

AUDIENCE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PLAYS SEASCAPE,  
COMPANY, AND ARMSTRONG AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

NATALIE K. GREEN

B. S., Kansas State University, 1975

---

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

Approved by:

Harold J. Nichols  
Major Professor

LD  
2668  
T4  
1977  
G74  
C.2  
Document

15

## PREFACE

I want to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to my major professor, Dr. Harold Nichols, for his guidance, immeasurable help, and encouragement throughout the preparation of this thesis. Special thanks goes to Dr. Norman Fedder and Dr. Norma Bunton, the associate members of my committee, for their constructive criticisms, suggestions, and encouragement. I would also like to thank University Learning Network and the campus computer consultants for their time and efforts. For their assistance and cooperation in formulating the computer programs needed for the analysis of the thesis appreciation is extended to Dr. William Schenck-Hamlin and Dr. Raymond G. Smith.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. RATIONALE.....	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	6
III. PROCEDURE.....	12
IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	18
LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED.....	31
APPENDIX.....	32

## CHAPTER I

### RATIONALE

College and university theatre departments generally include a variety of elementary courses in their curriculums to acquaint the student with the basics of the theatrical art. Each course is designed to equip the student with the basic processes and knowledge fundamental to that particular element of theatre. The more exposure the student receives, the better qualified theatre participant he becomes.

The further the student continues in his studies, the more aware he becomes of stage techniques. His view of a production is sharpened. Each new class broadens his perspective until he comes to notice the detail which makes a production work. The setting, the lights, the costuming, the direction, and the action take on new meaning as he comes to understand the principles behind each of these elements.

For example, when a student takes a course in fundamentals of technical production, he learns how to construct flats, platforms, steps, and other basic units. He may possibly work with foams, resins, and pipe welding. He learns about stage set up, how to fly scenery in and out of a set, and other basic stage techniques. Since he has worked with the construction, he can understand this aspect of a production more fully. The technical elements, if done well, will fascinate him and may awaken his curiosity if he isn't quite sure how each unit was accomplished.

A student who takes a course in stage lighting will watch how the lighting shifts. He will observe the areas lit and the brightness or dimness of the lighting. If he was taught how to operate a follow spot he will



know whether or not the operator is doing a commendable job. All projections and other aspects of lighting take on new significance.

After completion of a costuming course, a student will watch the clothing for historical accuracy. He will notice the textures of fabric and the combination of colors used. If an unusual fabric is used, he may try to determine what kind of material it is. Especially if the material is used to represent a more expensive fabric, the student's interest will perk up. His senses will be heightened.

A Principles of Direction course will give the student new insights into movement on stage. The blocking of the actors and the development of their characterizations become a primary concern. The director's role in eliciting actor interaction takes on new perspective.

Thus, each course helps the student become more aware of the theatre arts and the procedures and processes behind each element. New insight and understanding of the elements increase with the more exposure the student has to them.

An interesting aspect of this increased awareness is whether or not it is beneficial to him as an audience member. Often the student's new insight gives him more aspects upon which to focus his attention and his mind may then focus primarily on the particular element he has been studying at the time. His desire to understand how that particular element was accomplished may cause him to temporarily lose the action of the play. Probably there will be no harm done, and the unfolding of the why and wherefore behind the action will enhance rather than detract from his appreciation of the production.

On the other hand, the student's acute perception may become a

drawback if the production has poorly executed elements. These can hamper the student's enjoyment as he knows the production could be better if these elements were done well. His mind may become temporarily sidetracked in an attempt to solve the inadequacies, and the student might miss out on some of the action and the subtler moments of the production. Although it is not always possible, the student may counteract this drawback by finding a well executed element on which he can refocus his attention and thus regain his appreciation of the production.

In general, then, theatre departments assume that a theatrically oriented person will appreciate a production more than a non-theatrically oriented person. For even if a production is found to be lacking in some element, a theatrically oriented person is able to find positive points to counteract the poor or negative elements. Appreciation of the production is not spoiled completely. It becomes no wonder that universities emphasize courses designed to familiarize students with theatre. With a more theatrically oriented population more productions will be seen and enjoyed thereby creating larger, more responsive audiences and added income.

An Appreciation of Theatre course is one of the easiest and most widely used methods through which a large number of people are familiarized with many elements of the theatre arts. Most institutions of higher learning offer this basic course or a similar one entitled Introduction to Theatre. The course descriptions of several Kansas schools express the rationale behind this course. Kansas State University's Appreciation of Theatre course is a "Direct experience with live theatre through an investigation of theatrical materials, forms, and styles and attendance at the University

theatrical productions."<sup>1</sup> Wichita State University's The Art of the Theatre course is "An introduction to the theatre as an art form, with emphasis on critical appreciation from the viewpoint of the audience."<sup>2</sup> The Introduction to the Theatre course at Washburn University of Topeka is defined as "The arts and crafts of the theatre with a view to developing both understanding of principles behind the production of a play and standards for the judgment of the success of the production."<sup>3</sup> At Kansas State College of Pittsburg their Introduction to Theatre: Arts class is "An examination of the aesthetic processes by which plays are translated into theatrical terms and projected from stage to an audience, focusing on the principles which underlie theatre practices and techniques."<sup>4</sup> The most inclusive description is the University of Kansas's Introduction to the Theatre course which is "Designed to help students by means of experience with theatre as well as study about it to achieve an understanding of its cultural role in contemporary society, to develop a sensitive and informed appreciation of its art, and to make it an integral part of their cultural lives. Lectures, discussion groups, special interest groups, theatre attendance."<sup>5</sup> Therefore, no matter what the title, the aim of each course is the same; to introduce a wide variety of theatrical elements to the layman in hopes that he, like the major, will come to understand and appreciate the theatre art.

<sup>1</sup>Kansas State University, Bulletin 1975-1976 (Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan, Kansas), p. 171.

<sup>2</sup>Wichita State University, Catalog 1976-1977 (Office of Information and Public Events, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas), p. 390.

<sup>3</sup>Washburn University of Topeka, Catalog 1975-1977 (Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kansas), p. 127.

<sup>4</sup>Kansas State College of Pittsburg, General Catalog 1975-1977 (Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kansas), p. 263.

<sup>5</sup>The University of Kansas, Composite Bulletin of the Schools 1976-1977 (The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas), p. 171.

Thus, the concept of improving a student's perception of theatre by exposing him to theatre is a proposition often taken for granted. The actual validity of the idea has not been questioned, rather it is accepted as common knowledge. Does being familiar with theatre actually create a more aware audience participant who reacts more positively towards a production than a non-theatrically oriented person? Studies of audiences have been made, but few touch this aspect of the audience.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Probably the least understood and yet most vital part of theatre is its audience. Studies have been made to determine exactly what kind of people constitute it, how often they attend, and for what reasons. Researchers have tried to understand their likes and dislikes. Yet, there are many aspects of this vital group of people which still need investigation.

One of the first questions which arises is how often people attend theatre. In her 1967 study of audiences in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties in Florida, Paula Mae Milton analyzed 669 questionnaires collected from 10 theatres in those areas.<sup>1</sup> The questionnaire was comprised of 22 questions ranging from the number of plays attended in a year to whether the performances met the expectations of the theatre goer, from what type of theatre is preferred to what play is preferred, from the reasons for going to the theatre to the evaluation of the effectiveness of the production. Among other results Dr. Milton found that the majority of playgoers attended up to 10 plays in a given year. In a similar manner, Amity Pierce Buxton's 1962 study involved spectators attending the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre in Stratford, Connecticut.<sup>2</sup> A check-list

<sup>1</sup>Paula Mae Milton, "A Descriptive Study of Audience Attitudes: A Survey of Selected Audiences in Professional, Educational and Community Theatres in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties in the State of Florida", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28 (1967), p. 3810 (The Florida State University).

<sup>2</sup>Amity Loring Pierce Buxton, "Audiences and Audience Reactions at the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre, Stratford, Connecticut: Summer Repertory-1957", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 24 (1963), p. 890 (Columbia University).

questionnaire was distributed to every sixth spectator attending, and open-ended interviews were conducted with five spectators selected by the investigator at each performance. In addition, a form letter covering audience reactions was sent to the 238 spectators who were interviewed. Dr. Buxton found that prior to the questionnaire about 40% had seen one production at Stratford and about 75% had seen one stage and one mass media production of Shakespeare. Those answering the questionnaire viewed an average of eight stage plays, nineteen feature movies, and 103 television dramas during that year.

Both studies show that people attend a fairly large number of plays. The reason for attendance varies. Buxton's research gave the casts, news reviews, friends' advice and the plays per se to be decisive factors in attendance. Milton's study also ranked reasons for attendance. At the top was entertainment. This was followed by emotional, mental, or spiritual stimulation. Next came relaxation and escape, and finally enlightenment. Milton's subjects preferred touring professional theatre rather than local professional, college/university, and finally community/regional theatre. When subjects were asked to rank their type of play preferences, comedy and drama ranked nearly equal. Musical comedy was not far behind and tragedy was rated the lowest.

The type of people who attend theatre vary. They come from a wide variety of backgrounds and interests. In Amity Pierce Buxton's study of Shakespearean productions, a cross-section of Americans was represented. A few features did predominate. Females outnumbered males and married outnumbered single respondents by a small margin. Those aged 30-40 formed

about 25% of the audience, and those from 25-29 and 41-54 each formed about 25% of the audience. About 45% were in the professions. Housewives and student-retired-unemployed formed about 16% each; and managerial and clerical each made up about 8%. Those who had completed college formed a majority and those who had completed graduate work or less than college each formed about 30%.

Does occupation influence the interest of the audience towards dramatic stimuli? Jack W. Vrieze investigated the possibility in 1953.<sup>3</sup> He took 15 occupational groups and exposed them to important episodes from 15 plays. Contrary to his original beliefs, Dr. Vrieze found that occupation did not influence the interest of the audience in their response to dramatic stimuli. All groups showed a relatively high interest in dramatic stimuli. The only slight deviation was that professionals such as lawyers, teachers, engineers, physicians and dentists, were somewhat less interested in dramatic stimuli as a whole. However, the difference of degree was not found to be significant.

College training, on the other hand, has been found to have some effect on interest depending upon how complex the dramatic material may be. In 1953 Elson Lowell Matson selected four educational levels; I (11-12 years), II (13-14 years), III (15-16 years), and IV (16+ years), to determine if educational training makes a difference in interest of simple vs. complex dramatic material.<sup>4</sup> Each group viewed 162 episodes from 15 plays chosen according to ideational

<sup>3</sup> Jack W. Vrieze, "An Experimental Study of Occupation and its Influence on Audience Response in the Theatre", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 13 (1953), pp. 453-454 (State University of Iowa).

<sup>4</sup> Elson Lowell Matson, "A Study of Years of Formal Education as a Factor in Audience Response to Ideational Content and Treatment in Plays", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 13 (1953), pp. 452-453 (State University of Iowa).

content and manner of treatment. Six categories, three illustrating the simple and three the complex in plays were devised. Dr. Matson found a difference in response to the plays due to the subject's amount of formal education. A definite difference was found between the high school trained people and college trained people in their interest in simple and complex dramatic material. The observers with three and four years of high school were more interested in simple dramatic material while those with some college training were more interested in complex dramatic material. The degree of interest in complex dramatic material over simple dramatic material tended to increase as the years of college training increased.

The difference between students and non-students in their reactions to theatre was studied by Nathaniel Sisson Eek in 1959.<sup>5</sup> He tried to determine what factors influenced theatre attendance and how these factors related to the audience. Dr. Eek applied a questionnaire to 200 students and non-students, attenders and non-attenders and found some interesting results. The student found the literary, intellectual, and cultural appeals of educational theatre stronger than the non-student did. He also tended to more critical and was more extreme in his approval or disapproval of the items. The non-student found the personal pleasure appeals, such as seeing his friends, relaxing, and enjoying theatre for its own sake, stronger than the students. The educational theatre attender was found to be primarily theatre oriented. He enjoyed theatre for its own sake, was inclined to see several plays rather than just one specific play, felt that people of his own background and interests

<sup>5</sup> Nathaniel Sisson Eek, "Attitudes Toward Playgoing in a Selected Contemporary Educational Audience", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 20 (1960), p. 3888 (The Ohio State University).



attended, considered attendance a pleasant and relaxing experience, and felt that the plays were well presented. The educational theatre non-attender had similar reactions of approval of the plays, but to a much lesser degree. An element of prestige seemed to influence his reaction. Also, he was primarily indifferent to attendance rather than strongly opposed to it.

In summation, then, occupational background seems to make little difference in appreciating theatre; however, college training does affect its appreciation. Increased education seems to increase the enjoyment of the theatrical arts. The type and specificity of increased education needs further investigation.

Jit L. Kapur's study done in 1960 is a step in that direction.<sup>6</sup> Dr. Kapur attempted to discover the differences in audience responses to two performances of the same play, acted by the same cast and directed by the same director, when the control performance was rehearsed and presented under conditions typical of the professional theatre, while the experimental performance was rehearsed and presented after a professional psychoanalyst had given an interpretation of the play to the director as an aid in the intellectual, as distinct from creative, direction of the play. The subjects consisted of four groups: a panel of experts, the participating actors, the director of the play, and two matched groups of laymen, one for each performance. Their responses to each performance were recorded on questionnaires, rating scales, tests, and magnetic audio tape. The differences between the two play's ratings were significant. The professional panel indicated a shift in the portrayal of the

<sup>6</sup>Jit L. Kapur, "An Experimental Study of Audience Responses to a Play Rehearsed with and without a Play Analysis by a Professional Psychoanalyst", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 21 (1960), pp. 265-266 (University of Southern California).

mood and comprehension of the theme of the play in favor of the psychoanalyst-aided performance over the control performance. There was no significant change, however, regarding estimated emotional and interest values of the two performances or the relative effectiveness of character portrayals by the individual actors. The audience also showed a shift in favor of the psychoanalyst-aided performance over the control performance with respect to cumulative acting and interest value of the play. The entertainment value, intelligibility of the theme, comprehension of characters, emotional impact, and retention of facts about the play remained stable for both performances. When the number, average volume, and duration of laughs and applause for the two performances were compared, no significant differences were found. All statistically significant shifts were consistently in favor of the psychoanalyst-aided performance. His services did improve the performance by giving the director enhanced insight into the play.

In general, then, if a director has a good understanding of a production it will improve the play's performance. The concept of increasing the audience's understanding of a production to improve their perception of it seems to be the next logical step. This process is being carried out in college and universities with their Appreciation of Theatre and Introduction to Theatre courses. Their effectiveness has yet to be substantiated.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

To accomplish the aims of this study three different groups, chosen at random from all students at Kansas State University, were needed. A group with extensive theatre background and experience, hereafter labeled theatre group, was randomly selected from Spring 1976 roll sheets of theatre major courses. A group which has taken the lower level course, Appreciation of Theatre, which is designed to familiarize a student with theatrical materials, forms, and styles through theatre attendance, hereafter labeled theatre appreciation group, was randomly selected from Spring 1976 roll sheets from two different Appreciation of Theatre classes. The non-theatre exposed group, hereafter labeled non-theatre group, was randomly selected from the 1975-1976 student telephone directory. Since the 1976-1977 student telephone directory had not been issued, the list of names drawn for each group was taken to the University Learning Network or ULN, the campus information source, and the phone number of each person was located. The first list, containing the theatre appreciation and the non-theatre groups, had approximately 100 names for each group. Of these, ULN was able to locate phone listings for no more than about one third due to graduation, non-returning students or just no phone listing available. Calls were made to these students, and because of the small number of available subjects a second random sample had to be drawn. This sample contained approximately 200 names for each group, and again ULN was only able to locate a portion of them. These individuals were called, and from the combined calls the groups were formed.

The phonecalls were similar in nature. Each individual was told approximately the following:

Hi. This is Natalie Green and I'm doing a study of people's perception of theatre for my master's thesis. What I need is for people to go to three of our K-State Players productions during the year and fill out a questionnaire after each show. To get them to do that I'm giving them a free ticket to the show. Do you think you might be interested?

If a favorable response was received, the procedure was explained in detail. If the individual agreed to participate, he was also asked if he had taken the Appreciation of Theatre course. This was necessary to initially determine proper group placement for the non-theatre group selected from the student directory.

All participants were required to attend one performance of each of the following plays: Seascape by Edward Albee, the musical Company, and a serious play Armstrong. Following each performance attended, a questionnaire was filled out concerning the traits of that particular play. The questionnaire chosen for the study was the Message Measurement Inventories developed by Raymond G. Smith of Indiana University. The Inventories are based on two assumptions: one, that message reality consists of whatever the receiver perceives it to be, rather than what the originator may have intended and two, that given a response field consisting of far more traits than any receiver would ordinarily utilize, and with the receiver permitted complete freedom of selection, message perceptions will be maximally defined. The Inventories are particularly useful in this study as they utilize a set of 56 positive and 58 negative qualifying terms which Smith divided into four influence categories. These are: the rational or intellectual/reasoned discourse which includes facts, examples, reasons, and arguments; the affective or emotional discourse which

includes appeals to needs, wants, and desires; the credible or belief system discourse which includes source and message credibility, both stated and implied; and the artistic or esthetic response discourse which includes balance, harmony, and congruity of the linguistic form and structure. Since an audience responds to a play in all of these ways, the Inventory is ideal. It permits comparison of those characteristics representative of a person's reactions to a play. In addition, the terms were designed to be generally meaningful to the college population. In this study the subjects were taken from the college population so the terms are appropriate.

Smith applied a variety of tests to determine the validity of the qualifying terms.<sup>7</sup> These indicated that the terms were accurate measurements of each particular trait. Smith used the Kuder-Richardson reliability formula to test the reliability of the scales and out of 120 reliability checks, 112 were significant at the .01 level.<sup>8</sup> When using the Inventory, it is necessary to apply it twice. On the first application the subject rates the importance of the trait in any message. This determines the value or general weight he places on the qualifying term, and this value can then be used as a basis from which he could deviate according to his responses to a specific message. On the second application the subject rates how much of the quality the particular message being judged has. Each qualifying term is placed on a ten-point scale which allows each subject to rank the importance of that particular quality. If the particular quality has no meaning for the subject, he is able to simply

<sup>7</sup>Raymond G. Smith, "The Perceptual Response Communication Inventory: Development and Application of a New Method of Judging Messages", an unpublished work.

<sup>8</sup>Raymond G. Smith, "Development and Possibilities of Message Measurement Inventories", delivered at Central States Speech Association Conference, April 14, 1977.

mark zero showing that the term, for him, does not apply. Thus, each subject creates his own scale by constructing his private rating instrument from the total offered by the message measurement inventory. This makes it possible to compare different groups' responses to each particular quality. As this study is based on the comparisons of the three different theatre oriented or non-oriented groups, the questionnaire is extremely useful.

In the study the sessions to complete the questionnaire for the first time were held on two separate nights for the convenience of the subject. The sessions were held prior to the first play's performance, and the subject was asked to direct his responses toward any play in general. This rating provided the weights of each term and later ratings were compared to these to determine how each subject perceived the qualities of each specific play. At this session the subject was also asked which night he preferred to view the first production and tickets for the first play were handed out.

For the second and third play the subject was notified by phone of the upcoming play and asked to pick his ticket up at the box office. His name was placed on a complimentary ticket list, and the subject could pick his ticket up anytime before the performance.

In the second play's questionnaire an extra page was added containing the following questions:

1. Prior to this study I have attended \_\_\_\_\_ theatre productions.  
Circle the correct answer.
  - a. 1-5
  - b. 6-10
  - c. 11 or more

2. Prior to this study I have actively been involved (either by acting, directing, or technical participation) in \_\_\_\_\_ theatre productions. Circle the correct answer.

a. 1-5

b. 6-10

c. 11 or more

3. Prior to this study I have taken. Check the correct answer.

Appreciation of Theatre

            
yes

            
no

Introduction to Theatre

            
yes

            
no

Fundamentals of Acting

            
yes

            
no

Fundamentals of Technical  
Production

            
yes

            
no

Other \_\_\_\_\_

These questions were asked to determine whether any of the subjects needed to be moved to another group instead of remaining in the one in which they were initially placed. To be in the theatre group, the subject needed to have attended 11 or more theatre productions, and either have participated in 11 or more productions or have participated in 6-10 productions and have taken a minimum of three theatre courses. The theatre appreciation group needed to have taken the Appreciation of Theatre course. For the non-theatre group it was necessary not to have taken a theatre course and to either not have attended more than 1-5 productions and not have participated in more than 6-10 productions or to not have attended 11 or more productions and not have participated in more than 1-5 productions. As a result of this questionnaire, both one non-theatre and one theatre appreciation subject were

moved to the theatre group.

A problem developed during the study due to conflicts of the subjects' schedules. One of the plays was performed on a three day weekend and, subjects wanted to go home. Athletic events and other meetings took precedence over play attendance. Regardless of each play having a minimum of three performances (Thursday, Friday, and Saturday), schedules conflicted and a high attrition rate of subjects occurred.

The theatre group originally consisted of seventeen subjects. Of these, eleven completed the study. The other six missed a play due to the following reasons: two to illness, two to prior commitments, one to an out-of-town unexpected visitor, and one to becoming involved in a production.

The theatre appreciation group started out with nineteen subjects. Eleven completed the study. The others had various excuses: two were ill, three had other commitments, one had a visiting relative, one had to work, and one went to a ROTC conclave in Florida.

Beginning with sixteen subjects, the non-theatre group dwindled down to seven who completed the study. Again various reasons were given: two were ill, four had other commitments, one had a test, one had a meeting, and one had a fraternity party.

Originally the number of subjects in the study was limited due to financial considerations since free tickets were given to each subject. The groups could not be too large. The unexpected withdrawal of a large number of subjects, however, was a disappointment. The available data from those who did complete the study was transferred to computer cards and an F-test and Scheffe comparisons were made.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the perception of each play was made to determine the differences among the three experimental groups. For each trait and each individual play, a separate F-test and a Scheffe comparison was run. The significant differences between the way in which the three experimental groups rated each particular qualifying trait for that individual play was thereby ascertained.

In the first play, Seascape, the theatre group rated three of the 56 positive traits higher than the non-theatre group at the .05 significance level (Tables I and VII). These three traits were thoughtful, broad-minded and scholarly. Since all subjects in the study were college students, Matson's research on play complexity and Eek's study of student vs. non-student responses do not explain the differences between the groups. Vrieze's study on occupation showed that occupation does not influence the audience's interest towards a production so an alternate reason for the difference must be found. One possible explanation is that the play Seascape is a thought oriented rather than an action oriented play. It takes a high degree of sophistication to perceive the ideas behind the action of the play. The non-theatre oriented person has had very little practice at perceiving these ideas, and this could be the reason why they rated the play less thoughtful and scholarly than the theatre group. They probably did not perceive the underlying ideas behind the play which the theatre group discerned. The theatre group generally has the background and experience to be able to perceive the

intellectual elements of a production. Because of their added awareness and sophistication it seems logical that the theatre group is the one which differs significantly from the non-theatre group on these three traits.

The negative traits illustrated in Tables II and VII show the theatre group significantly rating nine of the 58 traits lower than the theatre appreciation group. The traits dislikable, noisy, and biased illustrate displeasure with the play itself; while indirect, unclear, ignorant, unimaginative, worthless, and run-of-the-mill depict more of a lack of understanding of the play. Since the theatre appreciation group has had the opportunity to view a variety of productions and has had any confusion or unclear moments of a play deciphered for them, when they confront a complex play such as Seascape they sometimes need and desire extra help to comprehend the production. If they are not in a position to receive that help their disappointment may be conveyed as displeasure and distaste at the performance which they could not understand on their own. The theatre group, on the other hand, has a wider range of theatre background and can usually decipher the play more easily. Thus, comprehension and perception of the production are more easily obtained, and this group would rank these particular negative qualities higher than the theatre appreciation group.

On the above positive and negative traits the theatre group reacted more favorably towards the performance than the theatre appreciation and non-theatre groups, but this was not always the case. On one trait Tables II and VII show the non-theatre group rating lower than the theatre appreciation group. The non-theatre group found the play to be less dislikable than the theatre appreciation group. This result is contrary to the hypothesis that more exposure to

theatre will improve a person's perception of it. The theatre appreciation group would have more exposure to theatre than the non-theatre group and should have ranked the play as more likable than the non-theatre group if the hypothesis were true. There is no immediate explanation for this finding.

The differences found in Seascape were not found in Company and Armstrong. In Company only one negative trait out of the 56 positive and 58 negative traits was found to be statistically significant (Tables III, IV, and VII). The non-theatre group rated the play less passive than the theatre group. This rating can be somewhat explained by the fact that most musicals are extremely active productions and the play Company is somewhat lacking in this trait. Due to their experience, the theatre group might be expecting a large amount of movement and activity while the non-theatre group would not have this expectation. Considering this expectation, the non-theatre group rating the play less passive than the theatre group does make sense. In the play Armstrong only two of the 56 positive traits were found to be significant as shown in Tables V and VII. The theatre group rated the play as less clever than the theatre appreciation group and less harmonious than the non-theatre group. Thus, the results of the first play and the second and third play are not consistent. There is no clear difference in perception between the three groups on the last two plays.

A difference in perception is shown among the three groups, however, in a comparison of all group shifts, including both significant and non-significant ones shown in Tables I-VI, between the plays Seascape and Armstrong. Seascape and Armstrong are both plays dealing with a serious idea and should have a similar response, but this was not the case. In the theatre group 32

traits were rated more toward the positive end of the scale in Seascape, while 28 traits were rated more toward the positive end of the scale in Armstrong. The theatre appreciation group responded more toward the positive end of the scale in 11 traits in Seascape and responded more toward the positive end of the scale in 49 traits in Armstrong. The non-theatre group responded more toward the positive end of the scale in 7 traits in Seascape and 53 traits more toward the positive end of the scale in Armstrong. The shift in response in both the theatre appreciation group and the non-theatre group is quite dramatic.

	# more positive to <u>Seascape</u>	# more positive to <u>Armstrong</u>
theatre	32	28
theatre appreciation	11	49
non-theatre	7	53

Thus, while the theatre group's responses are divided among the two different plays, both the theatre appreciation and non-theatre groups tended to respond more toward the positive end of the scale in Armstrong than in Seascape. Although the majority of these shifts are not significant, the trend does exist.

The reasons for the difference in response among the three experimental groups are uncertain. It could be speculated on the basis of the Seascape results that the theatre group perceived the play more favorably than the theatre appreciation and non-theatre groups, since all but one significant trait was ranked higher by the theatre group than by any other group. The lack of significant differences among the three experimental groups on the second and third plays tends to suggest that no group perceived these plays different from any other group.

The shifts between the plays Seascape and Armstrong, although not

significant, tend to imply that the theatre appreciation and non-theatre groups' perception of a play may change by attending more than one play. Both groups reacted more positively toward the third play than they did toward the first play. These results suggest that attending more than one play may increase the positive perception of plays in general. However, the results of this study do not show that an increase in exposure to theatre will increase an individual's perception of it.

Further study will be necessary to make any conclusive proof that a person's increased exposure to theatre will change his perception of it. Several suggestions to aid in this further study might be helpful. The final sample size in this study was quite small. Although the sample was initially of adequate size, the number of subjects who dropped out was rather large. The precise effect of this cannot be determined. However, since many additional group differences approached significance, a larger sample might have produced a larger number of significant differences among the three experimental groups. If the study were to be repeated, it would be suggested to begin with a much larger sample. Another change which could be beneficial would be to have an additional non-theatre control group for each play after the first one. This would remove the possibility of the non-theatre group being influenced by attending more than one play during the study. Perhaps having the sample groups attend more than three plays could be advantageous, as this would reduce the possibility of a difference among the groups based solely on play preference. The use of Smith's Message Measurement Inventories did prove beneficial in this study. The 56 positive and 58 negative scales were sensitive enough to detect some differences among the three separate groups used in the study.

The instrument's value in this study or any other study based on perception of qualifying terms would seem to warrant its continued use.

Table I

Seascape Means and F-ratios

<u>Positive Traits</u>	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	
Likable	4.594	5.109	5.412	0.690	
Efficient	4.052	4.617	3.503	0.658	
Impulsive	2.842	3.558	3.073	0.532	
Colorful	5.837	6.129	6.360	0.257	
Candid	4.653	5.140	3.649	0.920	
Persuasive	5.722	4.163	4.480	1.084	
Decisive	5.210	3.671	4.195	1.198	
Reasonable	4.137	4.047	3.785	0.068	
Meaningful	5.841	4.917	4.265	1.750	
Clear	5.951	6.296	6.333	0.206	
Original	4.904	4.121	3.838	2.042	
Orderly	4.670	4.138	3.923	0.861	
Thoughtful	6.733	5.374	4.815	5.454	*
Broad-minded	6.187	5.670	3.097	3.762	*
Responsible	4.663	5.694	5.062	1.632	
Wise	4.407	4.209	2.656	2.006	
Self Confident	4.666	5.597	5.764	0.745	
Honest	5.980	4.736	5.397	0.971	
Scholarly	5.755	4.720	3.505	5.114	*
Active	6.152	5.993	6.885	0.700	
Shrewd	2.929	2.805	1.159	1.880	
Believable	5.701	3.906	4.678	0.970	
Clever	5.563	7.202	5.506	3.073	
Skillful	6.551	6.117	6.257	0.387	
Harmonious	3.785	4.441	4.970	1.072	
Artistic	6.195	5.690	5.759	0.678	
Valuable	4.563	4.586	2.823	1.146	
Imaginative	6.489	6.632	5.295	1.371	
Alert	5.771	5.446	5.635	0.133	
Theatrical	7.223	6.439	5.584	1.488	
Careful	3.208	3.928	4.576	1.184	

\* significant at .05 level

Table II

Seascape Means and F-ratios

<u>Negative Traits</u>	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	
Dislikable	1.985	3.968	2.277	7.341	*
Unpersuasive	2.471	4.089	3.397	1.981	
Colorless	1.824	3.312	2.744	2.075	
Noisy	0.460	2.991	1.191	5.533	*
Cunning	1.552	1.793	0.773	0.923	
Irresponsible	1.757	3.451	2.220	2.059	
Biased	1.912	4.132	2.705	6.338	*
Disordered	3.084	4.325	3.171	1.925	
Indecisive	1.952	2.968	3.103	1.005	
Indirect	1.701	3.647	2.726	4.957	*
Impractical	2.808	4.100	3.015	1.797	
Unclear	1.460	4.298	3.385	6.916	*
Unknowledgable	2.376	3.888	2.924	2.262	
Facetious	1.968	3.208	1.888	2.611	
Ignorant	1.541	3.861	2.789	4.874	*
Untrained	2.583	3.291	2.130	1.992	
Uncooperative	1.687	2.947	0.452	2.002	
Boastful	2.321	2.985	1.641	0.947	
Unscholarly	1.775	2.993	3.676	2.209	
Cowardly	1.654	1.651	1.494	0.036	
Passive	2.571	3.348	2.102	1.202	
Amateurish	3.180	3.987	2.970	0.804	
Dull	3.113	5.195	4.452	1.445	
Conservative	1.044	1.915	2.055	1.142	
Unimaginative	0.703	3.430	1.481	6.134	*
Unskillful	1.936	3.346	1.437	2.300	
Worthless	1.134	4.036	3.626	8.075	*
Unbalanced	2.297	3.757	2.576	2.069	
Run-of-the-Mill	0.203	2.573	2.341	4.241	*

\* significant at .05 level



Table III

<u>Positive Traits</u>	<u>Company Means and F-ratios</u>			<u>F-ratio</u>
	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	
Likable	4.721	5.368	5.911	1.301
Efficient	4.330	4.991	5.587	1.294
Impulsive	2.432	3.990	4.095	2.134
Colorful	6.360	6.603	7.148	0.949
Candid	5.049	5.267	4.506	0.239
Persuasive	5.099	3.755	5.182	0.766
Decisive	5.036	4.074	5.989	1.049
Reasonable	4.118	4.850	5.083	0.654
Meaningful	5.397	4.746	5.593	0.433
Clear	6.001	6.475	6.962	0.626
Original	4.337	3.919	4.459	0.345
Orderly	4.149	4.082	4.770	0.410
Thoughtful	6.415	5.721	5.707	0.431
Broad-minded	5.991	6.144	5.260	0.367
Responsible	4.622	5.752	6.015	2.007
Wise	3.907	3.616	4.449	0.339
Self Confident	4.313	5.965	6.286	1.437
Honest	5.822	4.957	5.957	0.968
Scholarly	5.220	4.647	4.914	0.445
Active	7.521	7.018	7.982	1.655
Shrewd	1.717	3.181	2.083	1.291
Believable	6.290	4.824	5.519	0.770
Clever	5.548	6.853	6.065	1.276
Skillful	6.324	6.398	6.619	0.110
Harmonious	3.766	5.090	5.650	3.044
Artistic	6.356	5.791	6.471	0.981
Valuable	4.353	4.028	3.627	0.178
Imaginative	6.256	6.920	6.006	1.014
Alert	5.606	6.334	6.637	1.253
Theatrical	7.377	6.759	6.211	0.806
Careful	4.088	4.199	5.610	1.540

\* significant at .05 level

Table IV

<u>Company Means and F-ratios</u>				
<u>Negative Traits</u>	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>
Dislikable	1.874	3.050	2.231	1.763
Unpersuasive	2.264	3.086	2.607	0.575
Colorless	2.495	1.805	0.571	1.785
Noisy	1.252	2.676	2.543	1.034
Cunning	1.369	2.233	1.146	1.583
Irresponsible	2.219	2.442	1.648	0.494
Biased	2.001	3.411	3.487	1.988
Disordered	2.528	3.307	2.642	0.884
Indecisive	1.955	2.102	1.926	0.024
Indirect	2.092	2.928	2.620	0.831
Impractical	1.806	3.015	2.933	2.140
Unclear	2.322	3.186	2.642	0.758
Unknowledgable	1.887	3.272	2.579	2.079
Facetious	1.887	2.720	1.879	2.057
Ignorant	1.936	3.159	1.925	2.673
Untrained	2.203	2.550	2.239	0.182
Uncooperative	1.363	2.790	0.697	2.120
Boastful	1.858	2.817	1.806	1.603
Unscholarly	2.353	2.649	2.700	0.099
Cowardly	0.970	1.079	1.401	0.261
Passive	2.205	1.301	0.404	3.772 *
Amateurish	2.381	2.942	1.503	1.005
Dull	1.789	3.309	1.841	1.252
Conservative	1.355	1.576	1.645	0.148
Unimaginative	1.823	2.211	1.063	1.023
Unskillful	2.169	2.322	2.182	0.027
Worthless	1.693	3.462	3.043	2.519
Unbalanced	2.280	2.759	3.174	0.656
Run-of-the-Mill	1.361	1.919	0.606	0.765

\* significant at .05 level

Table V

Armstrong Means and F-ratios

<u>Positive Traits</u>	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>
Likable	4.220	5.436	5.891	2.066
Efficient	4.314	5.416	5.611	1.143
Impulsive	2.574	4.179	4.220	2.461
Colorful	5.005	5.352	6.371	0.932
Candid	4.745	4.644	5.177	0.151
Persuasive	5.118	4.122	5.732	0.733
Decisive	5.700	3.990	5.572	1.311
Reasonable	4.302	5.286	5.459	0.964
Meaningful	6.200	6.050	5.756	0.211
Clear	6.433	6.745	7.446	0.977
Original	5.052	4.653	4.616	0.351
Orderly	4.891	4.665	5.242	0.329
Thoughtful	6.623	5.913	5.737	1.233
Broad-minded	4.827	5.709	4.847	0.624
Responsible	4.368	5.448	5.577	1.656
Wise	4.000	4.343	4.340	0.080
Self Confident	4.390	6.059	5.984	1.665
Honest	5.681	5.393	6.410	0.581
Scholarly	5.569	5.572	5.466	0.019
Active	6.184	6.078	7.061	0.600
Shrewd	1.982	3.602	2.005	1.538
Believable	6.560	5.344	6.003	0.514
Clever	3.936	6.632	5.974	5.705 *
Skillful	6.489	6.276	6.594	0.140
Harmonious	3.390	4.723	6.061	5.406 *
Artistic	5.275	5.465	5.935	0.533
Valuable	3.891	4.353	4.198	0.098
Imaginative	5.821	6.319	5.792	0.235
Alert	5.905	5.826	6.417	0.211
Theatrical	6.424	6.504	5.666	0.373
Careful	3.461	4.463	5.616	2.824

\* significant at .05 level

Table IV

Armstrong Means and F-ratios

<u>Negative Traits</u>	<u>Theatre</u>	<u>Theatre Appreciation</u>	<u>Non-theatre</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>
Dislikable	1.858	2.582	2.016	0.959
Unpersuasive	2.509	2.460	1.504	0.986
Colorless	2.732	3.364	2.594	0.307
Noisy	2.074	1.217	1.377	0.942
Cunning	1.012	1.730	0.547	1.235
Irresponsible	2.143	1.959	0.531	3.142
Biased	2.676	3.246	1.882	1.288
Disordered	2.572	2.231	1.790	0.615
Indecisive	1.250	1.194	1.132	0.013
Indirect	1.770	1.016	1.321	1.264
Impractical	2.325	1.821	1.782	0.600
Unclear	1.817	1.241	1.908	0.692
Unknowledgable	1.865	1.738	1.887	0.022
Facetious	1.385	1.861	1.243	0.572
Ignorant	1.460	1.522	1.224	0.093
Untrained	2.612	2.883	2.640	0.111
Uncooperative	1.094	2.865	0.830	2.849
Boastful	1.412	2.366	1.351	1.054
Unscholarly	1.710	2.277	1.673	0.278
Cowardly	1.103	1.308	1.391	0.104
Passive	2.194	2.236	1.330	0.618
Amateurish	3.509	1.909	2.328	1.972
Dull	2.813	2.761	2.597	0.015
Conservative	2.955	2.050	2.470	1.725
Unimaginative	1.357	3.411	2.222	1.113
Unskillful	1.814	2.325	0.990	0.936
Worthless	1.873	1.136	1.499	0.560
Unbalanced	1.928	2.577	2.803	0.807
Run-of-the-Mill	0.889	2.584	2.694	1.853

\* significant at .05 level

Table VII

## Significant Differences Between Means

(all pairs listed are significantly different at .05 level)

<u>Seascape</u>				
<u>Traits</u>	<u>Mean #1</u>		<u>Mean #2</u>	
Thoughtful	Non-theatre	4.8147	Theatre	6.7328
Broad-minded	Non-theatre	3.0971	Theatre	6.1866
Scholarly	Non-theatre	3.5050	Theatre	5.7545
Dislikable	Theatre	1.9846	Theatre appreciation	3.9675
	(and)			
	Non-theatre	2.2771	Theatre appreciation	3.9675
Noisy	Theatre	0.4604	Theatre appreciation	2.9910
Biased	Theatre	1.9119	Theatre appreciation	4.1325
Indirect	Theatre	1.7015	Theatre appreciation	3.6466
Unclear	Theatre	1.4600	Theatre appreciation	4.2984
Ignorant	Theatre	1.5411	Theatre appreciation	3.8614
Unimaginative	Theatre	0.7035	Theatre appreciation	3.4303
Worthless	Theatre	1.1335	Theatre appreciation	4.0360
			(and)	
	Theatre	1.1335	Non-theatre	3.6261
Run-of-the-Mill	Theatre	0.2033	Theatre appreciation	2.5724

<u>Company</u>				
<u>Traits</u>	<u>Mean #1</u>		<u>Mean #2</u>	
Passive	Non-theatre	0.404	Theatre	2.2045

<u>Armstrong</u>				
<u>Traits</u>	<u>Mean #1</u>		<u>Mean #2</u>	
Clever	Theatre	3.9360	Theatre appreciation	6.6323
Harmonious	Theatre	3.3900	Non-theatre	6.0607

## LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

- Buxton, Amity Loring Pierce, "Audiences and Audience Reactions at the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre, Stratford, Connecticut: Summer Repertory-1957", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 24 (1963), p. 890 (Columbia University).
- Eek, Nathaniel Sisson, "Attitudes Toward Playgoing in a Selected Contemporary Educational Theatre Audience", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 20 (1960), p. 3888 (The Ohio State University).
- Kapur, Jit L., "An Experimental Study of Audience Responses to a Play Rehearsed with and without a Play Analysis by a Professional Psychoanalyst," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 21 (1960), pp. 265-266 (University of Southern California).
- Matson, Elson Lowell, "A Study of Years of Formal Education as a Factor in Audience Response to Ideational Content and Treatment in Plays", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 13 (1953), pp. 452-453 (State University of Iowa).
- Milton, Paula Mae, "A Descriptive Study of Audience Attitudes: A Survey of Selected Audiences in Professional, Educational and Community Theatres in Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties in the State of Florida", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28 (1967), p. 3810 (The Florida State University).
- Skelly, Madeleine, "Theatre Impact on Audience Values", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 24 (1962), pp. 4315-4316 (St. Louis University).
- Smith, Raymond G., "The Perceptual Response Communication Inventory: Development and Application of a New Method of Judging Messages", an unpublished work.
- Smith, Raymond G., "Development and Possibilities of Message Measurement Inventories", delivered at Central States Speech Association Conference, April 14, 1977.
- Vrieze, Jack W., "An Experimental Study of Occupation and its Influence on Audience Response in the Theatre", Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 13 (1953), pp. 453-454 (State University of Iowa).

## APPENDIX

## Instructions

Form W1

On the following pages you are asked to rate some positive terms that some persons believe to be important qualities of good plays. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your answers will be important, however, in helping to determine how people judge plays.

First, look at the machine-scored answer form. Place your name, today's date, and the form number W1 down in the lower right hand corner of your answer sheet. Your name is asked only so that in case of an error we can ask you about it. These forms are machine scored so you must use pencil. Now make a check mark over column 11. You indicate your answer on these forms by drawing a horizontal line through your selected number between the two dots. In making your judgments, ask yourself how much this particular quality adds to, strengthens, or increases the effect of any play. If in your mind it adds nothing, draw a horizontal line through the zero. If it adds maximally, make the mark through the nine. For example, if the quality names is CLEAR, you are asked to indicate how much the trait of being clear adds to any play. In other words you are to scale the importance of the trait of clarity on a scale from zero to nine. Practice on the following scales.

-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-
-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-
-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-
HELPFUL-4-	EXCITING-4-	CLEAR -4-	CLEAN -4-	MODEST -4-	COLD -4-
-5-	-5-	-5-	-5-	-5-	-5-
-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-
-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-
-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-
-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-

Now consider the rating system. If your mark appears in the upper third of any column, it means that you believe the quality to be of low importance generally to any play; if it appears in the middle third, you believe the quality to be of modest importance; and if it appears in the lower third, it means that you believe it to be of great importance. The importance of each quality is to be considered in terms of all of the other qualities a play may possess. Some ratings will be easier than others. If in your mind the term does not apply, rate through the zero. Work rapidly but conscientiously. If you have any questions now or during your ratings, please raise your hand. If there are no questions now, turn the page and begin. The first term is number 11, so begin on column 11 of your answer sheet.



**ILLEGIBLE**

**THE FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT (S) IS  
ILLEGIBLE DUE  
TO THE  
PRINTING ON  
THE ORIGINAL  
BEING CUT OFF**

**ILLEGIBLE**

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11 SELF ASSURED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
no importance										maximum importance
12 BEAUTIFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
13 SKILLFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
14 BELIEVABLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
15 THOUGHTFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
16 ATTENTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
17 PERSUASIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
18 VALUABLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
19 CLEVER	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
20 HONEST	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
21 SELF-CONFIDENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
22 CAREFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
23 ARTISTIC	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
24 HARMONIOUS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
25 BRIGHT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
26 PRODUCTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
27 DECISIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
28 SCIENTIFIC	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
29 IMPULSIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
no importance										maximum importance



	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
49 METHODICAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
	no importance						maximum importance				
50 ORIGINAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
51 ACTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
52 RESPONSIBLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
53 BOLD	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
54 PLEASANT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
55 INTELLIGENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
56 PAINSTAKING	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
57 BROAD-MINDED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
58 EFFICIENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
59 COURAGEOUS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
60 CONSISTENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
61 GRACIOUS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
62 INVENTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
63 CONSTRUCTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
64 COHERENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
65 ENERGETIC	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
66 SERIOUS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
	no importance						maximum importance				

## Instructions

Form W2

On the following pages you are asked to rate some negative terms that some persons believe to be important qualities that detract from plays. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your answers will be important, however, in helping to determine how people judge plays.

First, look at the machine-scored answer form. Place your name, today's date and the form number W2 down in the lower right hand corner of your answer sheet. Your name is asked only so that in case of an error we can ask you about it. These forms are machine-scored so you must use pencil. Now make a check mark over column 11. You indicate your answer on these forms by drawing a horizontal line through your selected number between the two dots. In making your judgments, ask yourself how much this particular quality detracts from, weakens, or decreases the effect of any play. If in your mind it detracts nothing, draw a horizontal line through the zero. If it detracts maximally, make the mark through the nine. For example, if the quality is UNCREATIVE, you are being asked to indicate how much the trait of being uncreative detracts from any play. You are to scale its weakening effect on a scale from zero or nothing to nine. Now practice on the following scales:

-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-	-1-
-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-	-2-
-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-	-3-
-4-	-4-	-4-	-4-	-4-	-4-
CHILDISH -5-	STUPID -5-	IMPOLITE -5-	FORMAL -5-	UNSURE -5-	FALSE -5-
-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-	-6-
-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-	-7-
-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-	-8-
-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-	-9-

Now consider the rating system. If your mark appears in the upper third of any column, it means that you believe the quality to be of low importance as a detractor. It detracts very little. If your mark appears in the middle third, it means that you believe that the quality weakens the play a moderate amount; if it appears in the bottom third, it means that you believe that the detractor decreases play effectiveness a great amount. Each detracting quality is to be considered in terms of all other detracting qualities that any play may possess. Some ratings will be easier than others. If in your mind the term does not apply, rate through the zero. Work rapidly but conscientiously. If you have any questions now or during your ratings, please raise your hand. If there are no questions now, turn the page and begin. The first term is number 11, so begin on column 11 of your answer sheet.

- |                      | 0             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|----------------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|--------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 11 UNTRAINED         | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
|                      | no importance |   |   |   |   | maximum importance |   |   |   |   |
| 12 UNSCHOLARLY       | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 13 INCOMPREHENSIBLE: | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 14 CONSERVATIVE      | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 15 INCONSIDERATE     | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 16 AWKWARD           | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 17 UNPERCEPTIVE      | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 18 CONVENTIONAL      | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 19 BRAGGART          | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 20 AMATEURISH        | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 21 ILL-HUMORED       | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 22 INDIRECT          | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 23 FACETIOUS         | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 24 WORTHLESS         | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 25 COLORLESS         | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 26 UNPLEASANT        | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 27 INCOHERENT        | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 28 UNINTELLIGENT     | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
| 29 IMPRACTICAL       | :             | : | : | : | : | :                  | : | : | : | : |
|                      | no importance |   |   |   |   | maximum importance |   |   |   |   |

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
30 DISLOYAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
	no importance			maximum importance							
31 PASSIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
32 INCONSISTENT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
33 IMPRECISE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
34 BOASTFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
35 STUPID	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
36 BIASED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
37 UNENTHUSIASTIC	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
38 FEARFUL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
39 UNORIGINAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
40 NONINTELLECTUAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
41 INDECISIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
42 HACKNEYED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
43 UNKNOWLEDGABLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
44 UNBALANCED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
45 DULL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
46 RUN-OF-THE-MILL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
47 MESSY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
48 DISORDERED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
	no importance			maximum importance							

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	40
49 COWARDLY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
no importance											maximum importance
50 IGNORANT	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
51 NOISY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
52 DISLIKABLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
53 UNPRODUCTIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
54 NARROW-MINDED	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
55 WEAK	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
56 UNCOOPERATIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
57 WISHY-WASHY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
58 UNPERSUASIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
59 IRRESPONSIBLE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
60 TENSE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
61 SUPERFICIAL	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
62 UNCONVINCING	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
63 CARELESS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
64 UNIMAGINATIVE	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
65 SELF-CONSCIOUS	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
66 STUPID	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
67 CUNNING	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
68 UNFRIENDLY	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
no importance											maximum importance



## Instructions

Form S+

You have just seen a play and are about to rate its overall qualities. Your task in this study will be to judge the play on each of the positive scales provided in this test form. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your answers are important, however, in helping to determine how people judge plays.

First look at the answer form. Place your name in the upper right hand corner of your answer sheet. Your name is asked only so that in case of an error we can ask you about it. You indicate your answer on these forms by drawing an X under your selected number between the two dots. In making your judgments, ask yourself how much of this particular quality this play possesses. If, in your mind, the play has none of it, draw an X under the zero. If the play possesses a maximum amount, mark under the nine. For example, if the quality names is definite, you are being asked in general how definite this play is, from not at all to a maximum amount. Now, using the following single sentence message, rate it for practice on the following scales:

Sample Message: The stock market is going down.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
REALISTIC	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
MODEST	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
POSITIVE	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
COLORFUL	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
HELPFUL	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
KIND	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:

Now consider the rating system. If your mark appears in the left third of any row, it means that for you the play has very little of this quality. If it appears in the middle third, it means that you believe that the play possesses a modest amount. If it appears in the right third, it means that you believe that the play has a great deal of the quality. Your ratings are your judgments of how much of each quality, if any, the play possesses. Some ratings will be easier than others. If in your mind the term does not apply, rate under the zero. Work rapidly, but conscientiously. If you have any questions now or during your ratings, please raise your hand. If there are no questions now, turn the page and begin.

- 11 SELF-ASSURED : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 12 BEAUTIFUL : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 13 SKILLFUL : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 14 BELIEVABLE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 15 THOUGHTFUL : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 16 ATTENTIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 17 PERSUASIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 18 VALUABLE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 19 CLEVER : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 20 HONEST : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 21 SELF-CONFIDENT : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 22 CAREFUL : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 23 ARTISTIC : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 24 HARMONIOUS : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 25 BRIGHT : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 26 PRODUCTIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 27 DECISIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 28 SCIENTIFIC : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 29 IMPULSIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 30 CLEAR : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly

- |                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8                | 9 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| 31 RATIONAL     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 32 CANDID       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 33 SCHOLARLY    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 34 CONSIDERATE  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 35 SINCERE      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 36 MEANINGFUL   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 37 LIKABLE      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 38 RIGHT        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 39 WISE         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 40 GOOD-NATURED | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 41 DIRECT       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 42 ALERT        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 43 COLORFUL     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 44 LOYAL        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 45 SHREWD       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 46 INFORMING    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 47 REASONABLE   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 48 THEATRICAL   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 49 METHODICAL   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |

- |                 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8                | 9 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| 50 ORIGINAL     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 51 ACTIVE       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 52 RESPONSIBLE  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 53 BOLD         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 54 PLEASANT     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 55 INTELLIGENT  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 56 PAINSTAKING  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 57 BROAD-MINDED | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 58 EFFICIENT    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 59 COURAGEOUS   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 60 CONSISTENT   | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 61 GRACIOUS     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 62 INVENTIVE    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 63 CONSTRUCTIVE | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 64 COHERENT     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 65 ENERGETIC    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 66 SERIOUS      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |

## Instructions

Form S-

Now you are to re-rate the same play, but this time on a set of negative qualities. These are terms representing qualities that some people believe to be detractors of plays. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your answers are important, however, in helping to determine how people judge plays.

Place your name in the upper right hand corner of your answer sheet. Your name is asked only so that in case of an error we can ask you about it. You indicate your answer on these forms by drawing a X through your selected number under the two dots. In making your judgments, ask yourself how much of this detracting quality this play possesses. If, in your mind, the play has none of it, draw an X under the zero. If, in your judgement the play possesses a maximum amount, mark under the nine. For example, if the quality named is silly, you are being asked in general how silly this play is, from not at all to a maximum amount. Now, using the following single sentence message, rate it for practice on the following scales:

Sample Message:	<u>All women are discriminated against.</u>									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
SILLY	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
UNCLEAR	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
IRRATIONAL	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
DULL	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
TRITE	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:
WRONG	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:	:__:

Now consider the rating system. If your mark appears in the left third of any row, it means, for the first row, that the play is not very silly. If it appears in the middle third, it means that the play is moderately silly. If it appears in the right third, it means that for you, the play is very silly. Your ratings are your judgements of how much of this detracting quality the play possesses. Some ratings will be easier than others. If in your mind the term does not apply, rate through the zero. Work rapidly, but conscientiously. If you have any questions now or during your ratings, please raise your hand. If there are no questions now, turn the page and begin.

- |                     | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8                | 9 |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| 11 UNTRAINED        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 12 UNSCHOLARLY      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 13 INCOMPREHENSIBLE | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 14 CONSERVATIVE     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 15 INCONSIDERATE    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 16 AWFWARD          | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 17 UNPERCEPTIVE     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 18 CONVENTIONAL     | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 19 BRAGGART         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 20 AMATERUISH       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 21 ILL-HUMORED      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 22 INDIRECT         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 23 FACETIOUS        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 24 WORTHLESS        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 25 COLORLESS        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 26 UNPLEASANT       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 27 INCOHERENT       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 28 UNINTELLIGENT    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 29 IMPRACTICAL      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |

- |                    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8                | 9 |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------------|---|
| 30 DISLOYAL        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 31 PASSIVE         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 32 INCONSISTENT    | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 33 IMPRECISE       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 34 BOASTFUL        | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 35 SLOPPY          | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 36 BIASED          | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 37 UNENTHUSIASTIC  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 38 FEARFUL         | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 39 UNORIGINAL      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 40 NONINTELLECTUAL | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 41 INDECISIVE      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 42 HACKNEYED       | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 43 UNKNOWLEDGEABLE | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 44 UNBALANCED      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 45 DULL            | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 46 RUN-OF-THE-MILL | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 47 MESSY           | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |
| 48 DISORDERED      | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | :                | : |
| does not apply     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | applies strongly |   |

- 49 COWARDLY : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 50 IGNORANT : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 51 NOISY : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 52 DISLIKABLE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 53 UNPRODUCTIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 54 NARROW-MINDED : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 55 WEAK : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 56 UNCOOPERATIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 57 WISHY-WASHY : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 58 UNPERSUASIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 59 IRRESPONSIBLE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 60 TENSE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 61 SUPERFICIAL : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 62 UNCONVINCING : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 63 CARELESS : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 64 UNIMAGINATIVE : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 65 SELF-CONSCIOUS : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 66 STUPID : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 67 CUNNING : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly
- 68 UNFRIENDLY : : : : : : : : : : : :  
does not apply applies strongly



### FINAL CHECK

Before turning in your papers, check to see that you have placed your name in the upper right hand corner of your answer sheet. Check to see that you have not skipped any row and that you do not have two answers in any row.

If you have made any sort of error that you cannot easily correct, make a note of what it was, so that it can be corrected before the form is sent to the scoring machine. These answers are transferred to punch cards and the computer will reject your entire card if a single answer is missing. If you have erased an answer, make sure that the unwanted line is entirely erased so that the scoring machine does not record an error.

1. Prior to this study I have attended \_\_\_\_\_ theatre productions.  
Circle the correct answer.
- a. 1-5
  - b. 6-10
  - c. 11 or more
2. Prior to this study I have actively been involved (either by acting, directing, or technical participation) in \_\_\_\_\_ theatre productions.  
Circle the correct answer.
- a. 1-5
  - b. 6-10
  - c. 11 or more

3. Prior to this study I have taken. Check the correct answer.

Appreciation of Theatre	_____	_____
	yes	no
Introduction to Theatre	_____	_____
	yes	no
Fundamentals of Acting	_____	_____
	yes	no
Fundamentals of Technical Production	_____	_____
	yes	no

Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Theatre Group's Responses to the Survey

<u>Subject #</u>	<u>Question #1 Plays Attended</u>	<u>Question #2 Plays Involved In</u>	<u>Question #3 Courses Taken</u>
1	11 or more	11 or more	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Acting, Stage Movement I & II, Costuming, History of the Physical Stage, Dramatic Structure, Playwrighting, Reader's Theatre, Voice and Diction
2	11 or more	11 or more	Stage Movement
3	11 or more	11 or more	Playwrighting I & II, Advanced Playwrighting I & II, Directing I & II, Shakespeare, Greek Theatre, Oral Interpretation, Reader's Theatre, Avant Garde, Expressionism, O'Neill, History of the Physical Stage, Practice in Directing
4	11 or more	6-10	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Acting, Makeup
5	11 or more	11 or more	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Acting, Fundamentals of Technical Production, Stage Lighting
6	11 or more	11 or more	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Technical Production
7	11 or more	11 or more	History of Theatre, Scene Design, Costume Design
8	11 or more	11 or more	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Acting, Fundamentals of Technical Production, Advanced Acting, Vocal Expression, Oral Interpretation
9	11 or more	11 or more	Introduction to Theatre, Fundamentals of Acting, Fundamentals of Technical Production

Theatre Group's Responses to the Survey  
(continued)

<u>Subject #</u>	<u>Question #1 Plays Attended</u>	<u>Question #2 Plays Involved In</u>	<u>Question #3 Courses Taken</u>
10	11 or more	11 or more	Fundamentals of Acting, Fundamentals of Technical Production, Advanced Acting, Reader's Theatre, Oral Interpretation, Slavic Theatre, History of the Physical Stage, Avant Garde, Graduate Seminar
11	11 or more	11 or more	Theatre Appreciaton

## Theatre Appreciation Group's Responses to the Survey

<u>Subject #</u>	<u>Question #1 Plays Attended</u>	<u>Question #2 Plays Involved In</u>	<u>Question #3 Courses Taken</u>
1	1-5	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
2	6-10	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
3	11 or more	1-5	Theatre Appreciation, Oral Interpretation
4	11 or more	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
5	1-5	6-10	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Technical Production
6	6-10	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
7	1-5	6-10	Theatre Appreciation
8	1-5	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
9	1-5	0	Theatre Appreciation
10	1-5	1-5	Theatre Appreciation
11	6-10	1-5	Theatre Appreciation, Fundamentals of Stage Lighting

## Non-theatre Group's Responses to the Survey

<u>Subject #</u>	<u>Question #1 Plays Attended</u>	<u>Question #2 Plays Involved In</u>	<u>Question #3 Courses Taken</u>
1	11 or more	1-5	
2	1-5	1-5	
3	1-5	0	
4	1-5	1-5	
5	11 or more	1-5	
6	1-5	1-5	
7	1-5	6-10	high school workshop

AUDIENCE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PLAYS SEASCAPE,  
COMPANY, AND ARMSTRONG AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

NATALIE K. GREEN

B. S., Kansas State University, 1975

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

AUDIENCE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PLAYS SEASCAPE,  
COMPANY, AND ARMSTRONG AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

It is sometimes assumed that a person's familiarity with theatre will affect the way in which he perceives theatre. This study was designed to investigate the possibility. Three groups chosen at random from all students at Kansas State University were used to represent various levels of familiarity with theatre. A theatre group, theatre appreciation group, and non-theatre group attended three K-State Players productions, Seascape, Company, and Armstrong and filled out a questionnaire following each production. The questionnaire was designed by Raymond G. Smith of Indiana University to act as a rating instrument of a person's perception of 56 positive and 58 negative qualifying terms which describe the contents of a message.

The results of the study failed to confirm that an increased exposure to theatre will positively change an individual's perception of it. In the first play, Seascape, the theatre group significantly rated the positive traits of thoughtful, broad-minded, and scholarly more to the positive end of the scale than the non-theatre group. The theatre group significantly rated nine of the 58 negative traits lower than the theatre appreciation group. These included the traits of dislikable, noisy, unclear, ignorant, unimaginative, worthless, and run-of-the-mill. On one trait, dislikable, the non-theatre group rated Seascape lower than the theatre group. The differences found in Seascape were not found in Company and Armstrong. Out of a possible 56 positive and 58 negative terms for each play only 3 were found to be significantly different. A difference was shown in a comparison of all group shifts, both significant and non-significant, between the plays



of serious ideas, Seascape and Armstrong. The theatre group responses were divided among the two different plays while both the theatre appreciation and non-theatre groups tended to respond more toward the positive end of the scale in Armstrong rather than in Seascape. Since Seascape was the first play and Armstrong the third play this suggested attending more than one play may increase the positive perception of a play. However, the results of the study do not show that an increase in the exposure to theatre will increase an individual's perception of it.

Suggestions for further study would be to utilize a larger sample size. The initial sample size for this study was adequate, but a number of subjects dropped out for various reasons. Another suggestion would be to have an additional non-theatre control group for each play after the first one to avoid the possibility of the non-theatre group being influenced by attending more than one play during the study. Perhaps having the sample groups attend more than three plays could be advantageous as this would reduce the possibility of a difference among the groups based solely on play preference. The use of Smith's Message Measurement Inventory was found beneficial in the study as it was sensitive enough to detect some differences among the three experimental groups.