

<b>Outcome Measure</b>	<b>Social Performance Survey Schedule (SPSS)</b>
<b>Sensitivity to Change</b>	No
<b>Population</b>	Adult
<b>Domain</b>	Social Role Participation and Social Competence Behavioural Function
<b>Type of Measure</b>	Informant-report, self-report
<b>ICF-Code/s</b>	d7
<b>Description</b>	<p>The SPSS is a measure of social skill that assesses a wide variety of social behaviours. The SPSS contains separate subscales to assess positive social behaviours (Part A: Appropriate Social Skills and Communication Skills) and negative social behaviours (Part B: Inappropriate Assertion and Sociopathic Behaviour). It is assumed that the higher the Part A score and the lower the Part B score, the higher the respondent's level of social competence.</p> <p>Subjects are asked to rate the frequency with which they engage in each of the 100 behaviours on a 5-point Likert scale. In Part A, ratings of "very much" receive 4 points, "much" 3 points, and so on to "not at all," which is assigned 0 points. The opposite point assignments are made in Part B. Total subscale scores are obtained by adding the 50 item scores which comprise each subscale; total SPSS scores (maximum=400) are derived by summing the two subscales.</p> <p>Sample items include: 'Has eye contact when speaking'; 'Puts self down'; 'Demonstrates concern for other's rights'; 'Tells people what he/she thinks they want to hear'; and 'Takes advantage of others.'</p>
<b>Properties</b>	<p><u>Internal consistency:</u> Lowe &amp; Cautela (1978) administered the SPSS to 303 college students and reported unadjusted and adjusted coefficient of .94 and .88, respectively.</p> <p><u>Test-retest:</u> (de Lowe &amp; Cautela, 1978) The SPSS evidenced considerable stability over time (4 weeks) with a test-retest correlation between first and second administration of <math>r = .87</math>.</p> <p><u>Criterion validity:</u> Miller and Funabliki (1984) compared high- and low-scoring college students on behavioral measures derived from a simulated social interaction test. The high-scoring group demonstrated a greater level of skill on seven of 10 indices, including specific behavioral measures and judges' global ratings of social skill and social anxiety.</p> <p>Similarly, Lowe (1985) demonstrated that high skill subjects and low skill subjects on Part A differ significantly on most convergent validity criteria (i.e., Social Contact Monitoring, number of friends, peer rating form, Social Avoidance and Distress Scale and in vivo interactions)</p>

	<p>Lowe (1985) evaluated the discriminability of Part A scores of the SPSS from general of Psychopathology by comparing high skill and low skill subjects on their Hopkins Symptom Check List scores. There was no difference found between the groups (<math>F = 1.02, p &gt; .3</math>), supporting Part A's discriminant validity.</p> <p>Covey (cited in Miller and Funabiki, 1984) found that the SPSS was only weakly correlated with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale.</p> <p><u>Construct validity</u>: The SPSS correlated negatively with a measure of social anxiety (Lowe &amp; Cautela, 1978) and an abbreviated version of the SPSS correlated positively with objective observers' ratings of patients' social skill during the Simulated Social Interaction Test (Curran, 1982).</p>
<b>Advantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a measure of positive as well as negative behaviours, which is something that (to our knowledge) is not assessed by any other scale.</li> </ul>
<b>Disadvantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lengthy to administer.</li> <li>• In 2 studies where the SPSS was administered to individuals with TBI, findings were unexpected. It was found that informant ratings for TBI participants were <b>better</b> than controls on the SPSS-n (suggesting they exhibited less negative behaviours than controls) (McDonald, Flanagan, Martin, &amp; Saunders, 2004). In another study, the TBI group were not significantly different to controls on the SPSS-n (Long, McDonald, Tate, Togher, &amp; Bornhofen, 2008).</li> <li>• Does not correlate with performance on the TASIT (McDonald et al., 2004).</li> <li>• Qualitatively, many of the items appear to assess negative social behaviours that require a level of cognitive functioning that is higher than would be expected for a TBI population (e.g. manipulative behaviour).</li> </ul>
<b>Reviewers</b>	<p>Robyn Tate Jenny Fleming</p>

## References

- Curran, J. P., & Monti, P. M. (1982). *Social skills training: A practical handbook for assessment and treatment*: Guilford Press New York.
- Long, E., McDonald, S., Tate, R., Togher, L., & Bornhofen, C. (2008). Assessing Social Skills in People With Very Severe Traumatic Brain Injury: Validity of the Social Performance Survey Schedule (SPSS). *Brain Impairment*, 9(3), 274-281.
- Lowe, M., & D'Ilio, V. (1985). Factor analysis of the social performance survey schedule. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 7(1), 13-22. doi: 10.1007/bf00961843
- Lowe, M. R. (1985). Psychometric Evaluation of the Social Performance Survey Schedule: Reliability and Validity of the Positive Behavior Subscale. *Behavior Modification*, 9(2), 193-210. doi: 10.1177/01454455850092004
- Lowe, M. R., & Cautela, J. R. (1978). A self-report measure of social skill. *Behavior Therapy*, 9(4), 535-544. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(78\)80126-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(78)80126-9)
- McDonald, S., Flanagan, S., Martin, I., & Saunders, C. (2004). The ecological validity of TASIT: A test of social perception. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 14(3), 285-302. doi: Doi 10.1080/09602010343000237
- Miller, L., & Funabiki, D. (1984). Predictive validity of the Social Performance Survey Schedule for component interpersonal behaviors. . *Behavioural Assessment*, 6(1), 33-44.