THE PERFORMANCE STYLE TEST AS A PREDICTOR OF CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
John R. Jones Jr.
1968

ABSTRACT

THE PERFORMANCE STYLE TEST AS A PREDICTOR OF
CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

By

John R. Jones Jr.

This study was undertaken with the hope of further
validating the typology developed by Ring (1966) concerning
performance styles of people as they are distinguished by
their level of social competence. The concept of performance
styles is based on a dramaturgical approach to interpersonal
interaction advocated by Goffmann (1959). Three styles are
arranged in a typology: the p is incapable of good perform-
ance giving and consequently avoids social interaction, he
may be described as an introvert; the r is socially competent
and is motivated to give a good performance, he may be
described as an extrovert; finally, the c who is not competent
socially, but who has learned to imitate the styles of those
around him, may be termed a conformist.

One hundred and eighty-five students took the Performance
Style Test, developed by Ring to distinguish between p, r,
and c. Of these, eleven students were selected for each group
on the basis of their scores. Each of these persons were in

turn observed in the classroom setting, and concrete measures of behavior patterns were utilized, such as frequency of conversation, duration of conversation, seating position in the classroom, etc.

It was hypothesized that the socially competent group, r's, would be distinguished from the other two groups on all of the measures; for example, they would converse more frequently than p's or c's, etc. Results indicate that the difference between the r and p groups on various behavior patterns is reliable and consistent. The relation between c's (conformists) and the other two groups was not consistent in the hypothesized direction.

Suggestions for sharpening the distinctions between groups are offered and the potential use of the Performance Style Test and related typology are discussed.

11/13/68

THE PERFORMANCE STYLE TEST AS A PREDICTOR OF

CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

By

John R. Jones Jr.

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1968

DEDICATION

To all who have come before,
that my work may help those
who come after.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES AND APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

A concept of performance styles, based on the drama-
turgical approach advocated by Goffmann(1959), has recently
been developed by Ring et al. (1966). This view defines
interpersonal behavior as "performance-giving" and the
individuals involved as actors, each controlling the concep-
tion which others form of them. The idea is not based on
special people who read scripts written by others, nor is it
a new mode of relating to others. It is simply a new way of
describing what goes on when two or more people meet, a
description written by a third person observer. The under-
lying principle is similar to that of Berne (1964). Attempt-
ing to distil the myriad of behavior patterns characteristic
of interpersonal interaction, Ring et al. originally formu-
lated a typology of three performance styles, with a
description of a model individual associated with each of the
styles (Ring 1966). According to Goffmann, three variables
control any performance: the actor and his attributes, those
of the setting for the performance, and those of the audience
for whom the performance is given. Of these, Ring is only
presently concerned with the first, which he bases on three
components: 1) motivation to perform, 2) knowledge of the

"script", 3) and competence in performing. Competence is considered to be the base for the other components and the first in time. Thus, a person unskilled in acting will not be motivated to act and his knowledge of the scripts will be necessarily poor.

Returning to a previous statement, it is hoped that the variety of combinations of these components for the attributes of the actor may be synthesized into a few basic patterns. Part of the reason for this hope is that the components themselves are structurally interdependent. Thus we have mentioned the dependence of motivation on competence; the converse is also true; furthermore, knowledge follows from both and is necessary for both. Secondly, we emphasize that types, as such, represent reference points; they may be useful in prediction of behavior and further theory construction. The validity of such a typology rests on empirical investigation; this is the reason for our study. Ring describes each of the three performance styles and the individual characteristics of each of them.

The Performance Style of the p

"The p (i.e., the sort of person who displays the performance style we are about to describe) is conceived to be 'low' on all three actor components. Motivationally, he 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. With respect to skill factors, it is assumed that a p lacks the social agility required for successful performance-giving. He is also wanting in his knowledge of the scripts appropriate to a wide variety of social settings.

"Interpersonally, then a p is likely to be somewhat less than impressive; whenever he feels that he cannot 'be himself', he behaves ineptly and feels restively uncomfortable and ill-at-ease. In Goffman's terms, a p is a person who is deficient in the 'arts of impression management' and knows it."

It is perhaps important to consider some implications of this performance style. Any interpersonal behavior may be conceived of as a performance; to navigate in the world of human affairs, we must control the information which others have of us. It should only take a moment's introspection to assent to the fact that we act in different ways with different people, we control the conception which others form of us. According to Goffmann, such acting is work, demanding close attention to scripts, staging, etc.; being oneself is easy. The p is not a competent actor; so, he avoids situations which demand performance-giving (an unrealistic motivation, as will be explained later). The p would rather ad lib, throw away the script; he knows he couldn't handle it if he didn't. For this reason, he demands an informal atmosphere, places high value on "sincerity", and seeks cues

to others evaluation of him as a person. He cannot act, so
he emphasizes spontaneous, "non-phony" living.

The Performance Style of r

"The r is an individual who is typically skilled in
interpersonal relations. In fact, in virtually every respect,
r's and p's constitute antipodal types. An r enjoys inter-
personal relationships which make a p feel ill-at-ease; an r
knows what to do in interpersonal contexts where a p is at a
loss as to how to behave; finally, an r can do what needs to
be done, a p frequently cannot. From this contrast with p's,
it can be seen that we assume r's are 'high' on each of the
three actor components on which the p's were assumed 'low'.
Finally, whereas p's may be regarded as being motivated
primarily by self-expressive needs, r's seem better described
in terms of a somewhat manipulative interpersonal orienta-
tion. Their behavior may often be tinged with a certain
Machiavellian quality (Christie, 1962) and, when dependent
on others, they resemble what Jones (1964, pp. 73-74) has
labeled 'acquisitive ingratiators'. These instrumental moti-
vations, coupled with an adroitness in interpersonal relations,
enable r's to exploit social situations with an effectiveness
and versatility that p's can only find depressing.

"In order to imagine an r one need only think of the
skilled hostess, the engaging salesman, or the appropriately
doleful funeral director. These examples illustrate roles,

to be sure, but we believe that there are many individuals who <u>characteristically</u> perform interpersonally in such fashion reminiscent of role-playing itself. That is, such persons seem always to be putting on a performance for others in much the same way stage actors do for audiences."

The <u>r</u> is motivated to give a good performance; and because he is a competent actor, he seeks others evaluation of his performing ability. The <u>r</u> knows how to handle the script, he accepts its necessity in the majority of inter-personal relations and then improves on it, stamping it with his own personality (Ring, 1966). While it is true that he may manipulate others for his own ends, the same may be said for the <u>p</u> who demands that others come to him on his own terms; he demands the informal, "real self" atmosphere.

The Performance Style of the <u>c</u>

"The <u>c</u> is an individual whose behavior is dictated almost completely by the nature of interpersonal relations. Such an individual becomes the person the "script " calls for; and when the "script" changes, so does he, for there is no internal resistance to change. Such a person is called a <u>chameleon</u>.

"In terms of our three actor components, a <u>c</u> may be characterized as follows: a <u>c</u> is motivated to give good performances (like an <u>r</u>), but only performances of a passive,

conventional, approval-seeking sort (unlike r). A c has
sufficient skill to enact successfully only such passive
non-innovative performances--on the skill component,
therefore he falls somewhere between the p and the r,
but probably closer to the former. Because we assume that
a c has a strong need to achieve social approval, one would
expect him to be knowledgeable about the kind of performance
required in a wide range of situations; at the least, he
can be assumed to be as informed about the script-demands
of his preferred kind of performance as an r is about his."

The c is a person in the same boat as the p; he lacks
social competence. However, instead of withdrawing from
people, he moves toward them. He in motivated to give good
performances, but only for social approval. Because the c
is socially inept, he plays relatively passive, conventional
roles which appear as "good" performances. He conforms and
uses this conformity to manipulate others (Jones, 1964);
by it he receives the social approval which he demands.

After originating the performance style typology and a
paper and pencil test for distinguishing the individual's
particular typology, Ring has begun research on this founda-
tion with the hope of stronger validation and greater
usefulness. It is the hope of this author to employ methods
of naturalistic observation with a similar endeavor to provide
further validation of the performance style typology.

Use of Naturalistic Observation

Several recent articles expound the advantages and disadvantages of naturalistic observation (Rausch, 1967; Sechrest, 1967). Only a few points need be made. Research questions involving behavioral patterns of persons left to their own resources should involve low manipulation and low imposition by the experimenter (Willems, 1967). This point especially is relevant to the present study of performance styles, since these, by definition, are affected by "audience" and "setting" variables. Presence of the experimenter and the laboratory setting are salient features and quite possibly affect the performance styles of the subjects, perhaps differentially between groups. Since we are concerned with phenomena of human behavior as such (Manzel, 1967), it seems wise to consider them in a context involving the least interference. We may at the same time avoid artificial tying or untying of variables involved in the performance styles, thus, the behavior patterns of the c, for example, might vary from everyday life when situated in the laboratory setting.

Of perhaps most importance is the extent to which we may generalize findings. As Willems points out, it is easy to carry the results of controlled laboratory experiments to everyday life, supposing that caution is the only require-ment (1967). Rather, it seems that naturalistic methods are

needed to optimize generalization and to check laboratory findings.

Before we specify the locus of our observation, we should consider several assumptions which must be made. First, we assume that behavior, experiences, thoughts, etc. and/or reports of behavior, experience, thoughts, etc. as these occur in actual life situations are legitimate sources of data (Reusch, 1967). Secondly, we assume that attitudes (in this case, a particular performance style) must be inferred from some behavior, that there cannot be "inconsistency" between attitude and behavior (Sechrest, 1967). Thus, we assume that behavior patterns serve as data and that these are good means of isolating attitudes.

It seems then that a valuable source of verification of the Ring typology may occur in almost any natural setting. For several reasons, we have selected the classroom area. The setting is quite common to the Ss of our study (elementary psychology students); and we have here a kind of situational sampling (Sechrest, 1967) in which we make observations only in those situations having a reasonably high probability of yielding data in which we may be interested. Furthermore, we find here an opportunity to assess attitudes without exclusive dependence on questionnaires and interviews. There are a variety of ways in which an attitude may manifest itself and verbal statements are only one of many (Sechrest, 1967). We have selected several behavior patterns typical of the

classroom. Then, in the context of the personality typology, we should be able to predict the respective behavior patterns of a p̲, an r̲, or a c̲. In line with current thinking on naturalistic observation and its advantages, we have isolated measures which do not require the cooperation of the subject: such as seating position, time of arrival for class, postural and gestural cues, etc. Finally we have chosen a setting in which the undergraduate subject will behave as an accurate informant about himself (Jones, 1964).

Summing in the words of Marvin Dunnette, ". . . laboratory findings usually lead to elaborate theories or behavioral taxonomies, entirely consistent within themselves but lacking the acid test of contact with reality. . . . Psychologists who choose to partake of the advantages of the more rigorous controls possible in the psychometric of experimental laboratories must accept responsibility for assuring the day to day relevance of the observations they make ," (1966).

Particular areas of classroom behavior patterns are utilized in the following hypotheses:

(1) With respect to conversation before, during, and after the class period, r̲'s should speak more frequently than p̲'s; c̲'s should fall in between.

(2) With respect to the number of people involved in conversation, r̲'s should speak with more people than p̲'s do; again, c̲'s should fall in between.

(3) Students of the r̲ group should arrive earlier for class than students of the p̲ or c̲ group do.

(4) Students of the r group should remain longer in the classroom area after class than students of either other group do.

(5) With respect to the length of conversation, r's should speak for a longer duration during each conversation than p's; c's should fall in between.

(6) With respect to participation in class, r's should ask questions or enter into group discussion more often than do students of either other group.[1]

(7) With respect to seating position in the classroom, c's should sit somewhere near the front and center of the classroom, p's should sit near the rear and sides of the classroom, r's should fall in between.[2]

---

[1]Three other hypotheses contingent on the data related to class participation were deleted for reasons discussed later.

[2]If c's require social approval and recognition, they should sit up front and near the teacher. If p's wish to avoid interaction, they should sit at the extremities.

METHOD

Groups representing each of the performance styles were chosen on the basis of their scores on the Performance Style Test. Individuals in these groups were observed during their classroom periods and the results were compared with the predictions.

Selection and Assignment of Ss to Groups

One hundred and eighty-five Ss participated by taking the Performance Style Test (App.1). All Ss were drawn on a volunteer basis from a subject pool comprised of students enrolled at the time of this study in the introductory psychology course at Michigan State University. Participation in the psychological experiments is a requirement of the course; no financial incentives or reimbursements were involved.

Testing Procedure

Early in the Spring quarter of 1968, 185 students enrolled in the elementary psychology course, who have volunteered for the study in order to fulfill research credit requirements, will be asked to complete a paper-and-pencil

test (the Performance Style Test, designed by Ring et al.
1966, cf. App. 1). It was designed by the authors to
measure an individual's characteristic performance style.

> The Performance Style Test consists of 55 true-
> false statements. The content of these items reflects
> the characteristics attributed to p's, r's, and c's.
> Three scoring keys were devised (one for each perform-
> ance style) on the basis of the authors' intuitive
> judgements concerning how each item would be answered
> by a person of a given typological status. Each
> respondent, then, gets a score (in the form of a per-
> centile rank) on each of the three performance style
> dimensions. The test takes approximately 10 minutes
> to complete.

Administration of the test for all Ss took place at
the same time. Instructions were simple and were included
with each copy of the test. Questions were answered in a
way which did not disclose the purpose of the test. Ss were
asked to include a schedule of their classtime and locations
(for the purported reason that the present study was compar-
ing test outcomes of students who attend early classes with
those of students who attend classes later in the day). As
the Ss left the testing room, they were divided into groups
of five and photographed, and the photographs were labeled
with their respective names. (The purpose of the class
schedules and photographs was facility of identification
during the later observation period, cf. below.) Finally,
the tests were scored, and three groups, each comprised of
approximately 11 Ss, were formed on the basis of their scores
on respective typologies. In this investigation, we re-
stricted ourselves to relatively "pure" types (cf. Table 1).

Table 1

Criteria for entry into group, based on
respective percentile scores.

		Categorical Scores		
		p	r	c
Group Selection Criterion	p	above 90%	below 40%	below 40%
	r	below 35%	above 90%	below 35%
	c	below 45%	below 40%	above 85%

(cf. App.1)

Note: Based on these criteria, the groups finally consisted
       of: r = 9, p = 9, c = 10.

Observational Procedure

The study begins with the instructions to the co-workers
(10 undergraduate seniors) who collected the data of natural-
istic observation in the classroom setting. Each co-worker
was assigned a number of Ss from the three groups as deter-
mined by the test. Since class schedules were requested and
pictures taken, the co-workers were able to identify the Ss
assigned to them. The co-workers were given data sheets (cf.
Table 2) and the following instructions:

The plan is simply to observe and record several behavior
patterns of each student involved in the experiment. The
original observations will be recorded in the form of a
running log; the material will then be transcribed onto a
data sheet. With the running log we are attempting to record
the observable behavior of the student as it occurs. The data
sheet is used to operationalize these patterns for statistical
use. In recording the running log, we will be looking for
the following behavior patterns:

1. Time of arrival into the classroom area (i.e., the
   classroom itself and the hallway outside).

2. Conversation between arrival and departure times
   a. number of people involved in conversation
   b. duration of conversation (in secs.)

3. participation during actual classtime
   a. duration of participation (in secs.)
   b. manner of presentation (rate 1-5)
   c. content of presentation (rate 1-5)

4. seating position (mark on chart)

5. time of departure.

Table 2

Mean Scores on each of seven behavioral measurements.

Hypothesis	Behavioral measure	Mean scores		
		p	r	c
(1)	Number of conversations per class period.	1.33	3.39	1.70
(2)	Number of people involved per conversation per class.	.833	1.28	1.30
(3)	Minutes arrived before class-time.	6.55	6.66	4.20
(4)	Minutes departed after class ends.	.72	.94	1.89
(5)	Number of seconds per conversation.	21.16	51.61	54.30
(6)	Number of participations per class period.	.55	.38	.45
(7)	Proportionate distance from the front of the classroom.	61.12%	36.36%	42.85%

Note of explanation for criteria:

--criteria for manner of presentation
    Watch for: rate of speech, stammering, pitch of
                 voice, use of gestures, excuses about
                 the quality of speech, blushing,
                 posture, etc.

--criteria for content of material
    Watch for: does the material pertain to homework
                 assignments, dates for exams, grading
                 procedures, etc.; or to meaning of the
                 text or lecture material. Does the
                 question or statement reflect thought,
                 consideration; or is it a parroting of
                 previous statements?

--rating: rate 1 = calm; 5 = nervous
              1 = meaningful; 5 = superficial

Seating position: On the large chart, mark the student's
desk in relation to the entire class. When transpos-
ing it onto the data sheet's smaller chart, mark the
student's desk in relation to the class seating
arrangement, i.e., take the cluster of seating of
the class from the large chart and transpose it onto
the smaller one. Then state the percentage of seats
from the sides and from the front on the smaller
chart.

Example of the running log: I first saw Charlie Brown
enter the hallway outside of the classroom at about
10:00 AM (class begins at 10:00 AM). He talked to
two people for about 30 secs. just before entering
the classroom area; hung up his coat, and then took
a seat all the way over on the other side of the
room. He sat down, picked up a newspaper and began
to read for about 4 minutes. He than talked to the
girl sitting behind him for about 2 minutes. He
turned around and put his head on the desk and
"slept" for about 10 minutes. He was awakened by
raucous laughter and began to rub his eyes. He then
raised his hand and asked a question about a reading
assignment. He turned around and talked to the girl
behind him for another 1 min. (it should be mentioned
that Charlie was calm during his question, I would
rate him 1). Class ended at 10:50 and Charlie re-
mained to talk with four fellows for about five min.
Then he left. (Seating position is marked on the
chart.)

The compilation of data included in the running log was

recorded on individual data sheets (cf. App. 2).

RESULTS

The experimental hypotheses based on measures of class-
room behavior were divided into those related to interpersonal
interaction, classroom participation, and seating arrangement.
Nine hypotheses, then, were developed, each with a specific
behavioral measure.

With respect to interpersonal interaction in the class-
room, it was _first_ hypothesized (1) that students of the r
group would converse more frequently than students of the
other two groups. Table 2 summarizes the number of conversa-
tions carried on by students in each of the three groups.
The specific measure for this hypothesis was the number of
times each student spoke in the classroom situation to another
person or group of persons. Thus, students of the r group
spoke an average of three or more times before, during, or
after each class period, while students classified in the
other groups spoke only one or more times. Analysis of
variance (Table 3) applied to these results indicates a sig-
nificant difference between groups ($p < .05$). And finally,
the Studentized Range Statistic indicates that the difference
is in the expected direction ($p < .01$). Thus, students who
were assigned to the r group based on responses to the

Table 3

Analyses of Variance

Hypothesis	SS	df	MS	F	
			Between Groups		
(1)	44.37	2	22.18	4.82	(p<.05)
(2)	2.626	2	1.313	3.35	(p<.06)
(3)	49.62	2	24.81	.269	(p>.10)
(4)	14.44	2	7.22	.218	(p>.10)
(5)	8387.31	2	4193.5	1.24	(p<.10)
(6)	.281	2	.141	.012	(p>.10)
(7)	7927.69	2	3964.00	3.23	(p<.06)
			Between Observations		
(1)	.09	1	.09	.0006	
(2)	.657	1	.422	1.088	
(3)	.844	1	.84	.040	
(4)	1.97	1	1.97	.583	
(5)	389.27	1	389.27	.377	
(6)	.094	1	.094	.50	
(7)	2033.96	1	2033.96	.027	

Performance Style Test did, in fact, speak reliably more often than students of either of the other two groups.

The second hypothesis (2) about interpersonal interaction in the classroom states that r type students will join in conversation with more people than the p or c type students will. Thus, it would be expected that an r might join in conversation with two, three, or more students in or around the classroom, while p's or c's would probably stick with one or two people. The specific measure, then, is simply the number of people usually involved when a student of the r, p, or c, groups enters into conversation. It should be noted that some students of the p group did not speak at all during the class period but were still included for compilation of the mean scores. An analysis of variance of these results indicated a borderline significant difference between groups ($p < .06$). The Studentized Range Statistic indicates significantly ($p < .01$) that the difference between p and both the c and r groups is in the expected direction; thus, r's and c's on the whole, join in conversation with a greater number of people than p's do. We find no significant difference between r and c type students on this measure.

The third hypothesis concerning interpersonal interaction is actually composed of two hypotheses (3 and 4). The first (3) states that r type students should arrive earlier than the scheduled commencement time for each class, that p's will arrive later, and that c's will fall somewhere

in between. The specific measure is simply the number of minutes that a student arrives before class time. Thus, if a student arrives ten minutes before class time, he is scored 10; if exactly on time, he is scored 0, if two minutes late, he is scored -2, etc. Table 1 indicates that students of the p and r groups tend to arrive about $6\frac{1}{2}$ minutes before class, while a c type student usually arrives 4 minutes early. Analysis of variance did not indicate significance; and the simple mean scores were obviously not in the hypothesized direction. The second part of this hypothesis (4) states that r type students will tend to wait longer after class ends before they leave the actual class-room area, than students of the other groups. The measure is basically the same. Table 2 indicates that no one waits around too long after class ends. Analysis of variance, of course, did not find a significant difference between groups. Again, the direction was not that of the hypothesis.

The _fifth_ and final hypothesis (5) concerning inter-personal interaction states that those students in the r group, when conversing, will tend to speak for longer intervals than members of either of the other groups. Here the measure is in seconds of talking time; thus, the individual conver-sations of r's and c's tend to last for about a minute, while those of the p's lasts only about twenty seconds. Analysis of variance surprisingly did not indicate a significant dif-ference between groups (cf. Discussion). The simple means,

however, do indicate a noticeable, if not reliable difference

between r's and c's on the one hand and p's on the other.

The next set of hypotheses are grouped together insofar

as they refer to classroom participating behavior. However,

for reasons to be explained in the Discussion, the results

of only one of these are listed in Table 2. This hypothesis

(6) states that r's will participate more frequently during

class time than will p's or c's. Thus, an r would be

expected to answer or ask more questions than students of

either other group. The specific measure is simply the

number of classroom participations (i.e., anytime the stu-

dent speaks to the teacher or class as a student) which each

student offers during classtime. Table 2 patently indicates

a lack of participation. Analysis of variance indicated no

differences; and directions were not according to the

hypothesis.

Finally, the hypothesis (7) concerning seating arrange-

ment states that students of the c group will tend to sit

towards the front of the classroom and students of the p

group will tend to sit towards the rear. The specific measure

here is a given percentage, based on proportionate distance

from the front of the classroom. Thus, if a student sits in

the very first row or in the location proximate to the teacher,

his "score" would be 0%; someone sitting in the back of the

classroom would be scored 100%; someone in the middle, 50%,

etc. Mean scores for the groups in Table 2 indicate that p's

tended to sit in the back two-thirds of the classroom, while students of the other two groups usually sit in the front half of the classroom. Analysis of variance indicated a borderline significant difference ($p < .06$) between groups. The Studentized Range Statistic indicated that both r and c groups sat reliably closer to the front of the classroom than did students of the p group ($p < .01$).

Analysis of variance measures of the seven above hypotheses indicate that while there is often significant differences between groups, i.e., p, r, or c, there was never a significant difference between observations, i.e., results from the first classroom observation for each student were fairly consistent with those of the second classroom observation (cf. Table 3).

DISCUSSION

The results indicate that there are, in fact, consistent differences in simple classroom behavior patterns; but, more importantly, that these differences exist when people are grouped along a dimension such as social competence. Hence, a firmer basis for a typology classifying people according to their performance styles in social interaction is established. Consideration of those hypotheses indicating significant differences between groups will help to assess how great the differences are, how consistent, and consequently, how reliable future predictions might be.

Both p and r groups were consistently antipodal (Ring, 1966). Out of the seven hypotheses finally considered, these two groups were at opposite ends of the continuum on four of them; and on three of these, the differences were significant in the predicted direction. The behavioral patterns on which these predictions were based are both easily observable and important in their implications. Thus, r's tend to speak more often, with more people, and for a greater length of time than p's do. And r's tend to sit more toward the front of the class than p's do.

In one sense, the present study has indicated the probability of consistent differences between p and r groups on

behavioral patterns in the classroom thus heightening the value of the Ring typology as based on the Performance Style Test. But let us consider the data concerning the $\underline{c}$ group. It is variant from the predictions and not nearly so consistent as $\underline{p}$ and $\underline{r}$ patterns, and possibly suggests a partial revision of the Ring typology.

It will be recalled from the Introduction that Ring sets up the $\underline{p}$ and $\underline{r}$ styles as opposite. This trend, as we have seen, has been generally confirmed by our data. When discussing the $\underline{c}$ group, "the chameleons," he states vaguely that they fall somewhere in between $\underline{p}$ and $\underline{r}$ groups on several measures (1967). His original postulation (1966) however, states that both $\underline{c}$'s and $\underline{p}$'s lack social competence, but compensate in different ways. The logical theme of prediction, reflected in our hypotheses, stated that $\underline{c}$'s would fall in between the other two groups on most measures, but that they would generally be more similar to $\underline{p}$'s than to $\underline{r}$'s. In one out of four hypotheses with notable differences, this basis of prediction was borne out significantly and in the expected direction. Students of the $\underline{r}$ group converse reliably more often before, during, and after class than do students of the other groups. The results of the remaining three hypotheses indicate $\underline{no}$ significant differences between $\underline{r}$ and $\underline{c}$ groups.

Obviously, some explanation for the unexpected results could be so derived as to accord essentially with the theme

of the hypotheses. Such explanations are frequently found in discussions of results when the results plainly did not support the experimental hypothesis; such explanations, then, should not be considered as conclusions, but as modifications of the original hypothesis, subject to further research. In the present study, validation of the basic typology is well supported; but consideration of unpredicted results may assist a clearer understanding of Ring's theory.

The c category presents something of a problem to Ring; he is unable to specify its position on various measures and does not mention it specifically in any of his hypotheses (1966, 1967). Instead, it is placed "in between." Closer examination of the description of the c reveals that he is, in fact, a hard man to "pigeon-hole." Thus, he may feel socially incompetent and become anxious in situations demanding a well-handled performance; but he also has the ability to put on a good show. He has "studied" the styles of apparently more competent people, memorized the scripts, and is able to repeat it, probably _verbatim_. Let us clarify with an example: The r enjoys conversation before class, he is confident in his "acting" ability and makes it a point to demonstrate it every day, no matter whom he is talking to. The p scrupulously avoids conversation, makes no bones about it, and at best utilizes one script. Both can be distinguished by their observable behavior patterns: one talks, the other doesn't, etc. But the c does not exemplify such consistency

between conscious appraisal of the circumstances and overt behavior. He may not feel up to talking, but he also knows from experience that social approval is contingent upon talking. He does not know what to say but feels that he must say something. He resolves the conflict neither by developing social competence nor by remaining silent, but by becoming a conformist, i.e., he imitates the socially competent role. He is neither p (remains silent) nor r (socially competent), but an admixture, the chameleon, who takes a little from both.

Perhaps this may shed some light on the unexpected results, the inconsistent directions of the c group differences. The c is, in point of fact, socially incompetent, if we understand this as the ability to handle a variety of interpersonal situations well. Obviously, this concept of social competence is rather vague; it is certainly difficult to specify which behavior patterns measure it and which do not. Since we are fairly able to distinguish between the two antipodal types, p and r, on the assumed continuum of social competence, there is probably some basis for distinction; but why does the introduction of the c aspect of the typology throw in a monkey wrench? Let us speculate. The c may differ from the p in his ability to "pose" as a socially competent performer; he utilizes more of the socially competent script; he is, in some sense, an imposter. But, if the c's use of the script is imperfect, if he is an imposter, his performance should

breakdown in a crucial area. Considering again the results from various hypotheses, it is possible that the one hypothesis with results which distinguished r's from c's was based on one of these "crucial" areas. Specifically, a person's actual frequency of conversation tells more about his level of social competence than do such measures as number of people involved in the conversation or duration of conversation, etc. To stand in the presence of a large group of people is one thing, to speak to them is another. To speak at length with one person is one thing, to speak many times to many people is another. It is possible then, that some measures of behavioral patterns may be able to distinguish "real" social competence and others not.

This reasoning suggests a modification of the theme of the hypotheses to accommodate for areas where the c will be able to "bluff" the audience. Suppose that we distinguish between two types of conversational content: meaningful and superficial. Each of us has his own opinion about the criteria for such a distinction, but some consensus could probably be reached, possibly along the lines suggested in the Method section of this paper for rating of class participation content. On the basis of Ring's typology (1966) and the results of this paper's hypotheses we could say: the p will limit himself to "meaningful" conversation, the c will usually utilize "small-talk", while the r will be comfortable with either mode of communication. The p avoids superficialities

as representing phoniness; the c is mimicking another person's role and should avoid too much talk coming from the "heart"; the r realizes the necessity of both types of communication for versatile social interaction. An arithmetical rendition of this hypothesis would account for r's noticeably more frequent conversation than either p's or c's. Validation would require investigation of the actual conversational material utilized by the three types. Thus, a more specific definition of social competence might be developed, and more critical measures of behavioral patterns utilized.

Do our results then represent "sound and fury, signifying nothing"? By no means. This further validation of Ring's typology and his use of the Performance Style Test indicate that we have begun to isolate a concept such as social competence. But, the really important upshot of this paper is that the validation was based on unobstrusive measures of overt behavior patterns, and simple patterns at that. Concretely, we will be able to administer the paper and pencil test, and in some instances be able to predict several behavioral patterns fairly accurately. If we find "pure" r and p types, we will be able to easily distinguish them on several counts (cf. Table 1).

The findings have potential use in psychotherapy. If the r type is seen as basically desirable, we could suggest behavioral modification on the part of the p. Thus, a p complains that he is socially rejected, that he feels lonely,

and contemplates suicide. Hoping that his disturbance is
not too deeply rooted, we may suggest that he endeavor to
converse more often at class, that he join in larger conver-
sational groups, that he sit towards the front of the class-
room, etc. Relying, then, on a tenet of behavioral therapy,
we hope that this overt behavior change will favorably
affect other patterns of behavior. Again, we assume that
this sort of social competence reflects a better "adjusted"
personality, a happier person, etc.

A brief look at the non-significant results is warranted.
The measure of participation in class along with its several
dependent measures indicates little or no difference between
groups. This last mentioned variable with its results was
the most disappointing. In each of the groups, there were
no more than five instances of participation in class by the
whole group! Consequently, measures of duration, manner,
and content of participation were rendered useless. If any
conclusion may be drawn, it is a critical one concerning a
system of education which elicits such a parsimonious response
from students.

Non-significant results of the measures of arrival and
departure probably reflect faulty estimation by observers
who were working under the difficulty of not knowing exactly
what they were looking for; and this was magnified by the
fact that only two observations were being made. Other limi-
tations to the present study entered in the form of lack of

reliability on the part of the observers. Again, not enough time or variety of observation made cross-checks impossible. Finally, there was no male/female discrimination.

Modification of the experiment would take the form of an increased observation period (including perhaps five or six actual classroom periods for each student). This would presumably work to improve the reliability of all measures, but particularly those of rating and the arrival and departure times. Recording of arrival times would not begin until after the first two observation periods. The extension of the present hypothesis discussed above could be measured by some implementation of a study of actual conversational material.

Furthermore, this type of behavioral observation following Ring's typology and implementation of the Performance Style Test may well be extended to other areas, thus sharpening the concepts on which the test is based and the attention to cues involved in the behavior patterns. For example, the test could be administered to graduate students in clinical psychology undergoing supervision in actual psychotherapy. Observations of behavioral patterns in a given situation, e.g., a perceptual isolation situation, could be made at different times during the course of training. In this way, we might be able to determine correlations between a person's type of social competence and say, his length of time spent in therapy with a given client. Again, such an example only indicates the varied potential of the test and the numerous

settings for behavioral observations or experimental manipu-
lations which are possible.

How far may the results of the present study be general-
ized? Are they applicable beyond the elementary psychology
student population of the actual testing situation? One
factor may influence the extent of generalization, specifical-
ly generalization across age groups. Due to the qualities
being measured and discriminated by the performance style
test, it seems that people's styles may change with age.
In general, there seems to be a slight evolving development
of composure in the majority of personalities which seems to
be reflected in a transition from the $\underline{p}$ type of social inter-
action to that of an $\underline{r}$ or a $\underline{c}$. Thus, the self-conscious and
easily embarrassed adolescent will probably become, to some
extent, the self-confident adult. Use of the Performance
Style Test itself might be used to check such a possibility,
simply by comparing proportions of the typology across age
groups.

REFERENCES

Berne, E. Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.

Christie, R. "Impersonal interpersonal orientations and behavior," Unpublished research proposal, Columbia University, 1962.

Dunnette, M. D. "Fads, Fashions, and Folderol," Amer. Psychol. 21, 343-52, 1966.

Goffmann, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1959.

Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., and Davis, K. E. Psych. Mono. 76. No. 2 Whole No. 521, 1962.

Jones, E. E. Ingratiation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Manzel, E. W. "Naturalistic and experimental research on primates," Human Development 10: 170-86, 1967.

Rausch, H. L. "Naturalistic aspects of the clinical research method," Human Development 10: 155-69, 1967.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., and Braginsky, B. "Performance styles in interpersonal relations," Psychological Reports, 18, 203-20, 1966.

Ring, K., Braginsky, D., and Levine, L. "Performance styles in interpersonal behavior: an experimental validation of a typology," J. of Experimental Social Psychol. 3: 140-59, 1967.

Sechrest, L. "Naturalistic methods in the study of social attitudes," Human Development 10: 199-211, 1967.

Willems, E. P. "Toward an explicit rationale for naturalistic research methods," Human Development 10: 155-69, 1967.

APPENDICES

Instructions, items, and scoring keys

for the Performance Style Test

For each of the statements presented below you are to decide whether it is <u>true</u> <u>as</u> <u>applied</u> <u>to</u> <u>you</u> <u>or</u> <u>false</u> <u>as</u> <u>it</u> <u>is</u> <u>applied</u> <u>to</u> <u>you</u>.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet provided. If a statement is true or mostly true, as applied to you, blacken in the <u>first</u> column space opposite the corresponding item number. If a statement is false or not usually true, as applied to you, blacken in the <u>second</u> column space opposite the corresponding item number.

Make sure, in using the answer sheet, that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Please do not omit any items.

	<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>c</u>
1. I would be uncomfortable in anything other than conventional dress.	-	F	T
2. If given the chance I would make a good leader of people.	F	T	F
3. I have skill in influencing others.		F	T	F

		p	r	c

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 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

	p	r	c
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.	F	T	F
18. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand.	F	F	T
19. I can easily make other people afraid of me, and sometimes do for the fun of it.	F	T	F
20. A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.	F	-	T
21. I do not mind meeting strangers.	F	T	-
22. I think I'd enjoy being an actor (or actress).	F	T	T
23. At parties I am more likely to sit by myself or with just one other person than to join in with the crowd.	T	F	F
24. I can usually get people to do what I want.	F	T	F
25. I usually have trouble making myself heard in an argument.	T	F	T
26. I like to be the center of attention in a group.	F	T	F
27. People can pretty easily change me even though I thought my mind was already made up on a subject.	F	F	T
28. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.	T	F	T

		<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>c</u>
29.	I think I would enjoy being a salesman.	F	T	F
30.	I like to meet new people.	F	T	F
31.	I don't like participating in formal ceremonies.	T	-	F
32.	If I'm with someone I don't like, I usually don't express my real feelings to him.	F	T	T
33.	I like to follow instructions and do what is expected of me.	F	F	T
34.	I find it hard to talk when I meet new people.	T	F	-
35.	I frequently feel intense sympathy for others.	T	-	-
36.	I enjoy being with people who are suave and sophisticated.	F	T	T
37.	I think it's important to learn how to obey.	F	F	T
38.	I think most people would lie to get ahead.	T	T	F
39.	When in a new situation, it's best to watch what others do.	F	F	T
40.	I enjoy being the host (or hostess) of a party.	F	T	F
41.	I feel I can handle myself pretty well in most social situations.	F	T	T
42.	I sometimes enjoy misleading people just for the fun of it.	F	T	F
43.	I can deceive people, if I have to, without feeling guilty about it.	F	T	T
44.	I don't mind pretending to like someone when I really don't if there's a good reason to do so.	F	T	T

	<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>c</u>
29. I think I would enjoy being a salesman.	F	T	F
30. I like to meet new people.	F	T	F
31. I don't like participating in formal ceremonies.	T	–	F
32. If I'm with someone I don't like, I usually don't express my real feelings to him.	F	T	T
33. I like to follow instructions and do what is expected of me.	F	F	T
34. I find it hard to talk when I meet new people.	T	F	–
35. I frequently feel intense sympathy for others.	T	–	–
36. I enjoy being with people who are suave and sophisticated.	F	T	T
37. I think it's important to learn how to obey.	F	F	T
38. I think most people would lie to get ahead.	T	T	F
39. When in a new situation, it's best to watch what others do.	F	F	T
40. I enjoy being the host (or hostess) of a party.	F	T	F
41. I feel I can handle myself pretty well in most social situations.	F	T	T
42. I sometimes enjoy misleading people just for the fun of it.	F	T	F
43. I can deceive people, if I have to, without feeling guilty about it.	F	T	T
44. I don't mind pretending to like someone when I really don't if there's a good reason to do so.	F	T	T

	p	r	c

45. I like people to notice and to comment upon my appearance when I am out in public.   F   T   F

46. I often feel like telling people what I really think of them.   T   T   F

47. I feel ill at ease with people I don't know.   T   F   -

48. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.   F   T   -

49. I am a good mixer.   F   T   T

50. I like to go to parties.   F   T   T

51. In general, I find that I dislike non-conformists.   F   F   T

52. I don't like to be too conspicuous at social gatherings.   T   F   T

53. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.   F   T   T

54. I often find that my wishes conflict with those of others.   T   -   F

55. I feel guilty whenever I have done something I know is wrong.   T   F   -

Percentile norms, means, standard deviations,

and ranges for the three scales of

the PST, according to sex of respondent

	p scale		r scale		c scale	
Score	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
41			99			
40			98		MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE	
39	99	99	97	99	p = 54	
38	98	96	96	98	r = 50	
37	97	97	93	97	c = 47	
36	97	97	90	95		
35	96	95	87	93		99
34	94	94	83	89	99	98
33	93	93	80	85	97	97
32	92	90	76	80	96	94
31	90	87	70	76	93	88
30	88	85	63	70	89	83
29	85	81	56	63	86	75
28	80	76	51	55	78	68
27	76	71	46	50	69	58
26	73	67	38	44	60	48
25	67	62	31	38	53	38
24	62	55	26	32	46	31
23	55	49	21	28	33	23
22	50	40	17	23	26	16

	p scale		r scale		c scale	
Score	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
21	43	35	13	18	21	12
20	35	30	11	14	15	10
19	29	23	10	12	11	8
18	21	18	8	10	6	5
17	14	13	6	8	4	3
16	10	9	5	6	2	2
15	8	6	4	3	2	1
14	4	4	2	3	1	
13	2	2	2	2		
12	1	2	2	2		
11		1	1	1		
Mean	23.44	24.24	28.18	27.01	25.15	26.45
s	6.17	6.13	6.37	6.23	4.36	4.32
Range	8-42	9-42	9-45	7-43	13-36	10-37
N	391	461	391	461	391	461

APPENDIX 2

DATA COMPILATION FROM RUNNING LOG

Class begins __:__   Student arrived __:__

Class ends   __:__   Student departed __:__

	CONVERSATION	PARTICIPATION
Frequency (no. of times)	____	____
People involved ($\overline{X}$ no. for each time)	____	____
Duration ($\overline{X}$ no. of secs.)	____	____
Manner ($\overline{X}$ rating)		____
Content ($\overline{X}$ rating)		____

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

SEATING CHART

FRONT

BACK