I could do so sympathetically.\textsuperscript{m}

6.52 .54 .45 .67 .48

If asked to play the part of an elderly person living alone in a big city, I could do so convincingly.\textsuperscript{m}

9.12** .54 .63 .82 .60

If asked to play the part of a Russian peasant, I could do so convincingly.\textsuperscript{l}\textsuperscript{,m}

6.23** .44 .75 .53 .48
Table 2 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-values</th>
<th>Correlation with</th>
<th>Item Discriminative</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi vs Lo</td>
<td>Improvisations</td>
<td>Difficulty Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I can usually "put on a show" and liven things up without being self-conscious about it.

4.67** .48 .53 .42 .32

Note: all t-values significant with p of at most .05; *p ≤ .01; ** p ≤ .001; all probabilities one-tailed.

a. n for high scorers=28; n for low scorers=27; on the 52 item scale.
b. n=20.
c. percentage not answering in direction of high role-playing ability (1 or 2 out of 4) out of 133 individuals.
d. percentage of high scorers on the 52 item scale marking in direction of high role-playing ability (3 or 4 out of 4) minus percentage of low scorers on 52 items scale marking in direction of high role-playing ability.
e. correlation of item with the full 33 item scale which excludes the item in question, on the final version of the scale.
f. from Elms (1966).
g. from Tellegen and Atkinson (1974).
h. from As, O'hara, and Munger (1962).
i. from Shor (1960).
j. from suggestions found in Hilgard (1979).
k. from Lee-Teng (1965).
l. suggested by Sarbin and Allen (1968).
m. from expert judges.
n. from class of 94 students used in first analysis of internal consistency (Step 3).
Sex differences. Sex differences on the overall RPA and the two hypothetical "subscales"—the cognitive items and the performance items—were tested for with t-tests. The results are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Tests of Sex Differences on the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Males Mean</th>
<th>Males SD</th>
<th>Females Mean</th>
<th>Females SD</th>
<th>t-value (2-tailed)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>41.797</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA</td>
<td>87.04</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for males, n=47; for females, n=84.

Thus, sex differences are indicated, particularly on those items classified as cognitive items. Females tended to score higher on these items. In addition, there was a difference in the total RPA scores which while not significant in this sample could be significant in a larger sample. Thus, the information pertaining to the RPA scale will henceforth be reported by sexes as well as the overall sample.

Reliability. The most widely used test of internal consistency and reliability is probably Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The alpha for the overall RPA and the "subscales" of cognitive and performance items are presented in Table 4 below according to sex and overall
As the table indicates reliability on the RPA is quite high. In addition, the reliabilities for the males and the females are essentially the same. These results indicate that any random half of the items would tend to yield results reliably comparable to the overall scale results. Test results should also remain fairly stable over time.

Subscale validity. Results of interitem correlations reinforce earlier assertions that while the items may be logically divided into the two general categories of cognitive and performance items, they do not necessarily naturally divide so. The mean interitem correlation among all 34 items of the RPA scale was only .15, for the sample of 133 subjects. The mean correlation among the cognitive items was not much higher at .17. The mean correlation among the performance items was somewhat higher at .22. The mean correlation

---

Table 4
Cronbach's Alpha for the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for males, n=47; for females, n=84; for total sample, n=133.
among the cognitive and performance items, on the other hand, was less than all of these other interitems correlations, at .11. But this correlation is not that much less than the others. All of these interitem correlations are fairly low.

A factor analysis of the items from the RPA (Step 22, page 125) produced 12 factors with an eigenvalue over one after 25 iterations using oblique rotation--for the males (n=71). And these 12 factors accounted for 74.5% of the variance. The female (n=176) responses yielded 11 such factors after 25 iterations which accounted for 61.7% of the variance. Some of the factors for both genders were similar to the original minor categories used for choosing items in Step 1, while other factors seemed composed of items from different categories. However, a 2-factor solution of the items (which is roughly equivalent to a higher order analysis of the structure of the items; cf. Cattell & Kilne, 1977) was forced. This analysis will be discussed in detail later; for now suffice it to note that the result for the females was to divide the scale almost exactly into its two major hypothetical subscales (see Table 21, page 138). For the males, however, nearly all items loaded most heavily on the first factor.

It would seem best, then to treat the RPA as a collection of discrete data related primarily to the underlying dimension of role-playing ability rather than as two subscales. And while this paper shall continue to present results as they relate not only to the overall scale but to the two "subscales" of cognitive and performance
items, this will be largely for analytic purposes. The primary argument shall be that all 34 items of the RPA combine to measure a simple dimension of role-playing ability.

Relationship to other variables. Table 5 below presents the correlations among the improvisational scores of the 20 volunteers and the scores of these volunteers on the other scales in the packet. The Improvisational Test appears, from these results, unrelated to extraversion, neuroticism, and social desirability. It also appears positively rated to both the RPA and the Self-monitoring scale. All of these results were as expected.

Table 5
Relationship Between the Improvisations and the RPA and Other Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPA Scale</th>
<th>Eysenck's</th>
<th>Self-monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impros</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * $p \leq .05$ and *** $p \leq .001$.

a. Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale.
b. Factor analysis factor relating to acting ability or tendency (cf. Briggs, Cheek, and Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980).

Table 6 provides correlations between the RPA and the other scales for all 133 subjects in the larger sample, as well as for the 47 males and 84 females. Included in the table are Eysenck's extraversion
neuroticism, and Lie scales, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale, Snyder's Self-monitoring scale, and a factor derived from that scale which purportedly relates to an ability to act (cf. Briggs, Cheek, and Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980).
Table 6
Relationship Between the RPA and Related Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Scales</th>
<th>Role-playing Ability (RPA) Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td>M^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>F^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>T^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlowe-Crowne</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirability</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder's</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001.

a. Males, n=47.
b. Females, n=84.
c. Total sample, n = 133.
Table 6 provides a general indication of the relationship between the RPA and those scales included in the packet. There was a moderately positive correlation between extraversion and the RPA, for example, which appeared, for the most part, more a consequence of the performance items than the cognitive items. This is reasonable, since a component of acting ability would naturally involve some degree of extravertedness. The degree indicated by the above results was highly significant but far from overwhelming, and it was concentrated on those items which naturally and logically involve extraversion--the performance items.

A slight and unexpected relationship ($r = .19$) was obtained between neuroticism and the cognitive factors. Perhaps neurotic individuals tend to be more focussed on their cognitive processes. Whatever the reasons, the relationship was negligible.

Similar patterns emerge between the RPA and the lie scale, and the RPA and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale. The similarity in the intent of the lie and Marlowe-Crowne scale accounts for the similar patterns. More interestingly, males seem to rate higher on both scales the higher they score on the RPA, indicating, perhaps that males may tend to overrate their abilities. The females, on the other hand, tend to demonstrate a negative relationship between the RPA and the other two scales, indicating, perhaps, a tendency to underrate themselves. Or, role-playing may be related to a tendency to dissimulate, at least among males in this sample.

The strong correlation between the RPA and the Self-monitoring
scale is also not particularly surprising, since factor analytic studies indicate that the latter also contains an acting subscale (Briggs, Cheek, & Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980). This subscale consists of five questions which essentially ask subjects whether or not they believe they would make a good actor (see Appendix F). The RPA is, of course, much more comprehensive than this acting factor.

Summary

This chapter has presented the method of constructing the final version of the Role-playing Ability scale. Items were first devised according to theoretical analysis which suggested various classes of behaviors that could hypothetically contribute to authentic role-playing ability. The 60 items collected in this manner were then presented to expert judges from the theater department who chose 25 items which, in their opinion, best differentiated good actors from individuals low in acting ability. The 60 items were also administered to a class of 94 undergraduate psychology students and an item analysis performed which revealed 7 more items beyond the 25 chosen by the expert judges which seemed to discriminate between high scorers and low scorers on all 60 items. In this way 32 items from the original 60 items were chosen for a second item analysis. To these 32 items were added items hypothetically relevant to the measurement of an ability to become involved in a role. The 20 items added to the 32 for this reason were generally taken from
the research tradition which suggests a relationship between hypnotic susceptibility and what Hilgard (1979) calls "imaginative involvement." There were then 52 items included in the second item analysis.

A sample of 133 undergraduates in psychology next answered a packet of questionnaires which included the 52 item role-playing questionnaire, Eysenck's Personality Inventory (Eysench & Eysenck, 1968), the Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), and Snyder's (1974) Self-monitoring scale. Twenty of these subjects were chosen from volunteers who scored either High or Low on the 52 item questionnaire to be rated on their performances in the first version of the Improvisational Situations Test (see Chapter II). Items were then compared first on the basis of distinguishing High scorers in the sample of 133 subjects from those scoring Low. The 47 items of the 52 which did significantly differentiate Highs and Lows were further subjected to comparisons with the performance ratings of the 20 volunteers in the improvisational testings. In this manner 34 items were selected for the final version of the RPA scale (see Table 2, this chapter).

Sex differences were noted in this final version of the scale, particularly on those items in the so-called cognitive "subscale" of the RPA. A reliability check of the scale using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) indicated an alpha of .86 for the overall scale for the total 133 subjects in the sample. The alpha for males was equivalent, as was that for the females. In addition, the RPA
was found essentially uncorrelated with neuroticism and social
desirability (with some sex differences apparent on these measures),
moderately correlated with extraversion, and more strongly correlated
with the scale most closely related to role-playing ability, Snyder's
(1974) Self-monitoring scale which is intended as a measure of
Goffman's (1959) impression management, a concept based on a
dramaturgical model like the RPA.
CHAPTER IV
VALIDATIONAL STUDIES

Validation of a scale requires evidence of both convergent and divergent validity. Convergent validity is established by evidence of significant positive correlations with theoretically related traits or abilities. A significant correlation between the Role-playing Ability (PRA) scale and the Improvisational Situations Test (IST) would provide one indication of the RPA's convergent validity. Discriminative validity should be established as well. Part of the process of establishing discriminative validity for the RPA involved demonstrating that the scale is not just another measure of extraversion. A further complication arises with such scales as Snyder's (1974) self-monitoring scale. Such a scale, primarily because of its acting subfactor (see Appendix F), should provide evidence of convergent validity with the RPA. But divergent validity must also be established so that the two scales are somehow distinguished from each other.

A number of different studies were thus necessary in order to provide evidence of the RPA's validity. These studies involved three distinct samples of subjects. The primary sample consisted of 115 undergraduates. This was the Improvisational sample of Step 8 in Chapter I. The other important sample consisted of community actors (Step 11). And the third was used to study the test-retest
reliability of the RPA (Step 14).

A variety of methods were used in the attempt to establish the convergent validity of the RPA. Significant correlations between ratings of performance in the Improvisational Situations Test described in Chapter II and scores on the RPA scale would provide a persuasive indication that the scale does what it purports to do—measures the ability to authentically play out a role. And those who score highly on the RPA should be likely to be rated a good actor by those who know them well. So subjects also had friends and relatives rate them on their acting ability.

Another way to demonstrate convergent validity would be to show that actors score more highly on the RPA than the general university student. An even more powerful demonstration of the scale's validity would entail using it to distinguish more experienced actors from those of less experience. This would be an especially persuasive demonstration because it could be argued that experience in acting has some relationship with acting ability. Thus, though far from conclusive, such a demonstration would provide one piece of evidence that the RPA is powerful enough to distinguish different degrees of role-playing ability even among actors.

A comparison of the RPA scale with other scales designed to assess traits and abilities theoretically similar to role-playing ability should provide evidence of both convergent and divergent validity. The RPA should be significantly correlated with Snyder's (1974) Self-monitoring scale, for instance, since they are both
derived from dramaturgical models of social behavior. However, the RPA should not behave exactly as the Self-monitoring scale, or the information it provides would be redundant. Therefore evidence should be provided that the two scales diverge in their abilities to predict certain relevant outcomes. Perhaps, for example, the Self-monitoring scale does not discriminate among actors on the basis of experience as the RPA scale does. The RPA scale was compared with several tests which, like the Self-monitoring scale, were devised to assess conceptually similar but distinct domains of behavior and should thus provide evidence of both convergent and divergent validity.

The RPA was also compared with tests of traits which should not be very highly correlated with a measure of role-playing ability, if at all and certainly not as highly as the conceptually similar scales. These other tests included assessments of neuroticism, extraversion, social anxiety, and self-consciousness. A comparison of subjects' scores on these scales with their scores on the RPA scale should thus provide further evidence of discriminant validity.

All of the above hypothetical relations were tested as part of the cross-validation of the RPA. The range and variety of hypothetical relations to be tested necessitated the use of a number of different samples during the process of cross-validation. Twenty students in a 300-level psychology class provided the data for the test-retest reliability of the RPA. A sample of 36 community actors (which included three upperclass drama students) provided
data for establishing the ability of the RPA to discriminate among actors according to experience. These same 36 community actors provided data for the comparison and discrimination of the RPA and the Self-monitoring scale. The largest sample by far--of 115 students from undergraduate psychology courses--provided the greatest range of information. These 115 subjects filled out a packet of questionnaires which included the RPA and other scales which were included to provide evidence of both convergent and divergent validity of the RPA. The scores of the 115 subjects on the RPA indicated the presence of sex differences on the scale. The same data were used to assess the degree of internal consistency for the scale, as measured by Cronbach's alpha. Furthermore, these 115 subjects were individually assessed on their performance in the Improvisational Situations Test as described in Chapter II. Each of these samples is described in more detail below.

**Improvisational Sample**

As indicated above the sample of 115 students provided data relevant to more of the hypotheses being tested than any of the other samples. And while each of the other samples can be--and are--described below in conjunction with the specific hypotheses they were used to test, this largest sample cannot be so easily matched to just one or two tests. Therefore the recruitment and testing of the 115 subjects in this sample will be described before reporting
the results of various tests of the sample data.

Recruitment. subjects were recruited from the undergraduate pool of psychology students with the following notice:

We need people to fill out a couple questionnaires for half an hour measuring individual differences in general abilities as well as a wide range of interests—not on intelligence. Then the same people would be asked to show us how they would react to 5 short, typical everyday situations. For this time (about 1 hour altogether), you receive an experimental credit.

Sample differences. Several differences existed between the testing of the 133 students who took part in the final item selection as reported in Chapter III (Step 5a) and these 115 students who were part of the cross-validation process (Step 8). One of the primary differences was that rather that just testing a subsample of volunteers on the Improvisational Situations Test as was done in the item selection, each one of the 115 subjects in this sample was rated on his or her performance in the Improvisations. Therefore, for ease of reference, this sample of 115 subjects will hereafter be referred to as the Improvisational sample. Another difference between the Improvisational and item selection samples was that subjects in the Improvisational sample were tested individually whereas those in the item selection were tested in groups of 15 to 25 subjects. The subjects in the Improvisational sample entered a small laboratory which consisted of an outer and an inner room connected by a door. While the subject filled out the packet of questionnaires—a process which usually took half an hour—while seated at a table in the outer
room, another subject was usually being rated on the Improvisations behind the closed door inside the soundproofed inner room. Once the subject involved in the Improvisations finished performing (after about 20 minutes), one of the raters would ask the subject to have four friends or relatives fill out and return a short rating sheet which included questions related to the subject's acting ability. Then that subject left and the individual in the outer room came in for his or her performance of the Improvisations after completing the packet of questionnaires. And the whole process was begun again. No more than five subjects were run in one day.

**Sex Differences**

The number of females in the Improvisational sample (91) was comparable to the number of females who took part in the item selection (84). The number of males in the Improvisational sample (24), however was half the number of males in the item selection (47). But, while t-tests of male versus female scores on the RPA and its "subscales" revealed no significant differences in the Improvisational sample (see Table 7 below), the females did tend to score higher on the "cognitive" items than did the males. It will be recalled that females in the Final Item Selection sample also scored significantly higher on the cognitive items than did males (see Table 3, Chapter III, page 66).
Table 7

RPA Sex Differences in the Improvisational Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Males Mean</th>
<th>Males SD</th>
<th>Females Mean</th>
<th>Females SD</th>
<th>t-value (Z-tailed)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>8.455</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>43.125</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA</td>
<td>88.14</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for males, n=24; for females, n=91.
a. df=31.59 (These degrees of freedom differ because they depend on the variances for males and females which change with each subscale.) b. df=32.45. c=30.65.

Table 7 also indicates that males in the Improvisational sample tended to score more highly than the females on the "performance" items. The males and females in the item selection sample, however, scored about the same on these items (see Table 3, Chapter III). Thus, while the two samples did not provide entirely consistent results, and even though the Improvisational sample yielded no significant differences between males and females, the indications are that sex differences may exist, particularly in response to the cognitive items. Therefore, as in Chapter III, information pertaining to the RPA scale will continue to be reported by sex as well as the total sample of subjects.
Reliability

Internal consistency. The Cronbach alpha measure of internal consistency was found for the 115 subjects in the Improvisational sample. The results are listed in Table 8 below.

Table 8

Cronbach Alpha for the Improvisational Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Males (n=24)</th>
<th>Females (n=91)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, internal consistency was again found to be high for both males and females as well as the total sample.

Test-retest. A further test of the reliability of scores over time was conducted with a separate sample of students. This sample consisted of 20 students in a 300-level undergraduate course in psychology. The subjects were administered the test twice with an intervening period of two months. Unfortunately, data on sex were not collected.

The resultant correlation between the two dates of administration for this sample was .93, \( p \leq .001 \), for the overall RPA scale. The correlation for the performance items was .90, \( p \leq .001 \). And for the
cognitive items the correlation was .62, p ≤ .01. These results indicate that the total score and the performance score on the RPA scale are both internally consistent and reliable over time. The reliability of the cognitive items is more questionable, at least as far as reliability over time is concerned. The reason for the lower test-retest correlation for the cognitive items is unclear, especially in light of the much better results obtained through the Cronbach alpha (Table 8). Perhaps the small size of the sample was somewhat to blame.

**Convergent Validity**

Campbell and Fiske (1959) noted that correlations between tests which make use of similar methods will tend to be inflated. They therefore suggested that convergent validity is best established through the comparison of assessments of similar traits which make use of dissimilar methods. Thus, a comparison of scores on the RPA scale with ratings of performance in the Improvisations should provide a meaningful measure of how well the RPA can predict performance in improvisations. Unfortunately, the validity of generalizing from high performance ratings in the improvisations to high role-playing ability has not been directly validated, even though the literature has assumed the possibility of such a generalization.

Therefore an attempt was made to provide evidence of significant correlations between scores on the RPA and a variety of other assessments of role-playing ability. Peers, for example, rated the
subjects from the Improvisational sample on how they compared to others in acting ability. In addition, community actors were compared both with the general student population (represented by the Improvisational sample) and with themselves, according to amount of acting experience.

**Improvisations.** As Table 9 indicates no difference in mean scores was found between the males and the females in the Improvisational sample. (Note that improvisational ratings were standardized for each rater separately and then the average of these two standardized ratings was used as each subject's score on the IST, as discussed in Chapter II.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>p (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>.1007</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=91)</td>
<td>-.0266</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Ratings are the average of the standardized ratings of both raters of each subject.

b. Degrees of freedom = 40.99.

As Table 10 indicates the scores of both males and females on the RPA correlated with their respective ratings in the Improvisational Situations Test (referred to as IST in much of the rest of
The magnitudes of these correlations did differ, however, according to sex. In addition, the cognitive items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-playing Ability Scale</th>
<th>r with Improvisational Situations Test (IST)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r corrected for attenuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=91)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=115)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA scales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were significantly correlated to Improvisational ratings only for the males of the sample. Furthermore, for the males, the cognitive items correlated nearly as strongly with Improvisational ratings as did the performance items of the RPA.

In order to better take into account the differences in test-retest reliability of the RPA scale and the IST, all correlations between the two measures were corrected using Spearman's correction.
for attenuation. These corrected correlations are reported in the last column of Table 10. These corrections were made using the test-retest reliability of .48 obtained for the Improvisations (as reported in Chapter II) and the test-retest reliability of the overall RPA scale and its "subscales" as reported above in this chapter. Both uses assume that the measures of test-retest reliability are accurate for both males and females. This assumption can be supported for the IST by the lack of difference in ratings for males and females in the Improvisations, as shown in Table 9. And the assumption for the RPA might be supported by the similarity in Cronbach alpha's obtained for the RPA and its "subscales" between males and females, as reported above in this chapter.

Thus, while the observed correlations between the RPA scale and the Improvisational Situations Test were not as strong as they might have been for the females, correcting for attenuation indicates that the relationship is stronger than observed. However, the cognitive items for the females are still not related to ratings in the Improvisations. The overall RPA scale, on the other hand, did yield significant correlations with the Improvisational Situations Test, providing initial evidence for the validity of the scale.

Peer ratings. The 115 subjects in the Improvisational sample were also asked to have four friends and/or relatives rate the subjects on three characteristics that might be potentially relevant to role-playing ability. Subjects were provided with four questionnaires and
envelopes, stamped and addressed to the experimenter. Instructions to the peers emphasized the importance of being completely candid and accurate in their ratings. They were told that, although there was nothing that might prove embarrassing to their friends in the questionnaire, their responses would nonetheless be kept strictly confidential. They also were told that the purpose of the study was to examine how a person's own perception of his or her behavior corresponds with the perception of others. They rated their peers anonymously. The specific instructions for answering the three questions were as follows:

Please rate your friend on a scale from "1" (low) to "5" (high) on each of the following dimensions, in comparison to other people you know of the same age and sex.

And the three items read as follows:

1) How logical and deliberate is he or she (as opposed to being intuitive and impulsive)?

2) Would he or she make a good actor (for example, if asked to play the part of a "hillbilly", or of a tightrope walker with hiccups, could he or she do so convincingly)?

3) How reserved and self-controlled is he or she in everyday affairs?
## Table II

Peer Ratings and the RPA and IST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Logical</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Self-controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femaales (n=74)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=22)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=96)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPA Cognitive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPA Performance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPA Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p \leq .05; **p \leq .01; ***p \leq .001.

The correlations between the peer ratings and the RPA and the Improvisational Situations Test reported in Table II are based on the 96 subjects from the Improvisational sample who had at least two of their friends and/or relatives return the rating questionnaires. (The mean of the two or more peer ratings was used in all analyses.)
involving these variables.) The most apparent results, of course, is that both the overall RPA and the IST correlate significantly with ratings of acting ability but not with ratings of how logical or how self-controlled a subject is. Furthermore, except for the cognitive items for the females, the degree of correlation is very similar for the two scales and the RPA "subscales." These results provided one more piece of evidence of the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale's convergent validity.

Community actors. As noted in the introduction to this chapter a sample other than the Improvisational sample provided more evidence for the convergent validity of the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. It was decided to study a sample of actors because such a group would be expected to be high in role-playing ability. It was also thought necessary to administer the RPA to a group of actors who varied amongst themselves in their acting ability. One way to vary ability might be to vary experience. Another way to insure variability in acting ability might be to vary training.

It was decided therefore to seek subjects among upperclass drama study in the Department of Theater at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst and among the various amateur theater groups in the area which exist outside the university. Subjects were paid $3.00 to answer both the RPA and Snyder's (1974) self-monitoring scale as well as a few other questions designed to assess both the experience of each subject with acting and their preference for style of acting.
In this manner 33 actors and actresses in the community (19 males and 14 females) and 3 upperclass students of drama (2 males and 1 female) were recruited and tested.

The additional questions these "community" actors were asked as a means of assessing various levels of experience were the following:

How many years of training (both in college and out) have you had?

How many years acting experience (both amateur and professional) have you had?

How many plays (both professional and amateur) have you been in? In how many of these plays have you played a character with five or more lines?

In order to assess preference for acting styles, these same subjects were, first, provided the following descriptions of two styles of acting:

Many commentators on theater distinguish between what might be called "surface acting" and deep acting." Surface acting involves use of gestures, postures, voice, and other outward expressions to present a character or role to an audience. Deep acting refers to some sort of attempt to "become" or "live" the character in some way. The two techniques are not totally unrelated, though some people in theater tend to rely more on one approach than the other. We are interested in your estimation of the extent to which you make use of each of these techniques.

They were then asked to indicate on an 11-point scale (where "0" was marked "not at all," "5" was marked as "half of the time," and "10" was marked as "all of the time") the extent to which they made use of each of the two techniques.

**Sex differences among community actors.** Table 13 indicates the
results of comparing the scores of community actors on the RPA according to their sex.

Table 13

Male Versus Female Actors On the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=15)</td>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=21)</td>
<td>54.57</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RPA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>111.58</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>108.24</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All were nonsignificant with 34 df and 2-tailed tests.

Thus, unlike the sample of 133 students in the item selection (which had a balance of males and females close to the proportions of the community actors, rather than the highly unbalanced mixture in the Improvisational sample) there was no difference between males and females on either of the "subscales" or on the overall RPA. For simplicity, therefore, subsequent discussion will report only the results of the combined male and female sample of actors. However, separate comparisons will still be reported for males and females in the Improvisational sample.
Results: Community actors versus the Improvisational sample on the RPA. The mean scores of the 36 community actors (which includes the 3 upperclass drama students) on the RPA were compared with the mean scores of the 115 students in the Improvisational sample using Welch's $t'$ for unequal n (and possible unequal variances; Myers, 1979) between groups. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 14.

As Table 14 indicates the differences between the scores of community actors and the general student population represented by the Improvisational sample was impressively significant in all comparisons. Thus, the RPA does very well at distinguishing between community actors and university students. Furthermore, the two groups are not only differentiated on the total scale and on the performance items but on the cognitive items as well. The implication of this result seems to be that actors tend to develop and/or rely more on their cognitive skills than does the general population.
Table 14

Actors Versus Students on the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Welch's t' value* against Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COGNITIVE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors (n=36)</td>
<td>55.08</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=91)</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>69.69</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>45.0208</td>
<td>8.455</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=115)</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>66.05</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE ITEMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>54.56</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>40.90</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>43.125</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.365</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>72.56</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>109.63</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>88.15</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.12</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .001 for all comparisons, 1-tailed.

Acting experience and the RPA. The correlations between scores on the RPA and, first, the various measures of acting experience, and then the self-assessments of acting style are presented in Table 15.
Table 15
Experience, Acting Style, and the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-playing Ability Scale</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Training</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Acting</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Plays</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Characters</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Minus Surface Acting</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=36, except for Deep Acting and Deep Minus Surface where n=35. *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001.

From Table 15 it is obvious that the best relationship between RPA and any of the four measures of experience was that with total years of training in and out of college. Years of acting was positively correlated with the two "subscales" but significantly so only with the overall RPA scale. The number of plays and number of characters with five or more lines played in those plays were only weakly related to scores on the RPA experience (1 had 1 year, 2 had 2 years, 3 had 3 years, and 2 had 5 years of professional experience behind them), and that number of years in amateur acting, on the other hand, ranged from 1 to 45 (with a mean of 10.2) years. It was, in addition, quite possible that some of those who reported more professional experience would also have reported less amateur experience, and thus less total years acting, than many of those who reported greater than 10 years in amateur acting.
The implication here is that to ask a group of community actors how many years of acting they have had is not the best method of assessing acting ability. The same argument can be applied to the lack of correlation between ability and number of plays or characters. Years of training, on the other hand, should logically have more relation to acting ability. Thus the pattern of significant correlations in Table 15 does provide evidence of the ability of the RPA to differentiate actors in terms of their acting ability.

Another interesting pattern that emerges from Table 15 is the fairly stable positive correlation between the cognitive items on the RPA and the various measures of experience. This provides further evidence of the importance of the cognitive skills to actors.

Acting style and the RPA. Table 15 also presents the correlations between scores on the RPA scale and self-assessments of acting style. As predicted, there was a strongly significant relationship found between RPA scores and preference for, or dependence upon, a particular acting style. The negative correlation between the RPA and "surface" acting was a result of the method of having subjects rate themselves on an 11-point scale based on frequency of use. Thus, the negative correlation simply indicates that the higher the RPA score the less frequently was surface style preferred when acting.

The last line in the table indicates the extent to which the use of "deep" acting was reported after subtracting the extent to which the use of "surface" acting was reported by each subject. This line best indicates the strength of relationship between use of a "deep" or involved
acting style and the RPA scale. The relationships between the RPA and all three measures of acting style are all large and significant, for the cognitive items just as much as for the performance items, it should be noted.

Interestingly, there seemed to be no bias in the sample as a whole in favor of one or the other of the two styles of acting. The range of estimated use of "surface" acting, for example, was from 0 to 10, with a mean of 5.4, a median of 5.3, and a standard deviation of 2.4. The mode for this style was 4.0, indicating a slight tendency to rate below the average of 5. For "deep" acting, the range of ratings was also from 9 to 10 (for the 35 subjects who answered this question), with a mean of 5.7, a median of 5.4, a mode of exactly 5.0, and a standard deviation of 2.5, indicating a slight tendency to rate this scale higher than the average of 5. These tendencies to rate "surface" style slightly less than and "deep" acting slightly more than the average are, however, not very great. The range and variation of estimates for both styles are very similar, indicating further reason to believe subjects were not biased in favor of one style over the other. Further evidence of a fair degree of independence between the estimates of frequency of use of both styles was found in the correlation between the two scales, which was -0.44, a moderate but not overly strong indication of covariance between the two.

Summary of convergent validation. The several studies conducted to establish convergent validity of the RPA did so with consistently significant results. Through evidence of possible sex differences was found,
subjects who rated highly in the improvisational situations—whether male or female—also scored highly on the RPA. Those who scores highly on the RPA were also rated as potentially able actors by their peers. Community actors scored more highly than the general student population on the RPA. In addition, those actors with more years of training and acting scored more highly than lesser experienced actors on the RPA. And, finally, community actors who reported using "deep acting techniques more than "surface" acting techniques score much higher on the RPA than those reporting use of "surface" more than "deep" acting. The RPA thus consistently differentiated between actors and nonactors in general, and between various levels of experience among actors themselves, demonstrating a high quality of differentiation between more and less able role players, as it was designed to do.

Divergent Validity

Divergent of discriminant validity was established by comparing the scores of the 115 students in the Improvisational sample on several scales deemed relevant to role-playing ability with their scores on the RPA scale and their ratings in the Improvisational Situations Test as well as with peer ratings of acting ability. In addition, community actors were compared on their scores on the RPA and the Self-monitoring scale of Snyder's (1974). The intent of these comparisons was to establish whether or not the RPA scale was truly measuring abilities which could be significantly distinguished from the traits and abilities assessed by theoretically similar or relevant scales. In the discussion
which follows the scales themselves are first described, and then the results are described and discussed.

The scales. Upon arriving for their hour long sessions, subjects were seated and asked to fill out a packet of questionnaires. The first part of the packet consisted of the Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) Personality Inventory, Form B. This inventory was included for the same reasons as in the final item selection—to establish a difference between both extraversion and neuroticism and the RPA scale. This inventory was presented in the exact order and answer format as suggested by Eysenck and Eysenck. The rest of the questionnaires, however, were interspersed one with another in order to reduce the time necessarily involved in answering so many questions, because such an interspersal eliminated the need for filler items. The interspersal of items from the different questionnaires also served to obscure the purpose of each separate questionnaire and of the study in general. One further change in the format included changing all answer scales to the 4-point scale used in the RPA. All of the scales but the RPA and Buss' Self-consciousness and Anxiety scales were originally in a dichotomous answer format. The other scales included in the packet are discussed in detail below.

Performance Style Test. Ring and Wallston (1968) devised a test designed to assess what they called performance style (see Appendix I). Performance style, according to their usage, refers to interpersonal styles, how one prefers to act, rather than how well one is able to perform, in social situations. The items on this tripartite scale were intended to assess preferred modes of appraisal and manipulation of social
situations rather than actual capacity for role performance. The test was designed to measure three different typical styles of performing.

Ring and Wallston labeled their "typology of three performance styles" simply p, r, and c (p. 147). According to them,

A p dislikes and prefers to avoid those interpersonal contexts which, in his own eyes, call for him to "act" or "play a role." He wants merely to "be himself" and for others to "be themselves" too. (p. 147)

Ring and Wallston never seem to have actually named the scales beyond labeling by one of the three letters p, r, or c. But the p performer might be described as subscribing to a personal performance style.

On the other hand,

An r enjoys interpersonal relationships which make a p feel uncomfortable; an r knows what to do in interpersonal contexts where a p is at a Toss as to how to behave... Finally, whereas ps may be regarded as being motivated primarily by self-expressive needs, rs seem better described in terms of a somewhat manipulative interpersonal orientation. (p. 147-148)

unfortunately, there seems to be no easy mnemonic name which can be applied to the r style, as there is for the p and c ("chameleon") styles. This is especially unfortunate since the r style, because it is the manipulative and most interactive style, was the most relevant of the three performance styles in relation to the RPA scale. The nature of this r style can, however, be conveyed well enough if it is thought of as the Machiavellian style (and thus similar to the Machiavellian personality of Cristie and Geis, 1970).

As for the third type,

A c is an individual whose behavior is dictated almost completely by the nature of the interpersonal situation in which he happens to find himself. Such an individual becomes the person the
situations called for; and when the situation changes, so does he, for there is little internal resistance to change. Such a person is usually called a chameleon. A \( r \) is motivated to give good performance but principally of a passive, conventional, approval-seeking sort and has sufficient skill to enact successfully only this kind of role. (p. 148)

The \( r \)- or Machiavellian--style, on the other hand, could be termed more of an active changer, a performer who actively seeks out opportunities to change and manipulate the environment, rather than passively changing like the \( c \)- or chameleon--type. And the \( p \)- or personal--type would prefer instances where his or her self-image could be faithfully displayed.

Each of the items on the Performance Style Test is scored differently for each of the three types. Take, for example, the two following examples from the test:

A. I like to do things that other people would regard as unconventional.

B. I like to be the center of attention.

According to Ring and Wallston, a \( p \) or personal style performer would answer A true and B false. A Machiavellian or \( r \) style performer would be likely to answer A false and B true. While a \( c \) or chameleon style performer would most likely answer A false and B false.

Self-monitoring scale. In 1974 Snyder constructed a scale which, in line with Goffman's (1959) concept of impression management in the service of self-presentation, was intended to discriminate individual differences in concern for social appropriateness, sensitivity to the expression and self-presentation of others in social situations as cues to social appropriateness of self-expression, and use of these cues as guidelines for monitoring and managing self-expression and expressive behavior. (p. 529)
More specifically, the scale included items which describe (a) concern with the social appropriateness of one's self-presentation...; (b) attention to social comparison information as cues to appropriate self-expression...; (c) the ability to control and modify one's self-presentation and expressive behavior...; (d) the use of this ability in particular situations...; (e) the extent to which the respondent's expressive behavior and self-presentation is cross-situationally consistent or variable. (p. 529)

Factor analyses of the Self-monitoring scale (Briggs, Cheek, Buss, 1980; Gabrenya and Arkin, 1980) have demonstrated a general tendency for three fairly consistent factors to emerge from the overall scale. These three factors have been labeled in the following general fashion: extraversion (or sociability/social anxiety), acting ability, and other-directedness. The following item from the scale is representative of what Briggs, et al. called the extraversion factor:

At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (scored in the negative direction)

The following item is an example of what Briggs, et al. called the other-directedness factor of the scale:

Even when I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.

For a listing of the full scale according to the factors of Briggs, see Appendix F.

The complete set of five items which comprised the acting factor of Briggs, et al. follows:

I would probably make a good actor.
I have considered being an entertainer.
I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational
acting. (scored in the negative direction)
I can make impromptu speeches on topics about which I have almost
no information.
I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face
(if for a right end).

There are several differences between Snyder's concept of the
self-monitor and the concept of the able role player as developed in
Chapter I. The most obvious, perhaps, is related to the other-
directedness factor above. In these items, the concern for the
opinions of others, the attention paid to role demands and the
expectations of others is of paramount concern. The self-monitor is
motivated to behave as he or she believes others would either like
him or her to behave or, at least, as others would not object to him
or her behaving. No such motivation has been posited for the able
role player. Furthermore, while the self-monitor does have some
acting ability, as indicated by the last factor above, he or she uses
this ability with calculation to manage the impressions given off in
public. The able role player need not be so calculating. One last
important point of difference between the acting factor of the
Self-monitoring scale and the RPA is that the acting factor items
ask the subject directly whether or not they think they would make a
good actor. The RPA is not as direct. And the RPA includes items
intended to assess role involvement, a domain antithetical to the
concept of monitoring one's behavior. Thus, while sharing an interest
in the individual's ability to perform, the RPA and the Self-
monitoring scales should still provide assessments of differing
traits and abilities and should be able to be discriminated by tests
of divergent validity.

Public and private self-consciousness and social anxiety. Able role playing might be affected by such personal characteristics as self-consciousness and social anxiety. It was therefore thought important to be able to distinguish between measures of such characteristics and scores on the RPA scale.

Actually, Buss (1980) distinguished between two types of self-consciousness. A person high in private self-consciousness, according to Buss, would be highly "aware of the private aspects of themselves" (p.10). A person high in public self-consciousness would be highly aware of herself as a social object. Furthermore the two types of self-consciousness do not tend to occur simultaneously. Buss also noted that public self-consciousness need not lead to social anxiety. He therefore constructed a questionnaire which measured all three of these tendencies. The full scale is listed in Appendix H.

Examples of items from the private self-consciousness part of this questionnaire follow:

I'm always trying to figure myself out.
I'm alert to changes in my mood.

Examples of items from the public self-consciousness part of the questionnaire follow:

I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.

And examples of items from the social anxiety part of the
questionnaire follow:

It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations. I get embarrassed very easily.

Affective Communication Test. In 1980 Friedman, Prince, Riggio, and Dimatteo presented a 13 item test of "individual differences in nonverbal expressiveness" (p. 334) which they called the Affective Communication Test. The full test is listed in Appendix G. The following two items are illustrative of the test:

I can easily express emotion over the phone.
I am able to give a seductive glance if I want to.

As the acronym (ACT) suggests, the test was designed to assess a concept of expressiveness which "is strongly related to dramatic flair" (p. 334). Since the RPA was designed to exclude items assessing affective experience or expression, it did not need so much to be differentiated from the Affective Communication Test as to perform at least as well as that test, if not better.

Summary. These then were the questionnaires included in the packet each subject filled out before taking the Improvisational Situations Test and having peers rate him or her on relevant characteristics. To establish divergent validity the RPA needed to perform in a certain manner with each of these scales. It needed to correlate more highly with tests closer to its own purpose of assessing role-playing ability than it did with any of Eysenck's subscales on the Personality Inventory. It needed to behave in a manner similar to scales related to role-playing ability but provide a better overall prediction of concepts and abilities related to
this ability. The results discussed below indicate the extent to which such divergent validity has been established for the RPA scale.

**Improvisations** Table 16 indicates the correlations found between the various scales and ratings on the Improvisational Situations Test. The RPA, Self-monitoring, or Machiavellian style of performance, and the Affective Communication Test (ACT) are all significantly positively correlated with the Improvisational ratings, though the males' correlations in this sample were considerably higher than those of the females for all but the ACT. These results, however, do not provide adequate evidence of differentiation between the RPA and these other measures of traits and abilities similar to role-playing ability. Table 16 does, however, indicate that Eysenck's measures of extraversion, neuroticism, and lie can be differentiated from the other "acting" scales, for the total sample, as can Buss's measures of self-consciousness. The performance style or chameleon--can also be differentiated from the other scales. Buss's measure of social anxiety is not so clearly differentiated, however.
Table 16

Relationship of the Improvisations to the Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvisational Situations Test</th>
<th>Females (n=91)</th>
<th>Males (n=24)</th>
<th>Total (n=115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting factor</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Test</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self-Consc.</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Self-Consc.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p \leq .05; **p \leq .01; ***p \leq .001.

Relationship of the scales. Table 17 shows the correlations found between the various scales and the RPA scale.
Table 17

Relationship of the Scales to the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Role-playing Ability Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting factor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=91)</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n=115)</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Communication Test:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's Extraversion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-playing Ability Scale</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's Neuroticism:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .15</td>
<td>- .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>- .12</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>- .16</td>
<td>- .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss's Private self-conscc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-sonsc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p \leq .05; **p \leq .01; ***p \leq .001.

The table reveals a general pattern of relationships between the various measures of "acting" ability—the Self-monitoring scale, the Performance Style Test, and the Affective Communication Test—and the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. As expected, the RPA correlates positively with the Self-monitoring scale, the ACT, and the Machiavellian performance style, and negatively with the
personal performance style (which seems to be the same magnitude of the r style but in the opposite direction). Of the three scales the RPA correlates positively with, it does so most weakly with the performance r or Machiavellian style.

The results presented in Table 17 also clearly indicate that the RPA has no relationship to neuroticism, dissimulation (the lie scale), or public self-consciousness. And while the social anxiety scale did correlate mildly with the "performance" half of the RPA, it correlated only weakly with the overall scale--and in the expected negative direction. The moderately strong correlations between the RPA and private self-consciousness seems especially reflected in the cognitive half of the RPA. This was not an overly unexpected result. Some degree of awareness of one's inner self would be a necessary condition for the development of the cognitive skills measured by the cognitive items. Simple awareness, however, does not guarantee these skills will be developed, or even existent. Certainly the Stanislavsky system (1936) emphasized developing and then controlling inner awareness in the service of successful and involved performance. Nevertheless, only for the males (as Table 16 indicates--p.107) did private self-consciousness relate significantly to ratings in the improvisations.

Extraversion. The correlations between the RPA and the extraversion scale presented a problem. A comparison of the correlations reported in Table 17 (p. 108) with the results of
comparisons made between the two scales during the item selection
(as reported in Table 6, p. 70) revealed the fact that the
correlations reported for the females in the item selection sample
\((r = 0.35)\) and for the males in that sample \((r = 0.06)\) reversed themselves
for the females in the Improvisational sample \((r = 0.09)\) and for the
males of that sample \((r = 0.48)\). Males were low in the first and high
in the second, and vice versa for the females. What's more, the
magnitudes of the high correlations and the lows seemed to match.

In an attempt to explain this reversal in the pattern of
correlations between the RPA and extraversion for males and females
in the two samples, a variety of analyses were conducted, after
thoroughly checking for artifactual mistakes. The only reasonable
conclusion of these analyses was that the many differences in re-
cruiting and testing the Improvisational sample as opposed to the
item selection sample (these differences are listed at the beginning
of this chapter) provided two slightly different samples of students.

A look at the scattergrams of the plotted relationship between
scores on the RPA and those on the extraversion scale did reveal two
subjects in the female subsample whose paired scores lay far outside
the rest of the scores—for those females tested in the Improvi-
sational sample. One female subject scored 23 on the extraversion
scale (out of a possible 24) and 72 on the RPA (out of a range from
60 to 116). And the other scored 6 on the extraversion scale and 106
on the RPA. Just how much these two scores affected the correlations
of the 91 females in the sample can be seen by finding the correlations between the RPA and extraversion after these two subjects have been removed. This was done, and the resulting correlation was .19 ($p \leq .05$ with n=89).

Because of the ambiguities of the data the exact nature of the relationship between extraversion and the RPA scores could not be determined. The most that can be said is that there does appear to be some positive correlation between the two scales. And this correlation is of a mild to moderate magnitude. Thus there does seem to be a moderate degree of extraversion associated with role-playing ability as assessed by the RPA scale. But the RPA does not appear to be measuring the same thing as extraversion, as was expected, and this finding provides further evidence of divergent validity for the RPA.

To recapitulate briefly, the RPA scale does not overlap appreciably with scales designed to measure extraversion, neuroticism, dissimulation (lie), public and private self-consciousness, and social anxiety. Role-playing ability is also clearly distinguishable from the c or chameleon performer style. On the other hand, self-monitoring (especially the acting factor), the Affective Communication Test, and the r or Machiavellian style of performing (as well as the negative of the p or personal style), all measure a capacity similar to, but not identical with, that measured by the RPA scale.

**Sex differences.** Noticable patterns emerged demonstrating a
difference between the males and females in the Improvisational sample. The males, for instance, produced higher correlations than the females on many of the comparisons. Furthermore, the cognitive items on the RPA scale yielded significant correlations far more often for the males than they did for the females. The reasons for these results are obscure and necessarily indeterminate, since there were so few males in the sample (24), and since this group of males seem to have been biased in several ways, especially in the greater influence of extraversion and the cognitive items in the overall pattern of correlations for them.

Performance style, Self-monitoring, the ACT, and the RPA. As noted above, for the most part the "acting" scales included in the testing of the Improvisation sample performed in very similar manners when compared with other scales (see Table 22 in Appendix J for a full listing of the intercorrelations of the scales). The patterns of correlations shown in Table 18, however, did provide some evidence of divergence between the scales.

Comparisons on social anxiety. The magnitude of each scale's relationship to social anxiety did seem to differentiate some of the remaining "acting" scales from the RPA. It may first be noted that the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale (which appeared to behave in a manner more representative of an "acting" scale in its correlations with the other scales and was thus considered in the following comparisons rather than the total scale) could not be
Table 18
Extraversion, Neuroticism, Social Anxiety and the Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting factor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (n=91)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample (n=115)</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.51***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.73***</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.001.
differentiated from the RPA as fas as social anxiety is concerned. This is especially obvious then comparing social anxiety's correlation with the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale (Table 18, page 114) with the correlations obtained between social anxiety and the performance items of the RPA (Table 17, page 110). The correlations are nearly the same. And while the females' correlations between social anxiety and the total RPA are significantly different from the correlations obtained by the females between the Self-monitoring acting factor and social anxiety (by the Fisher $r$ to $Z$ transformation, $n=91, Z=2.43, p\leq.001$; Hays, 1973), the men's correlations do not differ.

However, since males and females did appear to achieve similar correlations between social anxiety and the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale, the Affective Communication Test, and the performance $r$ style, the correlations obtained by each of these scales on the total sample of 115 subjects could be compared for significant differences in magnitude by use of Fisher's $r$ to $Z$ transformation. It was found, in this manner, that the ACT's correlation of $-.54$ with social anxiety was significantly different from the acting factor's correlation of $-.38$ ($Z=2.16, p\leq.02$). Thus the RPA was differentiated from the Affective Communication Test through the correlations with social anxiety. Furthermore, the higher correlation between social anxiety and performance $r$ style--of $-.65$--also differentiated the $r$ from the acting factor and the RPA. And the $p$ style, while positive in correlation, had an absolute
magnitude similar to the ACT, thus differentiating it from the acting factor and, in turn, the RPA as well.

**Performance style differentiated.** Both performance styles $r$ and $p$ differed significantly from the RPA in the magnitude of correlation between each scale and the scale of social anxiety. The pattern of correlations between each of these scales and extraversion revealed further evidence for the divergence of the RPA from the two performance styles. The females obviously differed in a comparison of the two scales ($Z=4.43, p \leq .001, n=91$, using Fisher's $r$ to $Z$ and comparing the females absolute--without regard to sign--$r$ between performance $p$ and extraversion with the $r$ between RPA and extraversion). The males' correlations between extraversion and performance $p$'s absolute $r$ (.73) and between extraversion and the RPA (.48) also differed significantly ($Z=1.859, p \leq .05, n=24$, on Fisher's $r$ to $Z$). Since in both cases the correlations between extraversion and the $r$ style were larger in absolute magnitude than those of the $p$ style, both performance styles were thus found to diverge from the RPA on their correlations with extraversion. And, finally, while the males did not differ on correlations with neuroticism and these three scales, the females did significantly ($Z=2.85, p \leq .005, n=91$, on the Fisher $r$ to $Z$, using $r=-.34$ for the performance styles and $r=-.05$ for the RPA). The RPA was thus treated as sufficiently differentiated from all three performance styles.

**Affective Communication Test differentiated.** While the males
did not achieve significantly different correlations between extraversion and both the Affective Communication Test and the RPA, the females did for both the total RPA scale ($Z=3.70$, $p \leq .000$, $n=91$, on the $r$ to $Z$) and the performance items of the RPA (which provided the largest $r$ for the RPA of $0.23$ with extraversion; $Z=2.349$, $p \leq .01$, on $r$ to $Z$). This differentiation, coupled with that presented above in the discussion of social anxiety and the "acting" scales, provides further evidence of divergence between the RPA and the Affective Communication Test.

One further differentiation between these two scales has been mentioned before in this paper. This involves methodological differences. As the examples presented earlier in this chapter (page 106) of the items in the ACT (see Appendix G for the full scale) indicate, the ACT was originally designed as a measure of affective expressiveness. And since one of the objectives of the present research was to design a measure which did not confound affective expressiveness and role-playing ability, the Affective Communication Test would seem more susceptible to such confounding than would the RPA. The subtle differences found between the RPA and the ACT during the divergent validation process provide some indication of the difficulties a confusion of the two scales might produce. The ACT would provide a measure more sensitive to the presence or absence of social anxiety than would the RPA. And, for females at least, the ACT would provide a measure much more
sensitive to the presence of extraversion than would the RPA. The most efficient test of role-playing ability should be the least sensitive to confounding variables such as social anxiety and extraversion represent.

What's left. The only one of the four "acting" scales compared with the RPA in this section which was not differentiated from the RPA was the Self-monitoring scale, its acting factor in particular. It was in response to this lack of differentiation in the data that community actors were asked to answer the Self-monitoring scale along with the RPA. The results of analyzing those data will be reported below, after the presentation of the results of the peer ratings in the next section.

But first a methodological difference between the RPA and the acting factor could usefully be reiterated. As mentioned earlier in this chapter (page 104) role-playing ability does not imply calculated behavior as self-monitoring does. And the RPA includes items intended to assess role involvement, a domain antithetical to self-monitoring behavior. Thus further evidence of divergence between the two scales was actually unnecessary. However, evidence of such divergence would add to the RPA's stature as an independent and effective scale.

Peer ratings. Table 19 lists the correlations between the various scales and peer ratings of acting ability. The correlations of the scales with the other two peer ratings (how logical and how self-
Table 19
Peer Ratings and the Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peer Ratings on Acting Ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisations</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting factor</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance style:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Communication Test</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss's:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Self-consc.</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consc.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05;  **p ≤ .01;  ***p ≤ .001.

controlled the subject seemed) were essentially zero—just as with the RPA—and are therefore listed in Table 23 in Appendix J. The relationships found between the scales and peer ratings of acting ability were again very similar to those found between the RPA and the same peer ratings (see Table 11, page 88). These results, then, simply reaffirmed the relatedness of all to scales to acting ability.

Sex differences. These same results also reaffirmed sex
differences previously found in the sample. Just as their own self-reports did, the peer ratings of the males on acting ability correlated significantly with both extraversion and private self-consciousness. Thus, for the Improvisational sample, at least, the males' RPA scores were more sensitive to both of these traits than were the scores of the females. And the females, with their higher correlation between peer acting ratings and social anxiety showed more sensitivity to this area in their scores than did the men.

Community actors.

Table 20

Acting Experience, Style, and the Self-monitoring Scale and RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-monitoring</th>
<th>Role-playing Ability Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Factor</td>
<td>Total Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Training</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Acting</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Plays</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Characters</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Acting</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Acting</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Minus Surface Acting</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=36, except for Deep Acting and Deep Minus Surface where n=35. *p ≤.05; **p ≤.01; ***p ≤.001.
Experience. As reported earlier in this chapter the 36 community actors who took part in one of the studies filled out both the RPA and the Self-monitoring scales as well as additional questions designed to provide some indication of the level of experience each actor had and the type of acting style they preferred--deep versus surface. As Table 20 shows the Self-monitoring scores yielded correlations with the four measures of experience which were similar to those achieved between the RPA and these same four measures. There was essentially no relationship between scores on the RPA or Self-monitoring scale and the number of plays an actor was in or the number of characters with five or more lines an actor played in these same plays. And just as with the RPA, years of training was positively correlated with the Self-monitoring scale, though only the acting factor attained significance--as did the RPA. Only on the actual number of years acting did the correlations differ for those found between this measure and the RPA and those between the measure and Self-monitoring scores. While the difference in correlations does not attain significance in Fisher's \( r \) to \( Z \) transformation, the results do seem to indicate that the RPA was mildly sensitive to years of acting while the Self-monitoring scale (and factor) was not. One major reason would seem to be the RPA's emphasis on measurement of skills related to role-playing ability as opposed to the Self-monitoring scale's emphasis (via the acting factor) on the subject's own estimate of acting ability. The more
training in acting an individual has had the more likely he would be to report himself a good actor, and the more likely he would be to report skills related to able acting. On the other hand, community actors, who differ on training, but most of whom have little or no training, would have less reason to report themselves good actors, and thus the zero correlation between this measure and the acting factor of the Self-monitor. But lack of certainty about their acting ability would not keep them from reporting abilities in skills related to able acting. And for that reason the RPA does show a positive relationship (which attains significance for the total scale) with the number of years acting, because experience can facilitate the acquisition of skills related to able acting—both cognitive and performance skills.

**Style.** While the RPA and its subscales correlate significantly with the actors' reported preference for acting style--deep versus surface--only the preference for deep acting correlated significantly with the Self-monitoring scale, and then only with the acting factor. Indeed, the difference between the correlations found between Deep Acting estimates and both Self-monitoring and its acting factor differed significantly ($Z=2.03$, $p \leq .05$, $n=35$, on the $r$ to $Z$), providing a clear indication that the acting factor was behaving differently from the total Self-monitoring scale in relation to the question of style.

The correlations between estimates of Surface Acting and the
Self-monitoring scale (acting factor and total) did not attain significance, while those of the RPA did. Furthermore, the total RPA scale's correlation differed significantly from that of the acting factor ($Z=2.16$, $p \leq .02$, $n=36$, on the $r$ to $Z$). And, finally, even the cognitive items differed significantly from the total Self-monitoring scale in their correlations with the most appropriate measure of reliance on deep versus surface acting—Deep Minus Surface ($Z=2.01$, $p \leq .05$, $n=35$, on the $r$ to $Z$). And while the cognitive items did not differ significantly from the Self-monitoring acting factor in their correlation with this last measure, the performance items did ($Z=1.97$, $p \leq .05$, $n=35$, on the $r$ to $Z$). Thus, as expected, the RPA scale does a significantly better job predicting preference of deep over surface style of acting than does either the overall Self-monitoring scale or its acting subfactor.

The results of the study of the community actors, therefore, provided persuasive evidence that while the RPA does perform in a manner similar to the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale at times, it can also be meaningfully differentiated from that same scale at other times. The major difference between the two scales appears to be that the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale simply asks a respondent directly whether or not she feels she would make a good actor whereas the Role-playing Ability scale asks the respondent whether or not they have certain skills related to role-playing ability. And, as the results indicated, there are times when
respondents are able to provide useful answers about skills yet are not able to provide useful answers about acting ability when directly asked.

Summary

This chapter has presented evidence for the internal consistency and the reliability over time of the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. The RPA has also been shown to correlate more highly with scales measuring theoretically similar dimensions—the Self-monitoring scale (Snyder, 1974), the Performance Style Test (Ring & Wallston, 1968), the Affective Communication Test (Friedman, et al., 1980), and the Improvisational Situations Test of Chapter II—than it correlated with theoretically dissimilar scales—extraversion, neuroticism, lie (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1968), public and private self-consciousness and social anxiety (Buss, 1980), and social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). Peer ratings of subjects' acting ability also correlated significantly with RPA scores, as did acting experience among community actors. Scores of people involved in the theater differed significantly from people from the general population of university students. And the more an actor reported making more use of deep acting style over surface acting style, the higher he or she tended to score on the RPA. Thus, the scale did appear to be measuring what it was designed to measure—able role-playing.

The last part of this chapter differentiated the RPA from the
rest of the theoretically similar scales. Comparisons of the correlations of the various scales with rated performance on the Improvisational Situations Test clearly indicated that Performance Style c did not relate to what the RPA was measuring. Neither did neuroticism or Buss's (1980) measure of public self-consciousness. Extraversion did not correlate with the IST for females, but it did for males. A reconsideration of the female data indicated extraversion probably correlates moderately with RPA scores for males and females, but not more so than might be expected, since good actors must enjoy "performing" before others. Females' IST ratings showed no relationship with private self-consciousness, but the IST ratings of the males did. However, both males and females did attain significant correlations between private self-consciousness and RPA scores. However, the higher a male's private self-consciousness the higher he is rated as a actor by his peers. So, for males, an awareness of one's inner feelings and thoughts may very well be related to one's ability to role play. Males' RPA scores also showed more sensitivity to social anxiety than did the females' scores, though both sexes, as would be expected, showed only slight to moderate negative correlations in this respect.

The RPA was not so readily differentiated from the two Performance Styles p and r, from the Affective Communication Test, or from the Self-monitoring scale—especially from the Self-monitoring acting factor. Nevertheless, while all of the remaining "acting" scales
were positively and significantly related to social anxiety, the Performance Styles $r$ and $p$ and the Affective Communication Test were found to be significantly more sensitive to social anxiety than were the Self-monitoring and RPA scales. The two Performance Styles and the ACT were further found to differ from the Self-monitoring and RPA scales in their degree of sensitivity to extraversion. And, for females at least, the two Performance Styles showed significantly more sensitivity to neuroticism than did the Self-monitoring and RPA scales.

And, finally, data from the testing of community actors revealed divergence between the RPA and the Self-monitoring scale. Both scales did well at predicting years of training in actors. But the RPA showed an almost equal ability to predict years of acting for community actors while the Self-monitoring scale did not predict years of acting at all. In addition, the RPA seems to provide clear indication of an actor's preference for acting style while the Self-monitoring scale does not. The primary distinction between the two scales--the RPA and the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale--appears to lie in the directness of their questioning about acting ability. Whereas the acting factor just simply asks a respondent whether or not they would make an able actor, the RPA asks the respondent about abilities at skills related to acting and role-playing ability. And, as this chapter has demonstrated, the Role-playing ability scale both reliably and validly assesses an individual's ability to authentically play our a role.
CHAPTER V
FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The process of constructing a valid and reliable paper-and-pencil test of role-playing ability was discussed in detail in the preceding chapters. This complete process is summarized in this chapter, and potential areas of research suggested by the data are presented as well. These areas include attempts to validate the Improvisational Situations Test, closer scrutiny of sex differences in role-playing ability, and analysis of the differences and similarities between items in the performance half of the RPA and items in the cognitive half. As an aid to further research, normative data on the RPA and its "subscales" were found for males and females. The results of factor analysis are also discussed in this chapter, especially the results of forcing two factors for the 34 items of the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale. And, finally, a few areas of research are suggested wherein the assessment of role-playing ability might provide interesting and fruitful results.

Scale Construction

A research of theatrical and psychological literature led to the creation of several skill categories thought to contribute substantially to role-playing ability. Items were then either drawn from various sources in the psychological literature or written
specifically for the scale--with the intention of matching items to the various proposed categories of skills. This list of items was then judged by theatrical experts for the ability of each item to distinguish between individuals with good, "innate" acting ability and those without such ability. The judgments of the experts were then compared with an item analysis of answers provided by students to the items on the list. In this manner 32 items were gleaned from the list as most able to distinguish high from low role-players. To these items were added 20 more intended to measure role involvement. The new list of 52 items was answered by 133 students. The 47 items which distinguished between high and low scorers on the total 52 items were submitted to one further selection process; namely, the correlations of these items with the ratings of 20 volunteers in the original version of the Improvisational Situations Test (Step 5b) provided the final selection criterion. The final Role-plyaing Ability (RPA) scale which emerged from this process of item selection consisted of 34 items (see Table 2, Chapter III, and Appendix A).

Cross-validation

Cross-validation of the RPA involved a number of different tests using a variety of samples of subjects. One of the important tests of convergent validity involved the correlations between the RPA and the Improvisational Situations Test (IST). The RPA and the other "acting"
scales included in the study did correlate significantly--if less than expected--with ratings in the IST, though in some cases the correlations were as high as could be reasonably be expected, i.e., after correction for attenuation.

**Improvisational Situations Test.** The extent to which the IST measures what it purports to measure--role-playing ability in action--is still an open question. Very little is know about what traits and abilities--besides those relevant to role-playing ability--might influence performance on the IST. Because the IST was such an unknown quantity in the present study the magnitude of its correlations with the other scales could not be taken as an unequivocal indication of any scale's ability to assess role-playing ability.

Any number of factors in the present study could have contributed to ambiguous validity in the ratings of the IST. With each subject performing under the close scrutiny of two raters who were not to show any reaction to the subject's performance and who very noticeably filled out a rating sheet after each performance, ratings could very well have varied according to each subject's level of performance anxiety, evaluation anxiety, and audience effects associated with all of the above-named factors. Furthermore, the small size of the lab room wherein the ratings took place (about \( \frac{1}{2} \) the average living room) forced a close proximity between subject and raters which may have served to intensify these same problems.

It is interesting to note that subjects demonstrated only a weak
(and nonsignificant) negative relationship to public self-consciousness (see Table 16, page 107, Chapter IV). Thus, an awareness of oneself as a social object did not greatly influence ratings. But, for males only, an awareness "of the private aspects of themselves" (Buss, 1980, p. 10)—as measured by private self-consciousness—actually related to higher ratings in the improvisations. And for both males and females role-playing ability as measured by the RPA also correlated significantly with private self-consciousness, especially on the cognitive items (see Table 17, page 108, Chapter IV). It would thus appear that increased awareness of one's private thoughts and feelings is related to increased role-playing ability, or, at least, increased certainty about one's possession of particular cognitive skills.

The primary point here is that the validity of the Improvisational Situations Test as a measure of role-playing ability in action was neither directly studied nor more than tentatively addressed in this present research. Now that a standardized test has been developed such cross-validation research would seem necessary before further use can be made of the IST. And more research into both the similarities and differences between the IST and the RPA could provide theoretically interesting insight into the relationship between actional and self-report measures of role-playing ability.

Convergent validity of the RPA. Data relevant to the validity of the
RPA scale were reported in Chapter IV. The RPA correlated with the other measures of "acting" ability—the Affective Communication Test, the personal and Machiavellian styles of performance, and the Self-monitoring scale. Scores on the RPA also distinguished between subjects theoretically high in acting ability and those of average or below average ability. Most impressively, the RPA distinguished among actors on the basis of years training and years acting. It was also able to predict preference for acting style—deep or surface—among actors. All of these factors contributed to establishing the convergent validity of the RPA.

Divergent validity of the RPA. The correlations obtained between ratings on the improvisations and the scales successfully indicated that the RPA can be differentiated from Eysenck's measures of extraversion, neuroticism, and lying behavior, from Buss's measures of self-consciousness, and from the chameleon style of performance (Table 16, page 108, Chapter IV). Scores of subjects in the item selection sample on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale indicated the RPA did not consist of items biased in terms of social desirability (Table 6, page 70, Chapter III). Social anxiety, while significantly negatively correlated with the RPA was only mildly so and was differentiated from the RPA mainly because the low magnitude of the correlation differed from the stronger relationship between the RPA and theoretically closer scales (such as the Self-monitoring scale; Table 17, page 109, Chapter IV).
The ACT and the performance styles \( p \) and \( r \) were shown (Table 18, page 114, Chapter IV) to be more sensitive to social anxiety than were either the RPA or the Self-monitoring scale. In addition, the ACT and two performance styles demonstrated more sensitivity to extraversion than did the other two scales. And the two performance styles displayed more sensitivity to neuroticism as well. These significantly greater sensitivities were sufficient to differentiate the ACT and the two performance styles \( p \) and \( r \) from the RPA and the Self-monitoring scales.

Actually the relationship appeared to be strongest between the RPA and the acting factor of the Self-monitoring scale. The final differentiation between these two scales was achieved by comparing their performances with community actors. The RPA was able to predict total years acting while the Self-monitoring scale and its acting factor were unable to do so. Furthermore, the RPA predicted preference for style of acting--deep or surface--significantly better than did either the Self-monitoring scale or its acting factor. These differentiations between the two scales provided the final evidence of the RPA's divergent validity. And the demonstration of the reliability of the RPA--both internally and over time--completed the establishment of the cross-validation of the scale's ability to measure role-playing ability.

**Sex Differences**

There are innumerable directions further research could take
with the RPA as a tool. One such direction would be to investigate the presence of sex differences in role-playing ability found in the present research. Such sex differences have been found by at least one other group of researchers. Friedman, Riggio, and Segall (1980) also reported sex differences in acting ability when subjects were rated on their ability to enact specific emotions. These researchers found the following sex differences in personality traits (from the Jackson Personality Research Form, Jackson, 1974) associated with acting ability:

Impulsive (uninhibited, spontaneous) males were better able to enact emotions but this relationship did not hold true for females...This finding indicates that males who readily vent their feelings are also able to enact feelings; perhaps those males socialized to be "manly" and hold back feelings...also lose the ability to enact emotion. Similar differences occurred regarding Play...

Otherwise, males and females seem to show similar results. However, on Nurturance (assists others, cares for children), the correlations with acting abilities are higher for females. More nurturant people were less able to enact emotion...It may be that nurturant people are more concerned with (and good at) detecting the emotional needs of others rather than with commun- icating their own feelings. (p. 44)

The results of the present research indicate possible sex differences in sensitivity to extraversion, social anxiety, and perhaps private self-consciousness. A stronger delineation of such sex differences is an important issue for further research.

As an aid to such further reseach, Table 24 in Appendix K provides a listing of normative data related to the RPA and its "subscales" for females, and Table 25 in Appendix K provides normative data for males. These listings were derived by combining the results
of subjects in both the item selection sample and the Improvisational sample. For females here, n=176, and for the males, n=71.

**Factor Analysis and the RPA "Subscales"**

Another difference which appeared between the sexes, in the Improvisational sample at least, was the difference in the significance of the cognitive items for the males and the females. This calls attention to the theoretical differences and similarities between these two "subscales" of the RPA. Further study of these two subscales could prove a fruitful avenue of research.

An attempt was made to factor analyze the RPA items by sex using oblique rotation. For males (n=71) this yielded 12 factors with an eigenvalue over one after 25 iterations, and these 12 factors accounted for 74.5% of the variance. For females (n=176) this analysis yielded 11 such factors after 25 iterations which accounted for 61.7% of the variance. Some of the factors for both genders were similar to the original minor categories used for choosing items in Step 1. Both males and females, for example, had a factor on which the following three items loaded highly—the item which assessed ability to **imitate** three well-known people (#5 in Appendix A), the item which assessed the ability to **mimic** accents (#17), and the item which assessed an inclination to **imitate** people (#32). Other factors, on the other hand, grouped together in slightly altered forms. All of the so-called **Self-role congruency** items ("If asked to play..."; items 8,
14, 25, and 30 in Appendix A), for example, loaded on the first factor for the females, along with the item assessing ability at Charades (#16), the item assessing lack of self-consciousness in performance (#34), and the item related to amateur acting experience (#40). But for the males, the Self-role congruency items divided into three different factors, the amateur acting experience shared one of these three factors, and the charades item loaded highly on a fourth factor.

In order to see how the items would divide if there were just two factors, a 2-factor solution was forced. When such a factor solution is forced, it provides results similar to what would be derived if a higher order analysis were performed on the original 11 or 12 factors (Catell & Kline, 1977). In other words, if the items which loaded highly on the 11 or 12 first-order factors were combined into 11 or 12 new "combination" items, a factor analysis would provide a new set of factors representing a second-order analysis. And if these new factors were combined and submitted to factor analysis again, a third-order solution would result. Forcing a 2-factor solution approximates this process.

The loadings of each item in the 2-factor solution are reported in Table 21 on pages 137-138. Each item was placed with the factor with which it loaded the highest. The loadings shown in Table 21 are the highest loading attained by each item for males and females.

Interestingly, the two factors for the females divided almost
exactly into either performance or cognitive items. For the males, however, the first factor consisted of 25 of the 34 items in the RPA, with 11 of the 25 "cognitive" items. Thus, for the males in the two samples used, the cognitive items seemed to have played an indistinguishable role from the performance items in determining role-playing ability.
Table 21

Factor Loadings of Items on the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=176)</th>
<th>Males (n=71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGNITIVE ITEMS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. imagine (daydream) vividly</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. dance..lose myself</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. people's troubles bother me</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. watch people's mannerisms</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. after play feel as characters</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. interest in creative activity</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. attend to how people express</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. memory for way people move</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. become involved in movies</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. become involved in novels</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. get absorbed in fantasy</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. able to construct world</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. like character development</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. imagine myself various people</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. guess what people thinking</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. memory for voices</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. imagination became real</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE ITEMS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. create mood in stories</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. imitate three people</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. can't tell am telling truth</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. can play tightrope walker</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. elaborations seem real</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. can play &quot;hillbilly&quot;</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>(.45) .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. good at charades</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE ITEMS CONTINUED:</th>
<th>Females (n=176)</th>
<th>Males (n=71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. can mimic accents</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. play parts of story</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. good at faking things</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. can play elderly person</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. am good storyteller</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. can play Russian</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. can imitate people's talk</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. can make anybody believe</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. can &quot;put on a show&quot;</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. been in high school plays</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. These data are based on a forced two-factor solution. Items are numbered according to final order per Appendix A. The items have been paraphrased and worded in the positive RPA direction. Loadings are from the Oblique Factor Structure Matrix after Rotation with Kaiser Normalization (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, Bent, 1975).
Potentials for Further Research

Future research on role-playing ability can take—with the help of the RPA—any number of relevant avenues. The construction and cross-validation of the RPA brought to light some interesting questions about sex differences in role-playing ability and about the theoretical subcategories of "cognitive" and "performance" items within the scale itself. Any number of reasons for these differences might be suggested, many of which could bear closer study.

As a paper-and-pencil test of role-playing ability the RPA should provide a quick and efficient instrument for research into a number of issues related to role theory. An investigation of the relationship, if any, between role-playing ability and role-taking ability would be particularly interesting. And there are questions about what influence role-playing ability might have on counseling ability, leadership ability, or sociability—to name a few—which might find answers through the use of the RPA.

The RPA need not, of course, be limited to use within the domain of role theory. It would be useful to attempt to delineate the contribution of role-playing ability to social development—and vice versa. The correlation between susceptibility to stress and role-playing ability would be equally interesting to look at. As would a study of the possible correspondence between family functioning and the role-playing ability of family members. Studies have already
begun (Averill, in progress) studying the relationship between role-playing ability as assessed by the RPA and emotional behavior. A related question might be to ask whether or not psychopaths differ from individuals judged high in empathy as far as their role-playing ability is concerned.

Clearly many more areas of research could be furthered with the help of a quick and efficient measure of role-playing ability. It was for that reason that the Role-playing Ability (RPA) scale was conceived and constructed. The research reported in this thesis described how the RPA was constructed and provided evidence of its reliability and validity. And, as indicated above, it is already being put to use. Hopefully its availability will eventually serve as a spur to other research as well.
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APPENDIX A

Role-playing Ability (RPA) Scale
Role-playing Ability (RPA) Scale

Instructions: On the following pages you will find a series of short statements with which you are asked to rate the degree to which you agree. There are no right or wrong answers here. This isn't a test of intelligence but rather of interests and abilities in a wide range of activities. Work as quickly as you can and don't spend too much time on any one question.

In marking your answers, use the following system:

- If you AGREE with the statement, CIRCLE the A.
- If you AGREE MORE THAN DISAGREE, CIRCLE the B.
- If you DISAGREE MORE THAN AGREE, CIRCLE the C.
- If you DISAGREE with the statement, CIRCLE THE D.

Be sure not to omit any questions.

COGNITIVE ITEMS

Attention to relevant behaviors.
9. I like to watch people for movements and mannerisms that set them apart from other people.
15. When talking with people, I pay more attention to what they say than how they express it. (F)

Memory for relevant behaviors.
20. I do not have a good memory for the way people move, gesture, and make facial expressions. (F)
38. I have a good memory for voices and the way people talk.

General cognitive skills.
35. I like to imagine myself as being various types of people.
37. I often try to guess what people are thinking before they tell me.

The ability to become involved.
2. If I wish, I can imagine (or daydream) some things so vividly that they hold my attention in the way a good movie or story does.
4. When I dance I often lose myself in the music and the movement.
7. I do not let other people's troubles bother me. (F)
10. After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters.
Ability to become involved cont.

13. I have a serious interest in creative activities such as painting, writing, designing, and the like. 

21. While watching a movie or show I sometimes become so involved that I feel myself participating in the action.

22. When I read a novel, I become very involved, experiencing what’s going on, joining in with the action and the characters.

26. I am sometimes able to get so absorbed in a fantasy that I forget about my present self and become someone else in my imagination.

29. I am able to exclude everything from my mind, construct a new, imaginary world, and feel for a time that it is real.

31. I like action movies more than movies that concentrate on plot or character development. (F)

39. I have had the experience of imagining something so hard that it becomes almost real, for me.

PERFORMANCE ITEMS

Involved performance.

12. I have had the experience of telling a story with elaborations to make it sound better and then having the elaborations seem as real to me as the actual experience.

General tendency to perform.

16. I am good at playing the game of charades (acting out a concept in pantomime so that others can guess its meaning).

18. When telling a story I like to play the parts of all the different people involved.

27. People tell me I am a good storyteller.

40. I have participated in a high school or college play or other amateur theater productions.

Imitation and implicit rehearsal.

5. I can imitate at least three different well-known people.

17. I am good at mimicking accents.

32. I like to imitate the way people talk, move, gesture, and make facial expressions.
Convincingness and control.

6. People always seem to know when I'm not telling the complete truth. (F)

23. I am good at faking things.

33. I can make just about anybody believe anything I say or do.

Preference for expressive behavior.

3. When telling a story I'm more interested in presenting the facts rather than creating a mood or entertaining. (F)


34. I can usually "put on a show" and liven things up without being self-conscious about it.

Self-role congruency.

8. If asked to play the part of a tightrope walker with hiccups, I could do a convincing job of it.

14. If asked to play the part of a "hillbilly" factory worker whom everyone makes fun of, I could do so sympathetically.

25. If asked to play the part of an elderly person living alone in a big city, I could do so convincingly.

30. If asked to play the part of a Russian peasant, I could do so convincingly.

FILLERS

1. I like to sleep late on the weekend.

11. If asked to draw a horse, I could do so convincingly.

19. I like to tinker with mechanical or electrical things, work on cars or repair household appliances, etc.

24. When speaking in front of large groups, I prefer to use a prepared outline or speech rather than speak extemporaneously.

28. I feel uncomfortable being the center of attention.

36. I talk with my hands.

NOTES

NOTES Continued


c. Nearly all of the sources reported in this set of notes were influenced by the following work. The items noted here were created from suggestions from Hilgard, J.R. Personality and Hypnosis: A study of imaginative involvement. (2nd ed.), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.


e. This item was suggested by Sarbin, T.R. and Allen, V.L. Role theory. In G. Linzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of social psychology, vol. 1, 1968, 488-566.


h. High scores are awarded for answers in the negative--disagreement--direction for these items. All other items are scored in the positive--agreement--direction, with the lowest score=1 and the highest=4 for all items.

j. Each item is to be followed by the following letters: A B C D.

k. See, also, Table 2, page , in Chapter III for details related to the final item selection.
APPENDIX B

The first 60-Item RPA
The First 60-Item RPAG

COGNITIVE ITEMS

Attention to relevant behaviors.
5. I like to watch people for movements and mannerisms that set them apart from other people. a,b,c,
59. When talking with people, I pay more attention to what they say than how they express it. (F) a,b,c,f
67. I am aware of the way other people look, what they wear, how they cut their hair, etc.

Memory for relevant behaviors.
13. I have a good memory for voices and the way people talk. a,b,c
35. I do not have a good memory for the way people move, gesture, and make facial expressions. (F) a,b,c,f

Preference for spontaneous versus planned behavior.
33. When speaking in front of large groups, I prefer to use a prepared outline or speech rather than speak extemporaneously. (F) b,e,f
66. I prefer to plan things out rather than depend on acting spontaneously. (F) f

Lack of self-consciousness.
32. I feel uncomfortable being the center of attention. (F) a,b,f
26. I like being the life of the party.

Ability to become involved.
17. When I dance I often lose myself in the music and the movement. a,b,c
37. I don't have much sense of rhythm. (F) f

Items from Elms' (1966) role-taking scale.
18. After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters. b,c,k
28. It's hard for me to act as if I'm a different kind of person than I really am. (F) a,b,f
57. I often try to guess what people are thinking, before they tell me. b,c,k
Items from Elms' (1966) role-taking scale, cont.

68. I like to imagine myself as being various types of people. a,b,c

6. When I see strangers, I almost never try to imagine what they are thinking. (F)

30. I usually feel that I know exactly what mood my friends are in, even when nothing is said in words.

43. A person can't really know what is going on inside someone else's head. (F) f

62. When I disagree with a person, I do not try to feel in my own mind the reason why the person holds an opinion different from mine. (F)

70. I find it hard to imagine what it would be like to be paralyzed from the neck down. (F) f,n

Items from Lee-Teng's (1965) scale.

4. I have recollected past experience in my life with such clarity and vitality that it was almost like living them again. b,d

19. While watching a movie or show I sometimes become so involved that I feel myself participating in the action. b,d

24. I can recall having had an imaginary playmate with whom I played on many occasions while alone. b,k

36. I am sometimes able to get so absorbed in fantasy that I forget about my present self and become someone else in my imagination. b,c,d

61. I have had the experience of telling a story with elaborations to make it sound better and then having the elaboration seem as real to me as the actual experience. b,c,d

27. I enjoy roller-coasters, ferris wheels and similar rides at the amusement park.

31. As I participate in different situations, (e.g., being in class, being at a party with close friends, being home with the family) I sometimes feel that I change from the one situation to the other, so that I am not quite the same person in the different situations.

63. I have participated (been caught up in) in a crowd action (mass demonstrations, mass audiences, concerts, dormitory raids, riots, rallies, etc.) and found myself doing and feeling things I would not normally do or feel.

75. I can easily assume the leader's role in one situation and the follower's in another.
PERFORMANCE ITEMS

General tendency to perform.

2. When telling a story I like to play the parts of all the different people involved. a,b,c

16. I have participated in a high school or college play, or other amateur theatre productions. b,c,e

23. I am good at playing the games of charades (acting out a concept in pantomime so that others can guess its meaning). b,c,k

64. People tell me I am a good storyteller. a,b,c

3. I like to help people enjoy themselves.

Imitation and implicit rehearsal.

39. I can imitate at least three different well-known people. a,b,c

53. I like to imitate the way people talk, move, gesture, and make facial expressions. a,b,c

72. I am good at mimicking accents.

Self-control.

52. I am good at telling jokes with a straight face. a,b

20. When I want something, I do my best to go out and get it.

22. I know when I start to "go too far" with joking or teasing or showing off, and I am usually able to stop myself in time.

29. Even though I may be very nervous, I am usually able to appear calm and collected when I need to.

40. No matter what goes on around me, I usually know what to say or do.

42. When I say or do something potentially embarrassing, I am quick to recover and correct for this.

Convincingness.

9. I am good at faking things. a,b,c

38. I can make just about anybody believe anything I say or do. b,c,k

50. I would make a poor poker player, because I'm not very good at bluffing. (F) b,e,f

55. People always seem to know when I'm not telling the complete truth. (F) a,b,c,f
Preference for spontaneous and expressive behavior.
15. When telling a story I'm more interested in presenting the facts rather than creating a mood or entertaining. (F) a, b, c
49. I'd rather demonstrate something than just explain it in words. a, b
65. I have good reflexes. b, k

71. I can usually "put on a show" and liven things up without being self-conscious about it. a, b, c
47. I can easily organize groups in games.
58. When things get dull, people don't generally look to me to liven things up. (F)

Self-role congruency.
8. If asked to play the part of a "hillbilly" factory worker whom everyone makes fun of, I could do so sympathetically. a, b, c
11. If asked to play the part of someone being interviewed for a junior executive position, I could do so convincingly. b, k
14. If asked to play the part of a tightrope walker with hiccups, I could do a convincing job of it. a, b, c
21. If asked to play the part of a parent catching my child smoking cigarettes for the first time, I could do so convincingly. a, b, e
44. If asked to play the part of an elderly person living alone in a big city, I could do so convincingly in three different ways. a, b, c
46. If asked to play the part of a Russian peasant, I could do so convincingly.

FILLERS
1. I would make a good physician.
7. I like to spend money.
10. I have been a member of a 4-H or Future Farmers of America or other agricultural groups.
12. I have participated in high school or college athletics.
25. I would make a good forest ranger.
34. I like to be alone at times.
41. I like to ride a bicycle.
45. I follow the stock market.
FILLERS CONTINUED

48. If given a chance for free parachute jumping lessons, I would accept the offer.

51. I would make a good businessman.

56. I would make a good defense lawyer.

60. I would rather have a clerical job than a sales position.

69. If asked to draw someone riding a horse, I could do so convincingly.

73. I like to tinker with mechanical or electrical things, work on cars or repair household appliances, etc.

74. I am good at playing the word game Scrabble.

NOTES

a. Judged discriminative by expert judges in theater.

b. Appeared in the final item selection testing.

c. Included in the final version of the RPA (see Appendix A).

d. Included in the final item selection testing as an involvement item (see Appendix C).

e. Included in the final item selection testing for theoretical reasons.

f. Scored in the negative direction (No=1 and Yes=2).

g. All items answered either Yes or No, the item does describe the subject answering it.

h. This item was rewritten. The original item read as follows: "I find it hard to imagine how a poor Southern Negro feels about white people."

i. All items rewritten into the first person.

j. Situations in this item were rewritten slightly to better suit the population being tested.

k. Included in final item selection due to comparison of high and low scorers from the 94 undergraduates (Step 3).
APPENDIX C

Involvement Items in the Final Item Selection
Involvement Items in the Final Item Selection

2. I have recollected past experiences in my life with such clarity and vitality that it was almost like living them again.

3. If I wish, I can imagine (or daydream) some things so vividly that they hold my attention in the way a good movie or story does.

5. I have had the experience of being completely immersed in nature (e.g., in the mountains, at the ocean, etc.) to the point that my whole state of consciousness was temporarily altered.

7. I take a generally analytic, scientific view of myself and the world about me. (F)

12. When I dance I often lose myself in the music and the movement.

16. When a friend is disappointed or happy I can easily imagine how they feel.

20. I do not let other people's troubles bother me. (F)

25. After acting in a play myself, or seeing a play or movie, I have felt partly as though I were one of the characters.

27. I have had the experience of telling a story with elaborations to make it sound better and then having the elaboration seem as real to me as the actual experience.

28. I have a serious interest in creative activities such as painting, writing, designing, and the like.

31. When I read a novel, I become very involved, experiencing what's going on, joining in with the action and the characters.

32. I can recall having had an imaginary playmate with whom I played on many occasions while alone.

33. When at a party, job interview, or formal gathering, I am able to play a variety of roles if necessary; however, I find it very difficult to become involved, and am always aware that my behavior is not a true reflection of myself.

36. It's hard for me to act as if I'm a different kind of person than I really am. (F)

37. While watching a movie or show I sometimes become so involved that I feel myself participating in the action.

40. When I read I like to analyze the plot and predict what will happen next.
43. I am sometimes able to get so absorbed in a fantasy that I forget about my present self and become someone else in my imagination.\textsuperscript{a,c}

47. I can easily get beyond the world of logic and reason, and can experience new and different things.\textsuperscript{g}

50. I am able to exclude everything from my mind, construct a new, imaginary world, and feel for a time that it is real.\textsuperscript{a,f}

54. I like action movies more than movies that concentrate on plot or character development. (F)\textsuperscript{a,e,h}

62. I have had the experience of imagining something so hard that it became almost real, or actually seemed to become real, for me.\textsuperscript{d,f}

NOTES

a. Item included in the final version of the RPA (see Appendix A).

b. From Elms (1966).

c. From Lee-Teng (1965).

d. From As., et al. (1962).

e. Created from suggestions in Hilgard (1979).


g. From Tellegen & Atkinson (1974).

h. Scored in the negative direction (Disagree=4 and Agree=1).
APPENDIX D

Filler Items for the Item Selection RPA Questionnaire
Filler Items for the Item Selection RPA Questionnaire

1. I like to sleep late on the weekend.
9. I would make a good engineer.
14. I like to watch cartoons on TV.
19. I like to tinker with mechanical or electrical things, work on cars or repair household appliances, etc.
26. If asked to draw a horse, I could do so convincingly.
30. I like to ride a bicycle.
35. I like news documentaries on TV.
42. I know when I start to "go too far" with joking or teasing or showing off, and I'm usually able to stop myself in time.
45. I like to collect things.
52. I know how to organize my time efficiently.
60. I would rather have a clerical job than a sales position.
APPENDIX E

Final Rating Sheet for the Improvisational Situations Test
Final Rating Sheet for the Improvisational Situations Test

A. SENSE OF SCENE-INTERACTIONS WITH OBJECTS AND OTHERS IN SPACE

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

B. BODY POSTURE AND MOVEMENT

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

C. FACIAL EXPRESSIONS

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

D. VOICE QUALITY OR EXPRESSIVENESS

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

E. EXPRESSIVENESS OF HAND GESTURES

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
F. **APPROPRIATE USE OF LANGUAGE**

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

G. **OVERALL RATING OF ASSUMPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER IN THE PARTICULAR SCENE PORTRAYED**

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE.
3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

HAVE YOU EVER BEEN IN A SITUATION LIKE THIS ONE BEFORE?  YES __ NO __

ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 10, HOW LIFELIKE DO YOU THINK YOU ACTED IN THIS SITUATION?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
APPENDIX F

Factors\textsuperscript{a} of Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring Scale
Factors of Snyder's (1974) Self-monitoring Scale

Extraversion Factor
23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should. (F)
22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going. (F)
12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention. (F)
14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me. (F)
20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F)
21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations. (F)

Other-Directedness Factor
13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.
19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.
6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.
25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.
17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor. (F)
23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should. (F)
7. When I am uncertain how to act in social situations, I look to the behavior of others for cues.
2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs. (F)
3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like. (F)

Acting Factor
8. I would probably make a good actor.
18. I have considered being an entertainer.
20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting. (F)

5. I can make impromptu speeches on topics about which I have almost no information.

24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for the right end).

Remaining items

1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people. (F)

4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe. (F)

9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music. (F)

10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.

11. I laugh more when I watch comedy with others than when alone.

NOTES

a. From the factor analyses performed by Briggs, Cheek, & Buss (1980). Items in each factor are listed according to magnitude of factor loading. Note that some items appear under more than one factor. The total number of items in the scale is 25.

b. All items are marked either True or False. When an item is followed by an (F) it is counted toward a score on self-monitoring when marked False. All other items are counted when marked True.
APPENDIX G

The Affective Communication Test
The Affective Communication Test\textsuperscript{a}

1. When I hear good dance music, I can hardly keep still.
2. My laugh is soft and subdued. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
3. I can easily express emotion over the telephone.
4. I often touch friends during conversation.
5. I dislike being watched by a large group of people. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
6. I usually have a neutral facial expression. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
7. People tell me that I would make a good actor or actress.
8. I like to remain unnoticed in a crowd. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
9. I am shy among strangers. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
10. I am able to give a seductive glance if I want to.
11. I am terrible at pantomime as in games like charades. (F) \textsuperscript{b}
12. At small parties I am the center of attention.
13. I show that I like someone by hugging or touching that person.

NOTES

a. From Friedman, Prince, Riggio, and DiMatteo (1980).

b. Negative answers are scored as contributing to high ACT scores. The original scale was answered using a 9-point scale from -4 to +4 indicating the extent to which each item was true or false. In the present research, in order to blend the items of the ACT in with the several other scales administered to the Improvisational sample, only a 4-point scale was used.
APPENDIX H

Buss's (1980) Self-consciousness and Social Anxiety Scales
Buss's (1980) Self-consciousness and Social Anxiety Scales

**Private** Self-consciousness
1. I'm always trying to figure myself out.
3. Generally, I'm not very aware of myself. (F) b
5. I reflect about myself a lot.
7. I'm often the subject of my own fantasies.
9. I never scrutinize myself. (F) b
13. I'm generally attentive to my inner feelings.
15. I'm constantly examining my motives.
18. I sometimes have the feeling that I'm off somewhere watching myself.
20. I'm alert to changes in my mood.
22. I'm aware of the way my mind works when I work through a problem.

**Public** Self-consciousness
2. I'm concerned about my style of doing things.
6. I'm concerned about the way I present myself.
11. I'm self-conscious about the way I look.
14. I usually worry about making a good impression.
17. One of the last things I do before I leave my house is look in the mirror.
19. I'm concerned about what other people think of me.
21. I'm usually aware of my appearance.

**Social Anxiety**
4. It takes me time to overcome my shyness in new situations.
8. I have trouble working when someone is watching me.
10. I get embarrassed very easily.
12. I don't find it hard to talk to strangers. (F) b
16. I feel anxious when I speak in front of a group.
23. Large groups make me nervous.

**NOTES.**

a. The scales are actually presented as one scale. The numbering
presented above indicates the usual order.
b. Items reversed for scoring.
APPENDIX I

The Performance Style Test\(^a\)
The Performance Style Test

After each of the following items three symbols appear—either T, F or "--." These indicate the answer key for the p, r, and c performance styles. T=True. F=False. "--"=item not scored for the particular style. The first symbol after each item refers to the p style, the second to the r style, and the third to the c style.

1. I would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress.               P R C
2. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.                           F T T
3. I have skill in influencing others.                                                  T T F
4. I must admit that I enjoy trying to manipulate others for my own purposes.         F T F
5. I like to do things that other people regard as unconventional.                    T T F
6. I often find it's difficult to get people to do me favors, even when I have a right to expect them.  T F T
7. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.     T F --
8. I find it easy to get along with people.                                             F T T
9. I dislike having to behave according to the rules of etiquette.                     T F F
10. In most social situations, I feel tense and constrained.                           T F --
11. I can fit in pretty easily with any group of people.                               F T T
12. It's usually easy for me to persuade others to my own point of view.             F T F
13. I like to conform to custom and to avoid doing things that people I respect might consider unconventional. F -- T
14. I think I could be a successful businessman, if I wanted to.                      F T T
15. I like to avoid situations where I am expected to do things in a conventional way.   T F F
16. I usually find it difficult to change someone else's opinions.                   T F T
17. When serving on a committee, I like to be appointed or elected chairman.  
18. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand.  
19. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.  
20. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.  
21. I do not mind meeting strangers.  
22. I think I'd enjoy being an actor (or actress).  
23. At parties I am more likely to sit by myself or with just one other person than to join in with the crowd.  
24. I can usually get people to do what I want.  
25. I usually have trouble making myself heard in an argument.  
26. I like to be the center of attention in a group.  
27. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought my mind was already made up on a subject.  
28. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.  
29. I think I would enjoy being a salesman.  
30. I like to meet new people.  
31. I don't like participating in formal ceremonies.  
32. If I'm with someone I don't like, I usually don't express my real feelings to him.  
33. I like to follow instructions and do what is expected of me.  
34. I find it hard to talk when I meet new people.  
35. I frequently feel intense sympathy for others.  
36. I enjoy being with people who are suave and sophisticated.  
37. I think it's important to learn how to obey.  
38. I think most people would like to get ahead.  
39. When in a new situation, it's best to watch what others do.  
40. I enjoy being the host (or hostess) of a party.
41. I feel I can handle myself pretty well in most social situations.  
42. I sometimes enjoy misleading people just for the fun of it.  
43. I can deceive people, if I have to, without feeling guilty about it.  
44. I don't mind pretending to like someone when I really don't if there's a good reason to do so.  
45. I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.  
46. I often feel like telling people what I really think of them.  
47. I feel ill at ease with people I don't know.  
48. I have no dread of going into a room by myself, where other people have already gathered and are talking.  
49. I am a good mixer.  
50. I like to go to parties.  
51. In general, I find that I dislike nonconformists.  
52. I don't like to be too conspicuous at social gatherings.  
53. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.  
54. I often find that my wishes conflict with those of others.  
55. I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.  

NOTE  

a. From Ring and Wallston (1968).
APPENDIX J

Miscellaneous Correlational Tables
Table 22

Relations Between Scales Administered to the Improvisational Sample and "Acting" Scales, Excluding the RPA and IST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-monitoring</th>
<th>Performance Style</th>
<th>ACT\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>-.69***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total scale M</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>-.62***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion M</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism M</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private M</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfconscious F</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-monitoring</th>
<th>Performance Style</th>
<th>ACT&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>p    r   c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buss's Public</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buss's Self-Consciousness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.56***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buss's Social Anxiety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buss's Anxiety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Affective Communication Test.
b. M=males (n=24). F=females (n=91). T=total (n=115).

*<sup>p</sup>≤.05; **<sup>p</sup>≤.01; ***<sup>p</sup>≤.001.
Table 23

The Scales and Peer Ratings of Logical and Self-controlled Improvisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Logical Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self-controlled Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvisations</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Factor</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Test</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buss's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-con.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-con.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For males, n=22. For females, n=74. Total n=96. These are the number of subjects from the Improvisational sample for whom ratings were received from two or more friends and or relatives.

*p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001.
Table 24
Frequencies of Scores for Females (n=176) on the RPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean=48.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median=49.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode=51.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD=7.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean=41.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median=40.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode=38.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD=8.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq. b</th>
<th>Performance Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Total RPA Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=89.55  
Median=88.67  
Mode=90.00  
SD=13.547

a. Cumulative percentage of total.  
b. Absolute frequency of each score.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq. b</th>
<th>Performance Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Total RPA Score</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean=42.17
Median=42.00
Mode=39.00
SD=8.44

Mean=45.34
Median=45.20
Mode=41.00
SD=8.11

Mean=87.51
Median=86.00
Mode=86.00
SD=15.20

a. Cumulative percentage of total.
b. Absolute frequency of each score.
APPENDIX K

Normative Data on the RPA
We are interested in measuring how comfortably and convincingly different people are able to improvise 5 simple roles which we will ask them to play out for us during our study. For each subject two of us raters will describe what we expect of the subject for the overall role playing situation and then for each of the 5 roles as we get to them. We will also be rating each subject's performance in each role on a special rating scale consisting of 7 subscales. Each subscale consists of a 5 point scale related to how believably each of the raters judged the subject's performance to be on each of the 7 subscales during each of the 5 roles. A detailed discussion of each of these aspects of our job follows.

THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The first thing we need to keep in mind is that any time one's performance is being measured tension is likely to enter into the situation. This especially so in a situation where one's performance in "acting" is being assessed. And it seems to be very much so for those who consider themselves poor role players, whether or not this may be the case. And if one considers oneself to be a poor performer, when one knows that one's performance is being judged, anxiety may tend to increase the chance of performing poorly. This is especially true in role playing where audience effects can have important consequences.
A consequence of the possible uneasiness subjects may feel during the role playing situations is the manner that we will try to assume with everyone. This manner might best be described as friendly and informal but efficient. We want to get each subject in and at ease as quickly as possible, then through each of the five role plays. The role plays usually take between ten and fifteen minutes from introduction to final rating of the last role play. We do not want to come on pushy and in a hurry. We should all try to keep the pace comfortable but steady. Chatting with the subjects and treating them like human beings is perfectly acceptable. You don't want to get nosy or anything, of course. And you certainly do not want to take on the role of a clinician. But talking a little about the weather or school or innocent topics as such can help to make everyone feel at ease. And it can be a fun part of the experiment for us all.

When the subject first comes in and sits down, and after you have made your introductions and asked them how they are doing today to let them know our approach is somewhat informal, plus making them more at ease, and getting them to sign the consent form, then one of the raters will provide a general overview of the proceedings, something like what follows:

What we're going to do is to set up five typical situations for you, one at a time and ask you to show us how you or someone else would most likely behave in each situation. It's important that you try to make your demonstrations as life-like as possible so that we will have a better chance of getting
the data that we need.

What we will do is give you a brief description of one situation at a time and give you some time to think about what you would do, if you want. You can do whatever you want with the situation as long as you stay within the few limitations we set up for each one as we describe it. Feel free to get up and move around, use the space of the room in any way that you want, what there is of it, and make use of anything else in the room for props if you would like to. As I said, we'll describe one situation at a time, then ask you to demonstrate how you would act in that situation. Each situation usually takes about one or two minutes. They can stop in one of two ways: either you can stop them when you feel that you've run out of things to say or do or when you feel finished, or we'll stop you when we have enough information for our purposes, which will usually come first, but not always. Excuse us if we don't show any reactions to whatever you do unless we are directly involved in the situation, because we would rather that you forgot we were here and tried to act as naturally as possible. When we've finished with one situation, we will describe the next and then give you some time to think about what you want to do with that one while we fill out the forms we have to make out for each situation you run through with us. Then when we finish with all this we'll explain the diaries we'd like you to fill out for the next two weeks. Any questions?

The roles are described as follows:
Situation 1--
Simply be someone talking to someone else on the phone.

Situation 2--
Choose one of us to play the part of a friend, any friend, to have a conversation with, about anything. Describe the situation to us and maybe tell us a little about the friend. Then begin.

Situation 3--
You are a teenager asking a parent for a favor. Play both the teenager and the parent.

Situation 4--
You are a teacher in an elementary school. You are trying to explain something at the blackboard. But everytime you turn your back to the class there is a disruption amongst the students.

Situation 5--
You are an elderly person at a flea market. You are selling furniture and knick-knacks. One of your items for sale is an old oak rocking chair. (You can use that chair there as the rocker.) Unfortunately, your spouse has decided that he or she does not want to sell the chair after all. But before you
can move it out of the way, we come along (both raters) and show an interest in the chair. You try to shift our attention to some of your other merchandise, keeping our attention but not selling us the chair.

After the first two role plays ask the subject whether or not they have been in a situation like that one described, and note their answer on the rating sheet for that role play.

RATING THE ROLE PERFORMANCES:

For each of the 7 subscales we have a five point rating system. This system works as follows:

3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE. We have found that most subjects, while not giving perfect performances by any means, do perform on each measurable aspect of the role situations with a fair degree of comfort and convincingness. The average subject is able to forget their self-consciousness in front of the raters and enter into the role, at least in the aspect being rated, with a good amount of believability. There will probably be lapses in their performances some uneveness, periods of self-consciousness or even "hamming it up", but overall they present themselves believably.

4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE. Here the subject performs comfortably and convincingly, with few or no lapses, as far as the general script of the scene calls for. They are neither too hammy or too hesitant. Neither are they overly original. They do not really bring anything unexpected to their performance, at least in the aspect being rated. They generally do exactly what is called for with a good amount of ease and believability.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE. Here the subject does bring more than is expected to the situation. But at the same time what is brought in so unexpectedly seems to fit right in to the expanded scene as the subject performs it. This rating is a rare treat.

2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE. Here the subject sometimes presents him or herself acceptably, meeting some of the demands of the role being played. But there is a self-consciousness, a hesitancy and a general uncomfortableness about their performance in this area. There is probably also some evidence of awareness of audience here--glancing over at the raters (who should not be reacting, even to encourage, except in the first role which is somewhat of a warmer-upper, and even then raters should wait until the subject somehow verbalizes that they don't feel like they can perform adequately or that they don't know what is expected of them, and then the raters can attempt to make them feel more at ease, let them know that all we require is that they demonstrate how they might behave in that situation as best they can, and that nothing more is required; otherwise, we are stonefaced), making nervous smiles, fidgeting in general, etc. But the subject does try and succeed even though minimally to perform some of those behaviors associated with this aspect of the role being judged.

1. EXTREMELY LOW, RIGID, AND UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE. Like #5 this is something of a rarity, though it will occur, at least within specific aspects of the roles. The most extreme case is the
subject who says they simply can't do it. The next most extreme
is probably the one who explains what they might do in that situation
rather than showing or demonstrating and acting out. If this occurs
in situation 1, simply assume that the subject may have misunderstood
what is expected of them. Say, "Okay, that's good; but could you
show us how you would do that" Don't interrupt them too quickly or
abruptly. Try not to tell them they are doing something wrong. Try
not to use negatives at all--"No, that's not" sounds judgmental. Don't
judge. Be positive and encouraging. But also do not tell them
how to do it. Do not make suggestions for behaviors. If they
ask, "Do you mean I should pretend like I pick up the phone and
talk into it?" you can say yes. But if anyone asks, "Should I sit
and pretend like I hear it ringing and then pick it up?", you just
answer, "Whatever you want to do. That would be fine. But whatever
you feel comfortable doing or want to do." The unacceptable perfor-
manice is actually no performance at all. It is the barest of rudimen-
tary actions. Another example would be someone picking up the phone,
saying, "Hi, yeah I'll be right over. Okay, goodbye," and then
hanging up. That would rate a #1 rating for overall role play, and
probably on everything else as well, since the subject has provided
you will little or no behaviors to go on. When that happens, just
continue as usual, saying "Okay, fine. Now the next role is....."
EXPLANATIONS OF THE 7 SUBSCALES, HOW TO DIFFERENTIATE THEM FROM ONE ANOTHER, AND HOW TO RATE THEM:

The seven subscales are, in their order of appearance on the rating sheets, as follows:

A. SENSE OF SCENE--INTERACTIONS WITH OBJECTS AND OTHERS IN SPACE
B. BODY POSTURE AND MOVEMENT
C. FACIAL EXPRESSIONS
D. VOICE QUALITY OR EXPRESSIVENESS
E. EXPRESSIVENESS OF HAND GESTURES
F. APPROPRIATE USE OF LANGUAGE
G. OVERALL RATING OF ASSUMPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER IN THE PARTICULAR SCENE PORTRAYED

The order of the scales relates to the experience of raters in previous pilot studies. We found, for instance, that the interactions with objects and others, the sense of scene, was probably one of the most prominent features of the role plays and the most easily confused with the rest of the categories being rated. Next comes body posture and then facial and voice expressiveness. Hand gestures actually seem to have less chance for display in our role plays; thus their less prominent position on the rating sheets. The appropriateness of the language to the role and scene is fairly easy to assess, and thus remember, so we put it near the end of the sheet. And the overall rating is perhaps clearer by the time you get to the end of the rest of the ratings.

DETAILED EXPLANATIONS OF SUBCATEGORIES:
A. SENSE OF SCENE--INTERACTIONS WITH OBJECTS AND OTHERS IN SPACE
Here we are dealing with the way in which the subject relates to real or imaginary objects in each particular situation or scene. This
necessarily implies some sort of use of space as well. By use of space we mean mainly placing people and things in different places, imaginatively or otherwise, and moving around during the role play rather than staying in one place. But mainly we are interested in how the subject interacts with other people and things. Perhaps the following examples on each of the 5 rating levels will help to illustrate:

3. AVERAGE, ACCEPTABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE.

In the first role play of talking on the phone, subjects usually hold a receiver to their ear and talk into it. Some do this more realistically than others, and some more elaborately. The AVERAGE #3 rating should be conceived of as a broader width than the other 4. Think in terms of the natural curve. There is more leeway for acceptable performance at this level than any of the others with the least being at the two extremes, #1 and #5. Here if the subject at least holds the receiver slightly away from the face, this is considered contributing to an overall 3 rating for this dimension. If the subject at least holds the receiver slightly away from the face, this is considered contributing to an overall 3 rating for this dimension. If the subject does not pretend to pick up the receiver of hang it up when finished, however, I would suspect the rating would not be as high as a three.

A point to remember when judging subcategories is that we are judging overall performance within each sphere. So any one action may not qualify the subject for that level. We are making value judgements, but educated ones, hopefully.

In SITUATION 2, both raters should look for such behaviors as eye contact, listening to the rater who is also role playing, and generally interacting as if they were having a conversation with a friend.

In SITUATION 3-- the subject will very likely at least pretend to make some eye contact with the imaginary other, and they will make some sort of obvious indication when they are exchanging roles, such as turning their head from one direction to look at the place the other is supposed to be when changing the part they are playing. Some subjects also actually change positions. Others look up when playing the part of the teenager and then down when the parent. These all fall within the average performance range.
In SITUATION 4-- this scene is made for INTERACTIONAL performance. The teacher should at least face the blackboard, indicate they hear some sort of commotion, turn around and confront some imaginary student or other. Probably many will also pretend to point at something on the board or write on it. These are all within the average range.

In SITUATION 5-- There's a little more moving around and working with actual props, especially the "rocker". The subject should at least handle the chair somehow, perhaps point out the other items for sale, and make eye contact with the raters as these take part in the role.

4. UNQUESTIONABLY ACCEPTABLE AND BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE

SITUATION 1-- really get a sense that the subject is dialing a phone if they choose to show that, rather than twirling their fingers around or punching the air. The phone really stays in one place for them. In addition, there is some realistic playing with the phone cord or flipping through the pages of a date book as part of the situation that the subject has created. Maybe they drum their fingers with impatience. The important thing to remember here is that this is the natural acting that doesn't go beyond what is really called for in the situation.

SITUATION 2-- may be some realistic tinkering with imaginary drinking glasses if the conversation is in a cafeteria, for instance. Touching at appropriate moments is also a four if done naturally, comfortably and believably.

SITUATION 3-- here the subject does switch places when changing from one role to the other, but does so easily and convincingly. And perhaps there is some added moving around, say the parent is first seated and then stands up when the teenager addresses the parent. Generally, though, subjects score a three on this situation in this category.

SITUATION 4-- there is much opportunity for interaction, as noted above. But whatever is done, it seems appropriate and not overly exagerated or hammy. The subject does seem like a teacher who has to keep turning around because he or she is interrupted. Probably there will be some variations in the way the teacher turns around each time, as they get more irritated, say. Also the blackboard and the content of the blackboard are realistically related to.

SITUATION 5-- Here the subject moves around more than average. Most subjects will, on the average, stay where they are standing, making way somewhat for the raters as they look at the chair. Perhaps the subject actually sits in the chair to demonstrate how "unsturdy" it is or something, rocking back and forth as they do so. But usually, most subjects get no more than a three, though sometimes a four. A five on this aspect of situation five is difficult to achieve.
5. DISTINCTIVE AS WELL AS UNQUESTIONABLY BELIEVABLE PERFORMANCE. This performance goes beyond the usual, adding unexpected but still believable elements to the situation. The emphasis here is on distinctive as well as believable.

SITUATION 1-- decides that the phone is a wall phone rather than on the table as nearly everyone else does. Gets up from the chair and goes over and talks there. Or is in a telephone booth. Both are unusual but completely acceptable. Perhaps the subject pretends to pick lint from their clothes or doodle while talking on the phone. Both of these behaviors are totally believable but outside what the scene specifically called for and what most subjects bring to it.

SITUATION 2-- perhaps the subject actually pretends to drink from a glass while holding the conversation or pretends to see someone else in the room and talks to them for a minute. Again, something outside the specifics of the scene as we set it up, something distinctive but believable. And so on.

2. BARELY ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE. Here we see someone who generally goes through the motions but has only a few, if any, spontaneous and unselfconscious moments.

SITUATION 1-- pretends to hold the receiver to head, but presses hand unrealistically against the side of the head. No sense of space. Makes little effort to pretend there is a phone there. May pretend to dial, but only perfunctorily. Interaction with people and objects is perfunctory. Talks into space but not the receiver.

SITUATION 2-- does not appear comfortable talking to the rater as co-performer. Seems uncomfortable pretending to be talking to a friend. But makes the attempt and manages to get in a few acceptable interactions.

SITUATION 3-- makes only minimal attempts to indicate different locations of characters in space, as they relate to each other.

SITUATION 4-- has a hard time pretending to be giving lesson and then being interrupted. Talks to the air in general rather than to the class or any one in it. Makes only perfunctory jabs at pointing out things on the board.

SITUATION 5-- subject stands in one place makes some attempt to show the chair, but doesn't make much eye contact with the other characters.

A rating of one really needs no further explanation.

B. BODY POSTURE AND MOVEMENT. Some examples:

3. Situation 1-- sits or stands relaxed, perhaps slightly slouched or hunched over the phone.

Situation 2-- sits facing friend comfortably but attentively.

Situation 3-- just being relaxed is acceptable here.

Situation 4-- posture should indicate intent to teach when at
board and intent to stop the commotion when facing the class. A sense of authority.

Situation 5-- most people do not make much effort to assume the old person's stooped posture. Relaxation is acceptable. 4. Again, believability and relatedness to the role enter in here, and expressivity.

Situation 1-- posture matches the conversation. There should be some change in posture to qualify for this rating. A posture that is really related to the scene would get a 4. They don't just sit and talk on the phone. They express some attitude about the call, the caller, the message or themselves through their posture. Also slightly more inventive postures are assumed, such as putting the feet up on the table, or, if standing, leaning against the wall while talking.

Situation 2-- subject assumes posture natural for the setting they have created for the conversation, such as sitting back with legs crossed in a bar. Most subjects tend to lean forward here and concentrate on the dialogue. That is three rating. A #4 has to be more related to the whole situation, expressive of some attitude, whether calm relaxation or dejected confession or goodhearted comraderie.

Situation 3-- here the postures are differentiated, or an attempt is made to do so. The teenager has a sloppier posture or stands on one leg or something while the parent stands more erect and taller; not slouching, for example.

Situation 4-- the posture is expressive of the attitudes the subject is trying to get across. There should be some difference between when they are facing the blackboard and trying to teach and when they are facing the classroom and trying to discipline.

Situation 5-- some attempt is made to assume the older person's posture. Actual success at this could qualify the subject for a #5 rating because the #4 subject will have more difficulty maintaining the posture consistently throughout the role.

5. Here, again the emphasis is on distinct postures and expressivity. But, since posture seems more difficult for most subjects, we tend to give a 5 when there is exceptional believability and consistence in assumption of postures. This is difficult to describe. The best we can say is that there is a noticeable difference between the fully acceptable performance of #4 and the distinctively realistic performance of the #5.

2. The subject pays little attention to posture, but some relevant postures are assumed during the role play. They just do not seem that convincing or consistent.

Situation 1-- doesn't appear relaxed. May make few or no changes in posture or may make too many in an attempt to get more relaxed. Rigidity.

Situation 2-- subject doesn't appear comfortable but seems to make attempts to get comfortable. May be sitting rigidly for
awhile and then make an almost visible effort to sit in a more relaxed manner.
Situation 3-- sometimes makes some attempts to assume different postures for the different characters, but this is more of an afterthought than a natural and comfortable action. Characters are generally stiff and unmoving, assume same general posture. Situation 4-- subject merely makes perfunctory changes in position rather than posture when facing board and facing class. Posture not well suited to role and scene.
Situation 5-- again a rather stiff, uncomfortable performance, with some minimal effort to correct this. If they move at all they generally rate a least a #2 in this situation.
1. The subject is essentially frozen or rigid and uncomfortable in the role.

c. FACIAL EXPRESSIONS. The thing to remember here is that the facial expressions should be expressing something related to the scene or the character. An average job of doing this rates a #3, a very natural but generally not unusually creative performance gets a #4, while a minimal effort gets a #2. A #5 is the unusually creative, and The #1 is the unusually stonefaced.

D. VOICE QUALITY OR EXPRESSIVENESS. This needs to be distinguished from the use of language. Here we are trying to judge how well the quality of the voice is modulated in relationship to what is being expressed by the character in the scene. Again no change in voice is #1, minimal and perhaps forced voice change is #2, changes in the voice that relate to the scene (such as some sort of unexpected news on the phone or a change in character when teenager and when parent, or when trying to teach and trying to discipline as the teacher-- note that most subjects do not attempt an older person's voice, so a friendly, selling voice is acceptable), these rate a #3.
The voice that fits the scene almost to a "t" rates a #4 (the teenager whose voice is high while the parents is lower and the older person's whose voice is higher pitched and perhaps wavering may not be entirely convincing but they do rate a #4 here.) The voice that is distinctive rates a #5 (as does the totally convincing teenager, parent or older person, for example, and the modulation in voice which carry several undertones besides "teacher is teaching and teacher is reprimanding").

E. EXPRESSIVENESS OF HAND GESTURES. The major point here is that we are looking for expressiveness, movements of the hands that express something, rather than simply the mechanical interaction with objects or people as in the first subcategory. Dialing a phone, picking lint off of clothes, patting someone on the back, these are interactions. Shaking your fist, shrugging them in resignation, pointing your finger warningly, these are expressions. And of course this increases as the subject scores from 1 to 5.

F. APPROPRIATE USE OF LANGUAGE. The language should suit the situation. If the subject doesn't know what to say or says very little ("Hello, Yes. No. Okay. Goodbye.")", then they receive the #1. For a #2 they perform better but still come up with little and seem hesitant and uncomfortable, out of role often. For #3 they are usually saying something related to the role even if it is often banal and trite. They can say the right thing more often and more consistently than for a number 2. The natural use of language gets #4.
Here they show no trouble saying what is expected of them and even a little beyond. For #5, their language and conversation is unusual but believable.

G. OVERALL RATING OF ASSUMPTION OF THE ROLE OF THE PARTICULAR CHARACTER IN THE PARTICULAR SCENE PORTRAYED. Here you rate the subject on how well you think they performed on the situation OVERALL. That is, taking into consideration not only the above scales but everything else which might not have been rated or scored, how well, on our scale of 1 to 5, did this subject perform as this character in this particular role?