

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METAPERCEPTIONS
AND COMPETITIVENESS IN PERCEIVED
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A Thesis
Presented
to the Faculty of
California State University, Chico

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology
Psychological Science Option

by
© Samuel M Casale
Spring 2016

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METAPERCEPTIONS
AND COMPETITIVENESS IN PERCEIVED
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A Thesis

by

Samuel M. Casale

Spring 2016

APPROVED BY THE INTERIM DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

Sharon Barios, Ph.D.

APPROVED BY THE GRADUATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Linda Kline, Ph.D.
Graduate Coordinator

David Hibbard, Ph.D., Chair

Martin Van den Berg, Ph.D.

PUBLICATION RIGHTS

No portion of this thesis may be reprinted or reproduced in any manner unacceptable to the usual copyright restrictions without the written permission of the author.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mother for without her love and commitment to the written word this would not be possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I do not work in a vacuum and as such would like to extend my gratitude to those who helped me along the way: Dr. David Hibbard, for encouraging and humoring my persistence, Dr. Hope Smith and her students, for being a lifeline when I could not have continued on without one, and Dr. Martin Van den Berg, for his trust and support.

I would also like to thank my family: The future Kitty Casale, for believing so much in my potential that she decided to marry me (I promise to do everything I can to honor that belief), my father Mark Casale, for being an inspiration of resilience during the hardest of times, my partner in crime Sara Casale, for grounding me when I needed it the most, and my grandfather Gary Marquis, without him Chico and the transition to living here would not have even been considered, and for that I owe him more than he will ever know.

Lastly I must thank my friends: to my brothers, I love you, BTM and GC 218, escapism is sometimes a beautiful and necessary thing. To the friends who deserve mention but would be too long to list here, I would rather be making music with, taking pictures with, hiking and dueling with, or be at Disneyland with you, and you know who you are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Publication Rights	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	viii
Abstract	ix
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction	1
Background	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Limitations of the Study	6
Hypotheses	7
II. Literature Review	8
Introduction	8
Metaperceptions	9
Competitiveness	12
Home Advantage and the Influence of Crowd on Performance	15
Audience and Musician Performance and Evaluation	18
Conclusion	19
III. Methodology	21
Participants	21
Instruments	22
Procedures	23

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. Findings and Results	25
Variable Coding	25
Statistical Tests	27
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	30
Conclusions	30
Recommendations	33
References	35
Appendices	
A Survey	41
B Informed Consent	46
C Debrief.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Bivariate Correlation Matrix.....	28

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN METAPERCEPTIONS AND COMPETITIVENESS IN PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

by

© Samuel M. Casale 2016

Master of Arts in Psychology

Psychological Science Option

California State University, Chico

Spring 2016

With the rise of technology comes interesting new possibilities. It is commonplace for people to carry a constant source of entertainment in their pocket. Because of this, in live performance situations, the performer is now not guaranteed attention of their audience. The performers may feel a sense of competition to obtain the attention. Members of the crowd in attendance at any given time may feel the urge to differ their attention to the distraction of text messages, email, social media etc. This research asks the question of how this distraction affects the live performance, and the relationship value on audience attention has with competitiveness style.

To answer this question a sample of 34 college level music history students completed questionnaires. Partial support that value placed on audience engagement was

related to feelings of increased performance from audience engagement was found, and audience attention was not found to be predictive of competitiveness style. Implications of these results and suggestions for further research are discussed.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Late on a Saturday night in a small town two people walk into the same club to see a band perform. One person is in the year 1981, and the other is in the year 2016. Each person greets a friend they were meeting that night. They grab a drink from the bar and sit at a table towards the back of the venue. The band is already playing. The person in the year 2016 pulls out a cell phone and takes a picture. The cell phone camera is not aimed at the band. It is not even aimed at the club. The majority of the picture is encompassed by the face of the individual taking the photo. The rest of the evening, this person periodically checks their phone to see how the photo is doing on social media, or texts the person they came with because it is too loud to have a normal conversation. The person in 1981 sits and watches the band. Occasionally this person yells in the ear of their friend sitting next to them, or talks during the quieter points of the show. Eventually, in both timelines, the house lights come on and people exit the building. The friends from the year 2016 climb into a car ordered from an application on their phone during the last few songs of the show. The friends from the year 1981 hail a cab. On the way home each group talks about how much fun they had and how good the band was. Both groups claim to have had a phenomenal time, but who went to a better show?

In this hypothetical but realistic scenario, the people from the past most likely paid more attention, whereas the people from the current era were more distracted.

However, is this attention worth anything? Does the band care? Did they even notice? A modern performer has more to compete with for the attention of their audience. Current technology has provided the possibility for endless distractors in the pockets of everyone. It is now difficult for people to imagine what they would do if they had to wait without their smart phone, and that entertainment distraction is not limited to lulls in day-to-day life. It can also creep into planned activities. For example, it is not difficult to understand that a person on a date would be annoyed if their suitor was on Facebook. It can be challenging to connect with someone when the other person is focused on something else. Could these distractions influence other aspects of people's lives, especially when performing? During a live event, could that preoccupied audience and impending annoyance have actual effects on the performance? To use a familiar analogy, teachers have been writing cell phone policies into their syllabi for many years with the purpose of avoiding distractions. Could it be possible that this is not only for the benefit of the students, but also for protecting the professor's ability to give a good lecture?

Statement of the Problem

The research presented here seeks to examine whether a performer's perception of the engagement of an audience has an effect on their performance, and whether or not this perception is associated with their competitiveness style. In a modern culture inundated with technology, it is important to consider the effects that this ubiquity of technology has on people. Most past research has only considered the effects on the individual using the technology and not the people subjected to the other person's use. However, technology does not exist in a vacuum. Humans interact with each other every day. The implications of the use of modern technology for the people affected in a

secondary fashion should not be overlooked especially in the context of a performance situation. If attention can affect an individual's ability to perform than it is possible that the message trying to be communicated will suffer, and this may have great consequences in a variety of situations.

The conceptual framework underlying this study focuses on two psychological principles. First, looking at this issue through the construct of metaperceptions offers a theoretical background from which to better understand a performer's perception of how an audience views them and the accuracy of these perceptions. Second, examining trait competitiveness allows for a better understanding of how an individual will value the audience's attention in question, the degree to which this will happen, and the personality of that person. Moreover, bringing in research from sports psychology on home field advantage allows for a better understanding of how a crowd can affect performance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study is to provide answers to the following questions:

1. Do performers who value audience engagement in a live musical setting believe that audience attention is helping them to have a better performance?
2. Is there a predictive relationship between value placed on audience engagement and competitiveness style?

This study is concerned with performer's attitudes and how they relate to their personalities. This research seeks to serve as preliminary research to fuel and facilitate

further projects on the subject of performers' and their audiences. Its purpose to better understand the relationship between performers and their audience, and investigate the role of competitiveness in value placed on audience attention. A majority of the population does not perform in front of an audience, and therefore only thinks of a performance from the perspective of an attendee. However, the audience could be as much a part of the event as the ones on stage. The research presented in this thesis takes the people around the performer and brings them in. It acknowledges that live performance happens around other people in attendance and not in spite of them.

Definition of Terms

Competitiveness

The study of competition and competitiveness has a rich history grounded in experimental social psychology (e.g., Deutsch, 1949; Triplett, 1898). Most of this work, however, focused on the effects of *situations*, which were structured to be either competitive or cooperative with the main goal being to determine how individuals respond in these situations (e.g., do people accomplish more or feel better about themselves in a competitively- or a cooperatively-structured situation?) More recently, researchers have found a multidimensional trait approach to competition to be useful. For example, it has been proposed that competitive motivations and behaviors are rooted in either (a) the drive to outperform others, or (b) the drive to improve oneself. (e.g., Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010).

Competing to win

Several theorists and researchers have described a competitive orientation that is based on achieving superiority over others that parallels Bakan's (1966) concept of

“unmitigated agency.” Karen Horney (1937) described “hypercompetitiveness” as an indiscriminate need by individuals to compete and win at any cost as a means of maintaining or enhancing feelings of self-worth. She theorized that hypercompetitiveness is characterized by manipulation, aggressiveness, exploitation, and denigration of others across a myriad of situations. Ryckman and colleagues (e.g., Ryckman, Thorton, & Butler, 1994) characterize hypercompetitiveness as competing in situations that do not call for it, turning friendly activities into contests, and feeling powerful and superior when outdoing others. For example, a person with this style would attempt to win most games with the goal of proving that they are better at the games than the other participants, not because it marks improvement of their own past performance (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010).

Competing to excel

A second style of competitiveness is rooted in the goal of improving one’s own capabilities. The focus is on competence and improvement relative to one’s own past accomplishments rather than on one’s status relative to others. This form of competitiveness is characterized by a drive to surpass one’s past performance, absolute standards, or even physical challenges. Individuals who exhibit this style of competitiveness participate in competition because they believe that it will improve upon their skills. Competing to excel includes behaviors such as attempting to get good grades, practicing to become better at a sport, or mastering a musical instrument (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010).

Metaperceptions

Metaperceptions are evaluations on how one believes that they are perceived by other people. An example would be the thoughts a person has about how an interview went as they walk away, or how an individual believes a crowd is feeling about their performance. The existing literature has mixed views on the accuracy of metaperceptions (Malloy, Albright & Scarpati, 2007). It is understood that individuals are viewed differently, and the literature on metaperceptions has shown that individuals know about these different views. An example of this would be that a person is aware that their mother perceives them differently than their coworkers.

Home advantage

This concept states that a team is more likely, across most sports, to win the game when they are competing in their home stadium (Courneya & Carron, 1992). This advantage is theorized to have three components: critical behavioral states, critical psychological states, and game location factors. Location was theorized to have four factors, these are: travel, familiarity with the location, rules, and the crowd. Home advantage is a concept borrowed from athletics, but not limited to athletics. It has also shown to be a factor in business negotiations (e.g., Mayfield, Mayfield, Martin, & Herbig, 1998).

Limitations of the Study

Inherent in any research are limitations. First, not all perspectives on theories discussed in this thesis may be included. Second, this study was conducted using questionnaires in order to gain basic information and attitudes about the variables

discussed in this thesis. Research using questionnaires may be limited by the memories of the participants, and the surveys were given during normal class time and may not reflect attitudes that they could have held at different times. Moreover, these attitudes might have been influenced by any number of circumstances that the participants may have encountered throughout their lives. Third, the number of participants included in this study could potentially have an effect on the results and the generalizability of the findings, as this number is considered low for this specific type of research. Fourth, the participants were all students of music history courses, which could also affect the external validity of the results. Finally, studies using questionnaires may suffer from social desirability biases or participants attempting to discover what a researcher is investigating; thus, their answers may not be truthful but rather reflect an effort to prove or disprove the investigator's hypothesis.

Hypotheses

The following study proposes two hypotheses based on the following review of existing literature. First, individuals' ratings on a measure of value placed on audience engagement in a live musical setting will be related to ratings on a scale that measures belief that that engagement is improving their performance. Second, a measure of value placed on audience engagement will be predictive of scores on measures of competing to win and competing to excel. Specifically, higher ratings on the measure of value placed on audience engagement will predict higher scores on the measure of competing to win, and lower ratings on the same measure will predict higher scores on the measure of competing to excel.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Let's return to that late Saturday night at the club. The singer looks out and sees an audience member nodding their head to the beat. The person has a smile on their face. This vocalist gets the impression that this individual is having a good time and enjoying the performance. This impression is a metaperception. It is an idea that the singer has of how someone is interpreting their actions (Malloyet al., 2007). In contrast, the guitar player surveys the crowd and finds a person looking down at their phone, standing still. This causes the guitarist to start jumping up and down, or begin soloing in a flashy way to get their attention back. It is possible that the guitar player has a competing to win orientation. This is a style of competitiveness that some people have when their motivation for competing is primarily to outperform others (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010). Now, suppose the bassist has been practicing all week to write a better part for a song because he felt he could improve. This characterizes a style of competition referred to as competing to excel. The individual with this style of competitiveness does not seek to perform better than others; they seek to do better than the previous version of themselves (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010). Finally, the drummer takes more notice of the crowd as a whole, and sees that most people are enjoying themselves. She believes this means she is playing well. This relates to the concept of home advantage in that part

of the reason behind the increase seen in performance at a home field in sports it thought to be because of a supportive crowd (Courneya & Carron, 1992). The concepts of competitiveness, competing to win, competing to excel, music evaluation, and home advantage are next discussed in this literature review in relation to the questions posed by this study.

Metaperceptions

Metaperceptions are defined as “predictions of others’ judgments of oneself” (Malloy et al., 2007, p. 603). Laing, Phillipson, and Lee (1966) created the term metaperception. In their influential text, the authors argued that humans are refractive surfaces. That a person’s views can change after being exposed to other ideas from different people, and this can create new ideas by combining the interpretations. People’s perceptions of themselves are influenced by the thoughts that they have about how others think of them. Laing, Phillipson, and Lee explore the idea that psychological research and philosophy are often concerned with the self, and not the other and how individuals interact with the other. Other people have perceptions, and these perceptions can have profound influences on an individual. Just knowing that another person can have an opinion of an individual can change the perceptions and behavior of the individual. Negative metaperceptions can make an individual attempt to change their behavior to promote a more positive view of themselves in others. Positive metaperceptions may influence a person to believe themselves to be a better person.

Theory of mind serves as the theoretical framework work for metaperceptions. Having ideas about how another person views your behavior requires the belief that others can have thoughts of their own. Theory of mind is described as understanding

mental states or knowing about the mind, social-cognitive interactions, and insights (Pillow, 2012). The concept depicts the ability for humans to understand other humans, and how their behaviors are influenced by desires, thoughts, and intentions (Wellman, 2010). Social interaction is thought to allow for an individual to reference their interpretations of others, and is believed to be essential for one to develop theory of mind. The ability to think about other people's thoughts is believed to exist as early as grade school (Miller, Kessel, & Flavell, 1970).

According to Carlson and Furr (2009), in most literature on the subject, it has been found that metaperceptions are inaccurate, but this is sometimes contested. The existing evidence about the accuracy of metaperceptions is mixed. Some studies have found evidence that adults have a more accurate notion of how others view them (Kenny, 1994; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993), and studies on children have shown to be contradictory in terms of the accuracy of metaperceptions and age differences (Malloy et al., 2007). For instance, Cillessen and Bellmore (1999) found that fourth graders knew which of their classmates liked them the most and which liked them the least. Miller, Kessel, and Flavell (1970) discovered that second and third graders had knowledge of their social status, but it is not until the sixth grade that the accuracy of their metaperceptions rises above 50%.

In an effort to better understand the accuracy of metaperceptions in children, Malloy et al. (2007) gathered 194 participants from grades one through six and arranged them in groups of four to six individuals who knew each other. They rated themselves and were rated by the rest of the group on eight dimensions: well-behaved, physical strength, mathematic ability, reading ability, number of friends, popularity, happiness, and attractiveness. Metaperceptions were shown to be accurate across all grades included

except females in the third grade (Malloy et al., 2007). This is in contrast to previous research that states that the accuracy should be relatively low at earlier grades (Miller et al., 1970). The researchers said that this can be explained by stating that the adults at the school form and determine key components of the social structure in which the children exist, and even the youngest of the students can pick up on cues that communicate this social structure. There was evidence to suggest that accuracy of metaperceptions does improve from early grades to later grades. It was also found that females tended to underestimate in their metaperceptions, and males tended to overestimate in their metaperceptions (Malloy et al., 2007).

Research on the subject often only tests the accuracy of these perceptions in one situation (Carlson & Furr, 2009). However, life involves multiple interactions with many different people, who may have differing views on a single person. For example, individuals may treat a barista in a different manner than their spouse. In a recent study, Carlson and Furr (2009) tested the accuracy of metaperceptions across multiple settings. Undergraduate psychology students were asked to provide contact information for individuals with whom they had different types of relationships, which included parents, friends from home, and friends from college. The initial participant's metaperceptions and the impressions from the contacts were compared to each other, and the researchers found that people are more adept at understanding others' perceptions of them than previously thought. Carlson and Furr (2009) suggest individuals have an understanding that they are viewed differently depending on the situation that they are in, but this finding was varied depending on the personality trait being measured. That is, more communal traits (i.e., conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism) were more

easily perceived by the individual than more agentic traits (i.e., openness and extraversion).

In order to test the accuracy of an individual's self-perception versus friend's perceptions Vazire (2010) created a new model. Vazire recruited college students in groups of five. The groups evaluated each other on different personality traits, and had to know one another prior to the study. The study found that other people could accurately evaluate an individual better than the individual themselves on both creativity and intelligence. However, the author also suggests that this study could consist of people who do not know each other well. This is because a group of five individuals may have to bring in friends of friends to reach a full group size (Vazire, 2010).

The research on metaperceptions provides a framework for which to explore the relationship that a performer may have with their audience. Both parties involved will have perceptions of each other that, as explained by Laing, Phillipson, and Lee (1966), may have an effect on one another. It is possible that this can influence the performance. These perceptions are more likely to be accurate if the individual is adult, or the perceptions are about more communal traits (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Kenny, 1994; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993). They are likely to be less accurate if the traits are more agentic unless the traits are intelligence or creativity (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Vazire, 2010). However, research has not to date explored the role of metaperceptions in live musical performance.

Competitiveness

Attempting to captivate the attention of an audience is not typically framed as a competition. In popular culture, games and sports are competitive. Performance art is not. A few questions come up when claiming that a live performance is competitive (not a

battle of the bands or nationally syndicated vocal contests) such as: Who is the performer up against? Can a non-human actor (e.g., technology) be something to compete with? Research in the past lays the foundation for an argument in favor of framing performance art being a competition. May and Doob (1937) stated that a competition is any situation where the goal is finite and cannot be split among those who win and those who lose. Audience attention when listening to an album is often split with attention given to household chores, and ears to the radio. However, when playing the music to a live audience at a concert venue, a performer may be aiming for a visual experience as well as an auditory one. Thus full audience attention is a finite resource one that cannot be satisfactorily split between a smart phone and a performer.

Past research has identified two styles of competitiveness. The first is where an individual will compete to do better than another person. The second style is where a person will compete to outperform a previous version of him or herself. Ryckman, Libby, van den Borne, and Lindner, (1997) empirically tested the theoretical framework proposed by Horney (1937) and Sampson (1988). Sampson's (1988) self-contained individualism paved the way for Ryckman et al. (1997) to develop their construct that allows for win-oriented competition called hypercompetitiveness. This style has its roots in more traditional views of competitiveness (Ross, Rousch, & Canada, 2003), but Ryckman and colleagues go further in depicting an individual in a style of competition where they engage in contests where no one else is competing against them. An example of this style would be the motivation to have the best Christmas lights on the block when no one else is trying to do better lights, or obtaining a distracted individual's attention when there is not another human actor attempting to encapsulate it. It is not as though the

audience is attempting to withhold their gaze and auditory ability, or that the phone is an active participant whose goal is to keep the person from enjoying their time at the concert.

Ryckman et al. (1997) held hypercompetitiveness in a sinister light. They stated that hypercompetitiveness, "...incorporated some values associated with self-contained individualism that are compatible with mistrust domination, and exploitation of others," (p. 280) and that, "hypercompetitive individuals endorse the value of social power." (p. 280) In a concert setting, a performer with some hypercompetitive tendencies would place value on being able to control their audiences' focus despite an audience not actively attempting to thwart that goal. Many studies have been dedicated to finding relationships between hypercompetitiveness and other aspects of personality.

Hypercompetitiveness has been shown to be positively related to neuroticism, aggression, dominance, exhibitionism and negatively related to self-esteem (Ryckman, Hammer, & Gold, 1990). Using a scale developed by Zuckerman, Kieffer, and Knee (1971) initially created to measure sensation seeking behaviors, Ryckman, Thornton and Butler (1994) found positive relationships between aspects of hypercompetitiveness and boredom, disinhibition, narcissism and Machiavellianism. Possible links to psychopathy have also been found (Ross & Rousch, 2001; Ryckman et al. 1990).

Competing for personal development was also theorized by Ryckman et al. (1997). This style of competitiveness has commonalities with cooperation (Ross et al., 2003). A competition for personal development does not have a goal that is finite. All individuals competing stand the chance for personal growth through the contest. Personal development competitiveness has been found to be related to personality constructs such

as agreeableness, openness, and extraversion. It has also been found that this style of competition is related negatively to measures of anger, hostility, depression, and vulnerability. This presents some evidence towards the idea that a person with this style of competitiveness is not likely to feel a loss of control when confronted with stressful situations (Ross et al., 2003).

The current study conceptualizes these two styles of competitiveness as competing to win and competing to excel. Hibbard and Buhrmester (2010) built upon the foundation laid by Ryckman et al. (1990). These researchers took aspects from hypercompetitiveness as well as Bakan's (1966) meta-theoretical work to create a construct called competing to win. Competing to win is characterized as a style of competition where the goal is to perform better than one's competitors. They also built upon the Ryckman et al. (1997) idea of personal development competitiveness to create a construct called competing to excel. A person with this competitiveness style exhibits behaviors like a desire to earn all "As" in school or better their skills with a musical instrument.

Motivation to perform in a live setting for musicians could come from a desire to better themselves at their craft, and thus they may not place as much value on audience engagement. A person like this would be competing to excel. There also may be musicians who place more value on audience engagement because their motivation to perform comes from the attention they obtain from live performance. This musician could be competing to win.

Home Advantage and the Influence of Crowd on Performance

Research concerning crowd influence on performance often comes from the

discipline of sports psychology. It relates to the concept of home advantage. This is the idea that a team is more likely to win a game at home than they are when competing in a stadium that belongs to another team. The power of this advantage is different depending on the sport, 53.5% baseball, 57.3% American Football, 61.1% ice hockey, 64.4% basketball, and 64.5% soccer (Courneya, & Carron, 1992). Courneya and Carron (1992) created a conceptual model of home advantage with three components: critical behavioral states, critical psychological states, and game location factors. There are four game location factors that have an influence on game performance: travel (the team traveling may suffer from fatigue induced by travel), familiarity with the location (the team in their home field knows the facilities better than the traveling team), rules (the home team is favored in the rules of some sports), and the crowd (the home team has a bigger number of supporters attending).

The preoccupation that sports lore has with home advantage is warranted. This statistic shows that game location has a strong influence over who may win any given game, and the quality of the game played by the home team (Schwartz & Barsky, 1997, Snyder & Purdy, 1985). Research in negotiations for business purposes have shown this effect does not only exist in sporting events and can be applied to the business world as well. This research has shown that home advantages may in part be due to boosts in the abilities of the individuals in their home territory or disadvantages to the visiting people (Mayfield, Mayfield, Martin, & Herbig, 1998). Conducting business negotiations in a home area can allow for quicker and easier access to information that can lead to control over the environment (Selacuse & Rubin, 1990), and boost the confidence of those individuals who are in their home environment (Stajkovic, 2006). Some evidence in favor

of home advantage suggests, that this better performance is due to comfort in an individual's home surroundings. However, this is only anecdotal (Lewicki & Litterer, 1985).

Schwartz and Barsky (1977) concluded that crowds are important to a team's ability to win. They found that a team is more likely to win at home if they have a larger crowd. But this increase in performance may have led to the bigger crowds and not the increased number of supporters influencing the performance (van de ven, 2011). Crowd size in a study by Agnew and Carron (1994) did not have an effect on home advantage, but there was a small effect for crowd density. This refers to the ratio of total seats available over actual seats filled. Neither density nor size was found to be a factor in a study by Pollard (1986), and no effect for crowd size was found by Clarke and Norman (1995) for any of the four professional soccer leagues in England. Two studies have been able to isolate sporting events without crowds present and found no or little effect. The study by Moore and Brylinsky (1993) was able to find eight games by two teams whose crowds were deterred by a measles outbreak. They found that there was a slight increase in the abilities of specific athletes with no crowd present. The second study, by van de ven (2011), was able to find games played in stadiums where the buildings were not up to standard for audiences and thus they were not allowed to attend but the players still played the games without the crowd. The results indicated that audiences are not necessary for home advantage to take place. However, the author stated that the players believe that crowd support does have a positive effect on performance. Other studies have shown that the crowd believes that they have a strong influence on the outcome of games (Anderson, Wolfson, Neave & Moss, 2012; Wolfson, Wakelin, & Lewis, 2005).

Athletes were shown to believe that the crowd can benefit their performance (van de ven, 2011). This was despite researchers showing that the absence of an audience did not have an effect on the benefits of home advantage (Moore & Brylinsky, 1993; van de ven, 2011). The performance improvements of playing in one's home field are not limited to sports as shown by Mayfield, Mayfield, Martin, and Herbig (1998) and Selacuse and Rubin (1990). It is possible that these effects will carry on into the concert venue. Musicians may also believe in performance benefits of a supportive crowd.

Audience and Musician Performance and Evaluation

Being in front of an audience is part of performing live, and doing so may not be for all performers. They may find it uncomfortable, but there are also performers who embrace being under the spot light. Research conducted on rock musicians using surveys found that those musicians scored high on measures of openness (Gillespie & Myors, 2000). The same was found of other types of musicians. These findings suggest that this trait may be found in individuals who perform a variety of styles of music (Kobori, Yoshie, Kudo, & Ohtsuki, 2011). Being at the mercy of a live audience could very well require such a personality trait. Expressiveness of playing has shown to affect audience enjoyment of a performance. Also researchers have found that it takes on average sixty seconds to make a judgment on whether someone likes a performance or not. Moreover, the evaluation remains stable for the remainder of the performance (Thompson, Williamon, Valentine, 2007).

Musicians' evaluations of themselves tend to be inaccurate. These judgments of performance also have a tendency to be goal oriented (Hewitt, 2010), such as whether or not the audience's attention was obtained. The quality of performance is not the only

factor affecting an evaluation of performance. Both audience members' and musicians' enjoyment is impacted by emotional engagement. According to Thompson (2007), "It was found that listeners' emotional engagement with the performance was a markedly better predictor of overall enjoyment than was the perceived quality of the performance. This result suggests that, in the domain of live musical performance at least, affective and evaluative responses may not necessarily stand in a linear relationship to one another" (p. 21). If performing musicians are placing value on audience engagement, they have good reason because it seems to factor heavily on if they enjoyed themselves or not.

Conclusion

The literature reviewed in this chapter has interesting implications for the questions proposed for this study. The research on metaperceptions suggests that a performer and their audience will have views of each other that can have an effect (Laing et al., 1966). These views should be more accurate if the individuals are adults and the traits are more communal in nature (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Kenny, 1994; Kenny & DePaulo, 1993), and less accurate if the traits are more agentic, excepting intelligence and creativity (Carlson & Furr, 2009; Vazire, 2010). Performing musicians are likely to score high on the trait openness (Gillespie & Myers, 2000; Kobori et al., 2011). The research on metaperceptions and personality traits leads to the idea that an audience may have an impact on a performance, and the research on home advantage states that at least the performer will believe that this is possible (van de ven, 2011). However, these metaperceptions may be inaccurate.

The notion that performers will value the potential influence of an audience is furthered by the research on home advantage. This research states that the crowd and the

athletes believe that the crowd can have a positive impact on athletic performance (Anderson, Wolfson, Neave & Moss, 2012; van de ven, 2011; Wolfson, Wakelin, & Lewis, 2005). In musical performance an audience's engagement is positively related to their enjoyment, so a musical performer has a vested interest in keeping their audience engaged (Thompson, 2007). The earlier the performer obtains that engagement, preferably in the first sixty seconds, and the more expressive they play the better. Both these concepts are related to positive musical reviews (Thompson et al., 2007). If performers are aware that this engagement leads to positive reviews of their performance, they may be more likely to value audience engagement and believe that it improves their performance. These evaluations may also be inaccurate, but goal driven (Hewitt, 2010). The current study is not concerned with the accuracy of any of the metaperceptions or evaluations, only if said perceptions are there. Their existence has not to this date been examined in performing artists.

The competitiveness literature provides an understanding that competition does not always have to be about winning a contest. Competing to excel or personal development competition allows for an understanding of how an individual can compete to improve upon their own skills (Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010; Ryckman, 1990). A performer who competes in this style may not value audience engagement because it does not factor into their reason for performing. An individual who competes to win may value audience engagement because it is more of a motivator for them (Bakan, 1966; Hibbard & Buhrmester, 2010; Ryckman 1997).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted using the quantitative method of survey research. This method was used to gain information about participant's attitudes, personalities, demographic information, and musical history.

Participants

This study consisted of 34 participants aged 18 to 71 years ($M=23.41$, $SD=8.9$). The participants were all students in music history courses in attendance at California State University, Chico for the Spring 2016 semester. There were 17 males and 17 females. 28 individuals were of Caucasian descent, and 6 were non-white. Of the participants 21 were music majors, 2 were music minors, and 11 either did not indicate a music minor or had no relation to the music program at California State University, Chico. Six of the participants' main musical instrument was voice, 4 played piano, 4 were percussionists, 7 participants were wind instrumentalists, 1 was a DJ, 11 played stringed instruments, and one participant did not respond to this question. The majority of participants played contemporary musical styles (62.1%), and the remainder of valid cases played classical styles (37.9%). Most of the participants had been playing an instrument for 12 or 13 years (11.8%/11.8%) ($M=11.35$, $SD=9.07$), and had been playing an instrument in a live setting for 5 years (14.7%) ($M=7.82$, $SD=9.22$). Participants most

often shared a stage with 5 people or played alone (14.7%/14.78%) ($M=10.88$, $SD=15.27$). Most played to audiences with an average of 100 attendees followed by 30 attendees (17.6%/ 11.8%) ($M=101.79$, $SD=119.58$). The majority of participants played an average of 2 performances in a year, had not played live recently, or played on average once a year (14.7%/14.7%/11.8%) ($M=7.06$, $SD=8.98$).

Instruments

Demographic and Musical Background Questionnaire

A basic demographic information and musical performance and experience questionnaire was used to gain such information. This included sections for age, gender, ethnicity, major, and questions regarding the nature of musical performance and experience (see Appendix A).

Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire

A questionnaire designed specifically for this study was used to gather information about a participant's value of audience attention, their attitudes towards the subject, and live performance in general. Participants were asked to rate the value they place on different aspects of audience attention, and live performance on a five-point scale (see Appendix A).

Attitude Toward Competition Questionnaire

Participants' tendency to compete to win was assessed using a modified version of the Hypercompetitive Attitude scale (HCA; Ryckman et al., 1990). The HCA was originally designed for college-age samples and included 26 items intended to measure an extreme desire to dominate opponents at all costs. Hibbard and Buhrmester (2010) selected 17 HCA item (nos. 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 15-18, 20-21, 25) that were less

extreme yet reflected a competitive orientation that focused on the importance of winning (e.g., *Winning in competition gives me a greater sense of self-worth; I can't stand to lose an argument; Winning in competition makes me feel more powerful as a person*).

Responses were made on a 1 (Never true) to 5 (Always true) and were averaged to create scale scores. The HCA has demonstrated adequate reliability and construct validity in the past (Ryckman et al., 1994; Ryckman et al., 1997), and the abridged version used by Hibbard and Buhrmester (2010) proved adequately reliable (mean Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$, range .82 to .83) (see Appendix A)

Personal Mastery Survey

Participants' tendency to compete to excel was assessed using Hibbard and Buhrmester's (2010) modification of 13 items selected from the Goal Competitiveness subscale of the Competitiveness Questionnaire (CQ; Griffin-Pierson, 1990) and the Personal Development Competitive Attitude scale (PDCA; Ryckman et al., 1996). Items were selected because they conceptually focus on the desire to compete in order to excel or master (e.g., *I enjoy competition because it gives me a chance to test my abilities; Competition motivates me to bring out the best in myself*). Responses were made on a 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) scale and item scores were averaged to create scale scores. Both the CQ and PDCA have demonstrated adequate reliability and construct validity in the past (Griffin-Pierson, 1990; Ryckman et al., 1996, 1997), and the modified scale used by Hibbard and Buhrmester (2010) demonstrated good internal consistency as well (mean $\alpha = .90$, range .88 to .91) (see Appendix A)

Procedures

The participants of the study were recruited by asking them in person during a

class period. This recruitment took place during two music history classes. Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaires which took 10-20 minutes to complete. They were asked to sign an informed consent (see Appendix B), and return to the front of the classroom to receive a debriefing sheet (see Appendix C). The participants were offered candy as a reward for their participation. They were told that they could leave at any time or not participate if they did not want to. All students in both classes participated.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

All statistics were calculated using IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Simultaneous multiple regression and bivariate correlations were used to analyze the data. All missing cases were deleted pairwise. Brief implications of the results are presented in this chapter. Further exploration regarding the meaning of the results is discussed in the following chapter.

Variable Coding

The feelings a participant had on performance and audiences were rated using the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire. This questionnaire consisted of five questions and was rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 3 (I neither agree nor disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Upon analysis question four was recoded so that the number indicated by the participant would better represent the nature of the questionnaire. A response of 1 originally would indicate the agreement that audience engagement had an effect on performance. This is the opposite of the rest of the scale, so the item was recoded (1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1). A measure of attitude toward performance was created by summing the first four items on the questionnaire into a composite measure ($\alpha = .72$). Possible scores could range from 1-5. Actual responses ranged from 2-5 ($M=4.13$, $SD=.62$). Question five (P5) ($M=3.97$, $SD=.67$) was not included because the item failed in its intended use for the scale. It did not correlate well

with the other item. The Attitude Toward Competition Questionnaire was used to measure the concept of competing to win. The respondents indicated their attitudes using a 5-point scale: 1 (Never True of Me), 2 (Seldom True of Me), 3 (Sometimes True of Me), 4 (Often True of Me), and 5 (Always True of Me). A measure of competing to win was calculated by summing all 17 items into a composite variable ($\alpha = .88$). Responses could range from 1-5, but in responses actually ranged from 1.35-3.41 ($M=2.32$, $SD=.61$). In accordance with the creators of the questionnaire items 15 and 17 were reverse coded before creation of the composite variable, so that positive responses on these items would better indicate the positive responses on the majority of items.

The Personal Mastery Survey was used to measure participants on competing to excel. The respondents reported answers using a 5-point scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither Agree nor Disagree), 4 (Agree), and 5 (Strongly Agree). A measure of competing to excel was created by combining all of the 15 items into a composite variable ($\alpha = .7$). Participants could score from 1-5 on the composite measure, but responses from participants ranged from 2.73-4.73 ($M=3.76$, $SD=.48$). Items 3, 6, 8, 10, 14 were reverse coded before the forming of the composite variable in accordance with the authors suggested use of the scale.

To obtain meaningful correlation coefficients gender was coded 1 for male and 2 for female. Any positive correlations would imply a relationship to the female participants in the study and any negative correlations would imply a relationship to the male participants. These correlations would not suggest gender differences. They would only indicate a connection with the gender associated with the direction of the coefficient.

Statistical Tests

Bivariate correlations were calculated to test the hypothesis that value audience engagement in a live performance situation would be related to thoughts that audience engagement could improve live performance (See Table 1). Question one (P1) ($M=4.42$, $SD=.79$) of the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire was used to measure respondents' attitude toward whether a performer believes that audience engagement improves performance in a live situation. Question four (P4) ($M=4.06$, $SD=.86$) measures the same, only the question is worded in the reverse. The third item on the questionnaire (P3) ($M=3.94$, $SD=.85$) measures value placed on audience engagement. P3 was not significantly related to P1, $r(31) = .27$, $p = .133$, but was significantly related to P4, $r(31) = .51$, $p = .003$. Thus the prediction was partially supported.

The second prediction that competitiveness could be related to value placed on audience attention was not fully supported. A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was used in an attempt to predict the scores on the Attitude Toward Competition Questionnaire from the answers on questions one through five on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire. No significant multiple correlation was found, $R = .365$, $F(5, 26) = .906$, $p = .492$. This shows a lack of predictive power in these items for this measure of competing to win. The same was found of the predictive power of these variables for the Personal Mastery Survey when a simultaneous multiple regression analysis was used, $R = .29$, $F(5, 26) = .478$, $p = .789$. The bivariate correlations for both scales in regards to the composite scale for value placed on audience engagement were also not significant (See Table 1), (Personal Mastery Survey) $r(30) = .28$, $p = .126$, (Attitudes

Toward Competition) $r(30) = .10, p = .603$. The correlations were also found to not be significantly different from one another $z(30) = .72, p = .24$.

Table 1.

Bivariate Correlation Matrix

Correlations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Average Audience Members in Attendance											
2 Average Members Sharing Stage	.31										
3 Sex	-.28	.00									
4 Attitude Toward Audience P1	.06	-.47**	-.37*								
5 Attitude Toward Audience P2	-.02	-.25	-.18	.64**							
6 Attitude Toward Audience P3	-.14	-.28	.14	.27	.31						
7 Attitude Toward Audience P4	-.36*	-.43*	.07	.37*	.29	.51**					
8 Attitude Toward Audience P5	.11	-.01	-.31	.26	.28	.27	.10				
9 Attitude Toward Audience Composite	-.16	-.48**	-.11	.76**	.75**	.71**	.74**	.05			
10 Attitude Toward Competition Composite	-.32	-.06	.12	-.01	-.05	.25	.07	-.06	.10		
11 Personal Mastery Survey Composite	.02	-.08	.23	.07	.15	.22	.36*	-.09	.28	.17	

(*Indicates significant at the .05 level, **Indicates significant at the .01 level.)

Question four of the attitudes towards performance scale proved interesting (See Table 1). P4 was significantly correlated to the measure of average audience members in attendance $r(31) = -.36, p = .041$, giving evidence to the idea that crowd size is negatively related to value placed on audience engagement, and the composite measure of the Personal Mastery Survey $r(30) = .36, p = .044$, indicating that higher scores on this measure are related to placing more value on audience attention. This is of particular

interest to the second question proposed in this study.

A bivariate correlation also indicated that there was a significant relationship between the amount of individuals a performer shares a stage with and their attitudes towards audience engagement, $r(31) = -.48, p = .005$. This finding indicates that as the number of individuals a performer shares a stage with increases, the importance they place on audience engagement decreases.

Although no specific predictions were made regarding gender, an independent samples *t*-test was conducted to explore any significant differences between male ($M = 4.71, SD = .14$), and female ($M = 4.13, SD = .22$), participants on their responses to the first question on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire. No significant difference was found, $t(31) = 2.23, p = .220$. This finding indicates that the males and females do not feel differently in regards to their belief that audience engagement improves their performance in a live situation. However, bivariate correlations revealed that males are likely to rate highly on this measure, $r(31) = -.37, p = .033$. Leading to the possibility that although the genders do not differ significantly from one another, males have a high probability to believe that audience attention is of value to performance.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Although predicted outcomes of this research were not fully supported, the results still have interesting implications. With regards to the first prediction that performers who value audience engagement will also believe that audience engagement will have a positive effect on their performance, this hypothesis was only partially supported. One of the two questions on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire that related to value placed on audience engagement had a significant relationship. This result, however, may be a methodological artifact. That is, the positively worded question, question 1, had no relationship, but the question framed in the negative, question 4, was significantly related. This result could be due to the wording of the questions. The question that is worded in the positive could give the impression that it is more related to the positive effect that audience engagement has on a performer. The negatively worded question could give an impression of the positive effect audience engagement could have on the audience members. Thus, a positive rating on question one could be seen as more selfish because it could indicate that the benefit is only for the performer, whereas a low rating on question 4 would indicate a more beneficial outcome for the audience members. If this theory is true, it could indicate a more cooperative nature of live performance where the performer and audience are working together to create a better live experience for all who are involved. This runs counter to the idea that

the relationship is a one-way path where the performer only benefits from the audience's attention and is not concerned with the actual enjoyment of the audience. Cooperation could also give an explanation for why question four was negatively related to crowd size. A performer may feel more invested in a smaller crowd.

The inquiry into the relationship between competitiveness styles and value placed on audience engagement showed that scores on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire did not have predictive power regarding the respondent's competitiveness styles. This could simply be indicative of a lack of relationship between the constructs. Competing to excel may not be predicted by an attitude toward performance measurement because the value that they place on musicianship is the practice aspect and not live performance. Live performance for these musicians could not be seen as beneficial to their skills. Competing to win may have not been predicted by attitude toward performance because the performers might not see live musical performance as a competition. It is possible that the performers do not see audience attention as finite. They might believe that auditory attention is enough even if the audience is distracted visually or vice versa. These results could also be because of a small sample size. Future research could perhaps find a relationship with a larger sample size.

Further inquiry showed a positive relationship between question 4 on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire and the Personal Mastery Survey. This too could be because of the cooperative nature in the wording of this item. The Personal Mastery Survey measures the concept of competing to excel. Competing to excel has its roots in personal development competition, which has conceptual similarities to cooperation (Ross et al., 2003). This finding gives more support to the idea that some

musicians may not see a performance as something in which only they should benefit, as a means to improve their skills, or a way to show off their musical prowess. Rather, some performers may see a live event as a collaborative effort to benefit all those involved. At the beginning of this thesis it was mentioned that one of the goals of this research was to bring the audience in as part of the conversation. It is possible that some musicians have been attempting to accomplish this already, and additional research should incorporate a measure of cooperation to investigate this idea.

An intriguing finding was that male participants were likely to value audience attention. The first question on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire was rated highly by male participants. The scores were not significantly higher than female ratings, so there was not a statistically significant difference between the genders. Males could have rated this measure in this direction because of the portrayal of males typically found in the musical performance media. Men are more often portrayed in control of an audience in popular culture and these results may be indicative that it is having an effect on the male performing arts community, but further research is necessary to find any conclusive evidence of this.

The amount of individuals a performer shares a stage with was found to be negatively related to the audience toward performance composite measure. This may be evidence of larger amounts of performer's being a buffer between metaperceptions of the audience. If the performance group is larger, a metaperception indicative of performance quality may be easier to perceive in one's immediate vicinity than one coming from the audience. Earlier research showed that individuals understand that they are viewed in different ways when in different situations, but it did not investigate these multiple views

having any effect simultaneously (Carlson & Furr, 2009). It would be fruitful for researchers to investigate the possibility of the effect of interference in metaperceptions.

Recommendations

Future research should investigate cooperation in live performance situations. This could be accomplished by conducting the same study again but also adding a measure of cooperation to the study. Fine tuning should also be conducted on the Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire. Question five failed to fit well into a composite measure, and thus rewording the item should be considered. Questions should also be added considering the place that cooperation has in live performance situations.

Inquiry in the future should also investigate the effect of interference in metaperceptions. This could be accomplished by putting an individual in a situation where they are aware they are being observed by someone who has one perception of them while interacting with another individual who has another perception. It must be apparent to the individual who is in the situation that the other people involved have different views of them. Perhaps an experimental methodology would be useful to test this possibility.

Possible gender differences in value placed on audience engagement should be investigated in later research. With the results of this study in mind, the differences should be additionally evaluated by gathering a larger sample size of live performing musicians and testing for the differences. It is possible that the lack of significant gender differences is the effect of the small sample presented in this research.

In further research, inquiry should concern itself with the accuracy of the effect that audience attention has on performers. It would be possible to research this by

obtaining ratings of audience engagement and quality of performance from both the performers and the audience after a given live performance, and comparing the two with a control group who only listened or watched the performance from a recording.

So what does this mean for the concert attendees at the beginning? Who went to the better show? There seems to be a relationship between audience engagement and performance, and this could mean that the person in the 80s went to a better concert. The results indicate that the performer would think this to be true if they believed that audience engagement could improve their performance. However, there seem to be more constructs involved than just competitiveness style and value placed on audience engagement. Perhaps cooperation is the key to better understanding the relationship between audience and performer, or another concept not explored in this thesis. The only thing that is clear is that there is more research to be done on performers and their audiences.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Agnew, G. A., & Carron, A. V. (1994). Crowd effects and the home advantage. *International Journal Of Sport Psychology*, 25(1), 53-62.
- Anderson, M., Wolfson, S., Neave, N., & Moss, M. (2012). Perspectives on the home advantage: A comparison of football players, fans and referees. *Psychology Of Sport And Exercise*, 13(3), 311-316. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.11.012
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally
- Carlson, E. N., & Furr, R. M. (2009). Evidence of differential meta-accuracy: People understand the different impressions they make. *Psychological Science*, 20(8), 1033-1039. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02409.x
- Cillessen, A.H.N., & Bellmore, A.D. (1999). Accuracy of social self-perception and peer competence in middle childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 45, 650–676.
- Clarke, S. R., & Norman, J. M. (1995). Home ground advantage of individual clubs in English soccer. *Statistician*, 44, 509–521.
- Courneya, K. S., & Carron, A. V. (1992). The Home Advantage in Sport Competitions: A Literature Review. *Journal Of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 14(1), 13-27.
- Deutsch, M. (1949). The Directions of Behavior: A Field-Theoretical Approach to the Understanding of Inconsistencies. *Journal Of Social Issues*, 5(3), 43.
- Gillespie, W., & Myers, B. (2000). Personality of rock musicians. *Psychology Of Music*, 28(2), 154-165. doi:10.1177/0305735600282004
- Hewitt, M. P. (2010). The Impact of Self-Evaluation Instruction on Student Self-

- Evaluation, Music Performance, and Self-Evaluation Accuracy. *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 59, 1, 6-20, Apr. 2011. ISSN: 00224294.
- Hibbard, D., & Buhrmester, D. (2010). Competitiveness, Gender, and Adjustment Among Adolescents. *Sex Roles*, 63(5/6), 412-424. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9809-z
- Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. New York: Norton.
- Kenny, D.A. (1994). *Interpersonal perception: A social relations analysis*. New York: Guilford.
- Kenny, D. A., & DePaulo, B. M. (1993). Do people know how others view them? An empirical and theoretical account. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(1), 145-161. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.114.1.145
- Kobori, O., Yoshie, M., Kudo, K., & Ohtsuki, T. (2011). Traits and cognitions of perfectionism and their relation with coping style, effort, achievement, and performance anxiety in Japanese musicians. *Journal Of Anxiety Disorders*, 25674-679. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2011.03.001
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception: A theory and a method of research*. New York: Springer.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Litterer, J. A. (1985). *Negotiation*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Malloy, T. E., Albright, L., & Scarpati, S. (2007). Awareness of peers' judgments of oneself: Accuracy and process of metaperception. *International Journal Of Behavioral Development*, 31(6), 603-610. doi:10.1177/0165025407080590
- May, M., & Doob, L. (1937). Competition and cooperation. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Mayfield, J., Mayfield, M., Martin, D., & Herbig, P. (1998). How location impacts

- international business negotiations. *Review of Business*, 19, 21–24.
- Miller, P. H., Kessel, F. S., & Flavell, J. H. (1970). Thinking about people thinking about people thinking about . . . : A study of social cognitive development. *Child Development*, 41(3), 613-623.
- Moore, J. C., & Brylinsky, J. A. (1993). Spectator effect on team performance in college basketball. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 16, 77–84.
- Pillow, B. (2012). *Children's discovery of the active mind: Phenomenological awareness, social experience, and knowledge about cognition*. New York: Springer.
- Pollard, R. (1986). Home advantage in soccer: A retrospective analysis. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 4, 237–248.
- Ross, S. R., & Rausch, M. K. (2001). Psychopathic attributes and achievement dispositions in a college sample. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 30(3), 471-480. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00038-6
- Ross, S. R., Rausch, M. K., & Canada, K. E. (2003). Competition and Cooperation in the Five-Factor Model: Individual Differences in Achievement Orientation. *Journal Of Psychology*, 137(4), 323-337.
- Ryckman, R. M., Hammer, M., Kaczor, L. M., & Gold, J. A. (1990). Construction of a Hypercompetitive Attitude Scale. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, 55(3-4), 630-639. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5503&4_19
- Ryckman, R. M., Libby, C. R., van den Borne, B., Gold, J. A., & Lindner, M. A. (1997). Values of hypercompetitive and personal development competitive individuals. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, 69(2), 271-283. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6902_2

- Ryckman, R. M., Thornton, B., & Butler, J. C. (1994). Personality correlates of the Hypercompetitive Attitude Scale: Validity tests of Horney's theory of neurosis. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, 62(1), 84-94.
doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6201_8
- Salacuse, J. W., & Rubin, J. Z. (1990). Your place or mine? Site location and negotiation. *Negotiation Journal*, 6, 5–10.
- Sampson, E. E., (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. *American Psychologist*, 43, 15-22.
- Schwartz, B., & Barsky, S. F. (1977). The home advantage. *Social Forces*, 55, 641–661.
- Snyder, E. E., & Purdy, D. A. (1985). The home advantage in collegiate basketball. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2, 352–356.
- Stajkovic, A. D. (2006). Development of a core confidence-higher order construct. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 1208–1224.
- Triplett, N. (1898). The dynamogenic factors in pacemaking and competition. *The American Journal Of Psychology*, 9(4), 507-533. doi:10.2307/1412188
- Thompson, S. (2007). Determinants of listeners' enjoyment of a performance. *Psychology Of Music*, 35(1), 20-36. doi:10.1177/0305735607068886
- Thompson, S., Williamon, A., & Valentine, E. (2007). Time-Dependent Characteristics of Performance Evaluation. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, (1). 13.
doi:10.1525/mp.2007.25.1.13.
- van de ven, N. (2011). Supporters are not necessary for the home advantage: Evidence from same-stadium derbies and games without an audience. *Journal Of Applied*

Social Psychology, 41(12), 2785-2792. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00865.x

Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person? The self–other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 98(2), 281-300. doi:10.1037/a0017908

Wellman, H. M. (2010). Developing a theory of mind. In U. Goswami (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood cognitive development* (pp. 258–284). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wolfson, S., Wakelin, D., & Lewis, M. (2005). Football supporters' perceptions of their role in the home advantage. *Journal Of Sports Sciences*, 23(4), 365-374. doi:10.1080/02640410400021567

Zuckerman, M., Kieffer, S. C., & Knee, C. R. (1988). Consequences of self-handicapping: Effects on coping, academic performance, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1619-1628.

APENDIX A

Demographic Information

Age:

Gender:

Ethnicity:

Major:

Main Instrument Played in Live Performance:

Main Style of Music Performed Live:

Please Indicate the Average Amount of Live Performances You Perform in a Year:

Please Indicate the Average Number of Individuals You Share a Stage with When Performing:

Please Indicate the Average Number of Individuals That are in Attendance of Your Performances:

Please Indicate the Number of Years You Have Been Performing Live Music:

Please Indicate the Number of Years You Have Been Playing a Musical Instrument:

Attitude Toward Performance Questionnaire

Instructions: Please rate the following in regards to how much they relate to your personal feelings when performing for an audience.

1 = Strongly disagree, 3 = I neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Strongly agree

I feel as though I perform better when I feel that an audience is engaged in my performance.

1 2 3 4 5

I feel as though live performance improves my musical ability.

1 2 3 4 5

Audiences should be more engaged in musical performances.

1 2 3 4 5

I feel as though audience engagement does not affect my performance.

1 2 3 4 5

I feel that it is a musical performers duty to engage an audience

1 2 3 4 5

Attitude Toward Competition Questionnaire

Instructions: Please read each sentence carefully and write the number that best describes you. Use the scale below to see what each number means.

1	2	3	4	5
Never True of Me	Seldom True of Me	Sometimes True of Me	Often True of Me	Always True of Me

1. Winning in competition makes me feel more powerful as a person.
1 2 3 4 5
2. I find myself being competitive in situations that do not call for competition.
1 2 3 4 5
3. I see my opponents as enemies.
1 2 3 4 5
4. I compete with others even if they are not competing with me.
1 2 3 4 5
5. Success in competition makes me feel superior to others.
1 2 3 4 5
6. When my competitors receive rewards for their accomplishments, I feel envy.
1 2 3 4 5
7. I find myself turning a friendly game or activity into serious contest or conflict.
1 2 3 4 5
8. It's a dog-eat-dog world. If you don't get the better of others, they will surely get the better of you.
1 2 3 4 5
9. If I can disturb my opponent in some way in order to get an edge in competition, I will do so.
1 2 3 4 5
10. I really feel down when I lose in a competition.
1 2 3 4 5
11. I view my relationships in competitive terms.
1 2 3 4 5
12. It bothers me to be passed by someone while I am driving on the road.
1 2 3 4 5
13. I can't stand to lose an argument.
1 2 3 4 5
14. In school, I feel superior whenever I do better on tests than other students.
1 2 3 4 5
15. Losing in competition has little effect on me.
1 2 3 4 5
16. Failure to lose in competition makes me feel less worth as a person.
1 2 3 4 5
17. I believe that you can be a nice guy and still win or be successful in competition.
1 2 3 4 5

Personal Mastery Survey

Instructions: Please read each sentence carefully and circle the number that best describes you. Use the scale below to see what each number means.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I enjoy competition because it gives me a chance to test my abilities.

1 2 3 4 5
2. I would want to get an “A” because it shows me that I have mastered the material.

1 2 3 4 5
3. I do not care to be the best that I can be.

1 2 3 4 5
4. Competition motivates me to bring out the best in myself.

1 2 3 4 5
5. I respect and admire competitive people,

1 2 3 4 5
6. I am not disappointed if I do not reach a goal that I have set for myself.

1 2 3 4 5
7. Competition helps me develop my abilities.

1 2 3 4 5
8. Achieving excellence is not important to me.

1 2 3 4 5
9. I enjoy competition because it brings me to a higher level of motivation.

1 2 3 4 5
10. I do my best when forced to compete.

1 2 3 4 5
11. I wish to excel in all that I do.

1 2 3 4 5
12. I enjoy competition not because it makes me feel better than others, but because it brings out the best in me.

1 2 3 4 5
13. I would rather work in an area that challenges me to excel, rather than an area where things come easy.

1 2 3 4 5
14. I tend to get too carried away with competition.

1 2 3 4 5
15. I compete only if it’s all in good fun.

1 2 3 4 5

APENDIX B

Informed Consent for Research Participation

Title of Study: Students' Attitudes Project

Principle Investigator: Samuel Casale (916) 224-0197

Purpose of Study: The present study is being conducted to better understand multiple aspects of students' attitudes and personalities.

Duration: Your participation in this study will require approximately 20 minutes.

Procedures: You will be asked to complete multiple questionnaires. The questionnaires will include items pertaining to your attitudes, personal perspectives, and your personality.

Potential Risks: It is anticipated that this study will pose no greater risk to you than you would experience on a daily basis, although there may always be the chance of an unforeseeable risk. If you feel uncomfortable answering any item, you may skip the item without penalty. If you have any questions or concerns, do not hesitate to speak with the researcher.

Potential Benefits: Participation in this study may cause you to have a better understanding of your own attitudes, perceptions, behavior. Also, the experience of acting as a participant in a research study may serve you well if you intend to conduct any research projects of your own in the future.

Protection of Confidentiality: When you receive your questionnaires, please do not write your name on them. Your packet will be collected and a randomly assigned number will be used to identify the data from each questionnaire as coming from the same participant, but will not identify you as that participant. Your responses will remain anonymous. Although your name will be recorded on this informed consent form, you will not be identified in any other way, nor will your name be in any way associated with your responses. This form will be kept separate from your questionnaire packet. Because of this confidentiality, you are encouraged to answer all items as honestly and completely as possible. This will allow for the most accurate and comprehensive data set. However, you may skip any item without penalty.

Right to Refuse or to Withdraw from the Study: Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to begin your participation or continue your participation at any time without penalty. You may also refuse to answer some items while you continue to answer others.

Questions and Results: You may ask the researcher any question about the study or your participation in it at any time during the course of the study. If the researcher cannot answer the question for any reason, you will be informed of that reason and allowed to withdraw your participation at your discretion. If you have questions, concerns, or comments about the study or the informed consent process, please contact the principle investigator, Samuel Casale at (916) 224-0197 or Smarquiscasale@gmail.com or the faculty supervisor for this project, Dr. David Hibbard. You may also direct questions or concerns about the ethical conduct of this study to the chair of the Psychology Department Dr. Brian Oppy, Psychology Department, California State University, Chico, at (530) 898-5147. Please contact Samuel Casale at (916) 224-0197 or Smarquiscasale@gmail.com if you would like a copy of the results of this study.

Informed Consent: By signing below, you are indicating that you have read this form, understand its contents,

and intend to participate in this study. You have the right to choose not to participate or to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Please ask any questions you have about this study at any time.

I understand that by signing this form I acknowledge that I have received a description of my participation in this study, that I have read and understood that description, and that I am voluntarily agreeing to participate within this study. I am aware that I may choose to end my participation at any time without consequence.

Your Name - Printed

Your Name - Signed

Date

APENDIX C

Debriefing

Thank you for participating in this study!

Data from your participation will be used to help understand students' attitudes, perspectives, and behaviors associated with competitiveness and metaperceptions. In general, this study's aim is to understand the relationship between competitiveness and musical performance among college students. Specifically, this study investigates two types of competitiveness (competing to win, and competing to excel) as they relate to how an individual perceives audience engagement during musical performance. Competing to win can be described as competition motivated by a drive to outperform others, and competing to excel can be thought of as motivated by a drive to better one's own performance. This study seeks to find how one's level of each competitive style relates to their perception of the value of audience engagement during musical performance. This is one of the first research studies examine this relationship in college students.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this study, please contact Samuel Casale at (916) 224-0197 or Smarquiscasale@gmail.com

If you feel that you have become overly distressed or concerned about any aspect of your psychological well-being from taking part in this study, you may contact the University Counseling Center at (530) 898-6345

Please direct any further questions, comments, or concerns to the faculty supervisor for this project Dr. David Hibbard or the chair of the Psychology Department Dr. Brian Oppy, Psychology Department, California State University, Chico, at (530) 898-5147

You may obtain results of this study by contacting Samuel Casale at (916) 224-0197 or Smarquiscasale@gmail.com.

If you're interested in this topic, here are some further readings:

Hibbard, D., & Buhrmester, D. (2010). Competitiveness, Gender, and Adjustment Among Adolescents. *Sex Roles*, 63(5/6), 412-424. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9809-z

Ryckman, R. M., Libby, C. R., van den Borne, B., Gold, J. A., & Lindner, M. A. (1997). Values of Hypercompetitive and Personal Development Competitive Individuals. *Journal Of Personality Assessment*, 69(2), 271.

Thompson, S., Williamon, A., & Valentine, E. (2007). Time-Dependent Characteristics of Performance Evaluation. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, (1). 13. doi:10.1525/mp.2007.25.1.13.