Western Kentucky University **TopSCHOLAR®**

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects

Graduate School

12-1976

Social Desirability & Locus of Control as Predictors of Assertiveness in College Undergraduates

Clifton Mitchell Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses



Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Clifton, "Social Desirability & Locus of Control as Predictors of Assertiveness in College Undergraduates" (1976). Masters Theses & Specialist Projects. Paper 2640.

https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2640

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR*. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Mitchell,

Clifton

1976

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL AS PREDICTORS OF ASSERTIVENESS IN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATES

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Clifton Wilkes Mitchell
December 1976

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL AS PREDICTORS OF ASSERTIVENESS IN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATES

Recommended 12-9-76
(Date)

Petta & Pac

Director of Thesis

Som & Tarland

Approved 12- 20-76 (Date)

Dean of the Graduate College

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Clint Layne and Sam McFarland for their counsel and guidance during the execution of this thesis.

Special thanks are extended to Retta Poe for her abundant guidance and assistance and her genuine interest and care during the development and refinement of this thesis.

Thanks go out to Jim Craig for his advice and to Carolyn Marks for her help with the computer analysis of the data. Appreciation goes out to Faye's magic fingers. I would also like to thank Beverly for her unrelenting encouragement.

I would like to extend my appreciation to my parents for their patience and support throughout this endeavor.

"If I can step back and say, 'wait a minute, this person is a human being,' then I can relate to them."

Elsie Dotson

Table of Contents

																Page
Acknowledg	me	nt	s								٠					iii
List of Ta	bl	es														v
List of Ap	pe	nd	ic	es	:											vi
Abstract																vii
Review of	th	е	Li	te	era	atı	ıre	9								1
Method .																8
Results .																15
Discussion																21
References																27
Footnotes																30

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests for	
	I-E, MC-SD, and CSES	12
2	Correlation Matrix for Males, Females, and	
	Total Sample Between Scores on the I-E, MC-SD,	
	and CSES	13
3	Multiple Regression Summary Table for the	
	Internal Group	16
4	Multiple Regression Summary Table for the	
	Middle Group	17
5	Multiple Regression Summary Table for the	
	External Group	18
6	Multiple Regression Summary Table for Total	
	Sample, Males, and Females	20

List of Appendices

								Page
Appendix A	A:	Internal-External Scale						32
Appendix B	в:	Personal Reaction Inventory						36
Appendix (c :	The College Self-Expression	Sc	al	Le			39

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

AS PREDICTORS OF ASSERTIVENESS IN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATES

Clifton W. Mitchell December 1976 43 pages

Directed by: Retta E. Poe, C. Clinton Layne, and Sam G.

McFarland

Department of Psychology Western Kentucky University

Previous research concerning the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness has suggested that internals are more assertive than externals, but the findings of earlier studies are inconsistent and inconclusive. The present study focused on the social desirability needs of subjects as related to locus of control and assertiveness. It was predicted that individuals who scored in the internal direction on the I-E scale and had a low social desirability need would receive higher scores on a test of assertive behavior than individuals who scored in the internal direction and had a high social desirability need. The Marlowe-Crown Social Desirability scale, Rotter's Internal-External scale, and the College Self Expression scale were administered to 69 male and 111 female college undergraduates. The results of the multiple regression analyses indicated that social desirability did not contribute significantly toward the ability of locus of control to predict assertiveness. Other findings indicated that males as a group were more assertive and more internal than females. However, for

females only internals were more assertive than externals. It was suggested that perhaps what was being measured was expected male and female sex roles.

Chapter I

Introduction

In the 1970's an area of research and therapy within the field of psychology which has received an increased amount of attention has been that of assertive behavior. Alberti and Emmons (1970) define assertiveness as "behavior which enables a person to act in his own best interests, to stand up for himself without undue anxiety, to express his honest feelings comfortably, or to exercise his own rights without denying the rights of others" (p. 2). Research involving assertiveness has grown in popularity and has largely centered around the variables pertinent to direct clinical applications, or what is typically called assertive training (Alberti & Emmons, 1970; Galassi, Galassi, & Litz, 1974; McFall & Twentyman, 1973). Research investigating the relationship of assertive behavior to other personality characteristics has been somewhat limited.

Among the variables which appear to be related to assertive behavior are Rotter's (1966) internal-external locus of control continuum and social desirability (Bates & Zimmerman, 1971; Gay, Hollandsworth, & Galassi, 1975). The research investigating these variables with respect to each

other and with respect to assertiveness will be reviewed.

The locus of control concept will be briefly discussed first,

followed by a review of the relationship between locus of

control and assertiveness.

Rotter (1966) developed theory and research relating to a personality dimension referred to as locus of control.

According to the theory, persons who perceive an internal locus of control are distinguished from persons who perceive an external locus of control. Individuals who believe that reinforcements are contingent upon their own behavior, capacities, and attributes are identified as having an internal locus of control. On the other hand, individuals who believe that reinforcements are not under their personal control, but rather are a result of other factors such as luck, chance, or fate, are said to have an external locus of control. It should be noted that locus of control is seen as a continuous variable and not a distinct dichotomy as the definitions may imply.

Although the relationship between the locus of control dimension and assertiveness has not been extensively investigated, some authors (Bates & Zimmerman, 1971) have suggested a theoretical framework for such a relationship. Bates and Zimmerman (1971) hypothesized that individuals who feel that the reinforcements which they receive are contingent upon their own behavior (i.e., individuals with an internal locus of control) may likely be assertive in

their behavior. Similarly, individuals who feel that they have no control over the reinforcements which they receive (i.e., individuals with an external locus of control) may be non-assertive or less assertive in their behavior than individuals with an internal locus of control.

Bates and Zimmerman (1971) developed the Constriction Scale Two (CS2), which was intended to assess an individual's level of constriction or degree of assertiveness. A high score on the constriction scale may be interpreted as an indication of non-assertive behavior. Using 50 college females as subjects, Bates and Zimmerman reported a significant positive correlation, $\underline{r}=.38$, $\underline{p}<.05$, between scores on the CS2 and scores on Rotter's I-E scale. The authors interpreted their results to mean that the more individuals perceive external control of events, the less assertively they behave.

Additional evidence for a relationship between assertiveness and locus of control is found in the results of a second study (Gay, Hollandsworth, & Galassi, 1975). As part of their efforts to establish construct validity for a newly-developed measure of adult assertiveness, Gay et al. administered their assertiveness inventory and Rotter's I-E scale to a group of male and female subjects of diverse ages and backgrounds. A discriminant analysis of the mean scores of high and low assertive individuals and I-E scores indicated a nonsignificant relationship between assertiveness

and locus of control. However, the results of the analysis performed by Gay et al. were in the same direction as those of Bates and Zimmerman (1971) and thus tend also to indicate that externally oriented individuals may be less assertive than internally oriented individuals.

Several variables may be responsible for the differences in results obtained in the Bates and Zimmerman (1971) and Gay et al. (1975) studies. Perhaps the most obvious explanation is that the two studies used different measures of assertiveness. In addition, the Bates and Zimmerman (1971) study used only female college students as subjects, while the Gay et al. (1975) study used a more heterogeneous sample which included males and non-college subjects. Although these variables may account for the discrepancy in results, an alternative explanation is suggested by the findings of Hewitt and Goldman (1974).

In an investigation of variables related to selfesteem, Hewitt and Goldman (1974) hypothesized that need for
social approval may result in "false positives" on a selfesteem questionnaire. That is, the authors suggested that
some subjects who report high self-esteem may in fact have
high self-esteem, while others may have low self-esteem but
report high self-esteem because of its perceived social
desirability. Subjects in the Hewitt and Goldman study
were selected on the basis of high scores on a measure of
self-esteem. Following the administration of a measure of

need for approval, subjects were then assigned to one of two groups: a high self-esteem--high need for approval group and a high self-esteem--low need for approval group. It was predicted that only those individuals with a high self-esteem and low need for social approval would respond in a novel task like "true" high self-esteem persons. It was also predicted that individuals who indicated a high self-esteem and a high need for social approval would actually respond like low self-esteem individuals. Both hypotheses were confirmed. Thus, in this case, need for social approval clearly emerged as a moderator variable in a measure of self-esteem. Hewitt and Goldman concluded that need for approval may serve to obscure the nature of the relationship between self-esteem and other variables.

Since there is some evidence that preference for an internal locus of control may be perceived as socially desirable (Altrocchi, Palmer, Hellmann, & Davis, 1967; Berzins, Ross, & Cohen, 1970; Feather, 1967; Rotter, 1966), it may be that, as in the Hewitt and Goldman (1974) study on self-esteem, the socially desirable nature of the internal end of the locus of control dimension may result in two groups of subjects with a reported internal orientation. That is, there may be one group of internals who are actually internals and another group of internals who are in fact externals but who report themselves as internals because of the perceived social desirability of endorsing

an internal orientation. Therefore, the previous studies which investigated the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness may have failed to demonstrate a clear relationship between the two variables because of the possible moderating effects of social desirability.

In summary, a number of investigators have hypothesized that internally oriented individuals may be more likely to engage in assertive behavior than externally oriented individuals. Yet the research support for this hypothesis is inconclusive, and a clear picture of internals' assertive behavior is not available. One reason for this lack of consistent findings in studies of the relationship between locus of control and assertive behavior may be that Rotter's I-E measure has socially desirable characteristics which influence some externally oriented individuals and cause them to score in an internal direction.

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether social desirability may be used as a moderator variable to increase the accuracy of prediction in an investigation of the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness. It was hypothesized that individuals who scored in the internal direction on the I-E scale and had a low social desirability need would receive higher scores on a test of assertive behavior than individuals who scored in the internal direction and had a high social desirability need.

Because of a lack of experimental evidence on which to base predictions, no hypotheses were made concerning two other groups which were established: moderate scoring and high scoring I-E subjects. Nevertheless, social desirability scores and assertiveness scores were investigated for these two groups for exploratory reasons.

Chapter II

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 69 undergraduate college males and lll undergraduate college females enrolled in introductory psychology courses at Western Kentucky University. Participation in the experiment was an activity of the course.

Apparatus

Rotter's (1966) Internal-External (I-E) scale was used to measure perceived locus of control (see Appendix A). The test has been shown to have test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .49 to .83 and internal consistency coefficients ranging from .65 to .79 (Rotter, 1966). A high score on the scale indicates a more external orientation and a low score indicates a more internal orientation. A number of studies indicate that the test can be used to identify differences in a variety of groups in many experimental situations (Joe, 1971; Phares, 1976).

Assertiveness was measured by the College Self-Expression Scale (CSES) developed by Galassi, Delo, Galassi, and Bastien (1974). This particular assertiveness measure was chosen because there appeared to be more research utilizing this scale than other similar measures. The CSES is a 50-item, self-report scale which uses a five-point Likert format and is designed to measure the degree of assertiveness of college students (see Appendix C). Testretest reliability coefficients of .89 and .90 were reported for two samples of students over a two-week interval by Galassi, Delo, Galassi, and Bastien (1974). In a variety of college samples mean scores on the CSES ranged from 120.31 to 128.09 (Galassi, Delo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974). The test developers attempted to demonstrate construct validity by comparing CSES scores with Adjective Check List scores. Significant positive correlations were found between CSES scores and the following Adjective Check List scores: Number checked, Defensiveness, Favorable, Self-Confidence, Achievement, Dominance, Intraception, Heterosexuality, Exhibition, Autonomy, and Change. Significant negative correlations were reported for the following scales: Unfavorable, Succorance, Abasement, Deference, and Counseling Readiness. Galassi and his co-workers concluded that these correlations were in the direction expected, and construct validity was therefore partially established. Concurrent validity was assessed by measuring correlations between supervisor ratings and self ratings. A correlation of .19, p < .01, was reported. Further concurrent validity verification was reported by Galassi and Galassi (1974) using untrained judges and self ratings, $\underline{r} = .33, \underline{p} < .005.$

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (MC-SD) scale was used to measure need for social approval (see Appendix B). The scale was developed to measure the need of individuals to present themselves in a "favorable light."

The 33-question, true-false scale has been shown to have an internal consistency coefficient of .88 and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .89 (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

Procedure

Subjects were administered the three questionnaires in their classrooms during one class period. All subjects answered the CSES first, the I-E scale second, and the MC-SD scale last. The standard instructions for each questionnaire were utilized along with a statement by the experimenter expressing that he was investigating "various attitudes of college students." On each questionnaire an identification number was required from the subjects. Whether or not names were given was optional except in the cases where feedback was requested. In such cases names were required.

Data Analysis

In this study subjects' scores on the CSES were the dependent variable. The independent variables were sex of subject, scores on the MC-SD test, and scores on the I-E scale.

Because of the reported differences in scores of males and females on Rotter's I-E scale (Feather, 1967, 1968), an

initial analysis was conducted to determine whether in the present study there were significant differences between the scores of male and female subjects on the three question-naires utilized. As presented in Table 1, the initial investigation revealed that significant differences existed between males' and females' mean scores on the I-E scale, t (178) = -2.19, p <.05. Males scored in a more internal direction than females. Significant differences were also found between males' and females' mean scores on the CSES, t (178) = 2.34, p <.05. Males scored in a more assertive direction than females. There were no significant differences between males' and females' mean scores on the MC-SD scale. Because significant sex differences were obtained on the I-E scale and on the CSES, separate analyses were conducted for males and females throughout the data analysis.

Because the hypothesis of the study was based on the premise that the internal end of the I-E scale is perceived as more socially desirable than the external end, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed between scores on the I-E scale and the MC-SD scale. For exploratory reasons further Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between scores on the CSES and scores on the I-E scale and between scores on the CSES and scores on the MC-SD scale. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between the above scales are presented in Table 2. For both males and females significant correlations

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests for I-E, MC-SD, and CSES Table 1

	1 = 180)	SD	4.61	5.50	19.93	
	Total $(\underline{n} = 180)$	×	10.63	14.66	122.92	
	Ιt		-2.19*	.23	2.34*	
	<u>n</u> = 111)	SD	4.42	5.50	19.47	Y
	Females $(\underline{n} = 111)$	M	11.23	14.59	120.20	t of probability
Section of the Party and P	(69 =	SD	4.79	5.54	20.02	test of
	Males $(\underline{n} = 69)$	M	6.67	14.78	127.30	*P < .05, two-tailed test
	Scale		I-E	MC-SD	CSES	*p < .05,

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Males, Females, and

Total Sample Between Scores on the I-E,

MC-SD and CSES

Scale	MC-SD	CSES	
I-E			
Total	34*	23*	
Males	26*	18	
Females	39*	22*	
CSES			
Total	.11		
Males	.04		
Females	.16*		

^{*}p <.05

were found between scores on the I-E scale and scores on the MC-SD scale, $\underline{r} = -.26$, $\underline{p} < .05$; $\underline{r} = -.39$, $\underline{p} < .05$, respectively. Because a low score on the I-E scale indicates an internal locus of control, the negative correlations indicate that an internal locus of control appears to be perceived as more socially desirable than the external locus of control.

On the basis of their scores on the I-E scale subjects were divided into three groups which were labeled as internal, middle, and external. Subjects who received scores in the top twenty-five percent of the I-E distribution (i.e., scores ranging from 1 to 7) were assigned to the internal group. Subjects who received scores in the middle twenty-five percent of the I-E distribution (i.e., scores ranging from 9 to 11) were assigned to the middle group. Subjects who received scores in the bottom twenty-five percent of the I-E distribution (i.e., scores ranging from 13 to 20) were assigned to the external group.

In order to test the hypothesis that social desirability is related to internals' assertiveness scores, a multiple regression analysis was performed within the internal group. Also, separate multiple regression analyses were performed within the middle and external groups for exploratory reasons. In order to understand further the relationships among the independent variables additional multiple regression analyses were performed on the entire sample.

Chapter III

Results

Analysis of Internal Group

The results of the multiple regression analyses within the internal group are presented in Table 3. Within the internal group no significant relationships emerged between the independent variables and assertiveness. For the internal group as a whole social desirability accounted for a non-significant portion of the variance in CSES scores. Furthermore, the social desirability variance regressed in a positive direction, indicating that the higher social desirability scores are associated with higher assertiveness scores. Social desirability added .37 percent of variance to the amount of assertive score variance accounted for by the locus of control variable. 1

Analyses of Middle and External Groups

The results of the multiple regression analysis within the middle and external groups are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. No significant relationships emerged between the independent variables and assertiveness within either of these two groups.

Table 3

Multiple Regression Summary Table for the Internal Group

					Dependent Variable:		Assertiveness
Sample	Variable	Percentage of Unique Variance ^a	Eul	df	Cumulative Percentage of Variance ^b	ĿΙ	df.
Total	I-E	2.14	66.	.99 1/45	2.14	66.	1/45
(n = 4/)	MC-SD	.29	.13	1/45	2.51	.57	2/44
	Sex	1.92	. 88	1/45			
	(I-E & Sex	1.55	.71	1/45)			
Males	I-E	5.77	1.28	1/21	5.77	1.28	1/21
(<u>u</u> = 73)	MC-SD	.15	.03	1/21	6.30	.67	2/20
Females	I-E	.02	.01	1/22		-	1
(47 = 11)	MC-SD	3.67	.84	1/22	3.67	.84	1/22

aBased on Pearson r or Bivariate r

bBased on Multiple R

CShared variance between I-E and MC-SD

CShared variance between I-E and MC-SD

^aBased on Pearson r or Bivariate r

bBased on Multiple R

Table 4

Multiple Regression Summary Table for the Middle Group

				1		Assert	Assertiveness
Variable Unique Variance ^a F df	Œĺ		اق	w.I	Cumulative Perceptage of Variance ^b	ŒΙ	df
I-E .98 .48 1/48		.48 1/48	1/48	_	86.	.48	1/48
MC-SD .44 .21 1/48	.21		1/4	80	1.67	.40	2/47
Sex 3.05 1.51 1/48	1.51		1/4	80			
(I-E & Sex ^C 2.57 1.26 1/48)	1.26		1/4	8			
I-E 2.60 .35 1/13	.35		1/2	13	2.60	.35	1/13
MC-SD .59 .08 1/13	80.		17	.3	3.20	.20	2/12
I-E 1.25 .42 1/33	.42		1/3	13	1.25	.42	1/33
MC-SD .43 .14 1/33	.14	.14 1/:	1/	33	2.04	.33	2/32

Multiple Regression Summary Table for the External Group

					Dependent Variable: Assertiveness	Assert	iveness
Sample	Variable	Percentage of Unique Variance ^a	Eq.	đ£	Cumulative Percentage of Variance ^b	Ful	df df
Total	MC-SD	2.82	1.62	1.62 1/56	2.82	1.62	1.62 1/56
(85 1 11)	I-E	00.	00.	1/56	3.27	.93	2/55
	Sex	5.69	3.37	1/56			
	(I-E & Sex ^C	4.75	2.79	1/56)			
Males	MC-SD	5.95	1.07	1/17	5,95	1.07	1/17
	I-E	.15	.02	1/17	6.23	.53	2/16
Females	MC-SD	2.10	.79	1/37	2.10	.79	1/37
	I-E	.48	.18	1/37	3.93	.73	2/36
aBased	on Pearson r	aBased on Pearson r or Bivariate r					

Based on Pearson r or Bivariate r

based on Multiple R

CShared variance between I-E and MC-SD

Analyses of Total Sample

The results of the multiple regression analyses for the total sample are presented in Table 6. Within the total sample for both sexes combined, locus of control accounted for 5.11 percent of the variance in assertiveness scores, p < .05. For females alone locus of control accounted for 4.81 percent of assertiveness score variance, p < .05. For males locus of control did not account for a significant amount of assertiveness score variance. In all three cases, males, females, and both sexes combined, locus of control regressed in such a manner that the more internal scores (i.e., lower scores) were associated with higher assertiveness scores.

Although the variance in assertiveness scores contributed by social desirability scores regressed in a positive direction, this relationship was non-significant. Sex of subject accounted for 3.02 percent of assertiveness score variance, p < .05, and regressed in such a manner that males scored higher on the assertiveness measure than females.

Multiple Regression Summary Table for Total Sample, Males, and Females

					Dependent Variable:	Assert	Assertiveness
Sample	Variable	Percentage of Unique Variance ^a	더	df	Cumulative Percentage of Variance ^b	æl	df
Total	I-E	5.11*	9.59	9.59 1/178	5.11*	9.59	1/178
(<u>n</u> = 180)	MC-SD	1.30	2.35	1/178	5.27*	4.93	2/177
	Sex	3.02*	5.55	1/178			
	(I-E x Sex ^C	2.60*	10.57	1/178)			
Males	I-E	3.24	2.24	1/67	3.24	2.24	1/67
(60 = d)	MC-SD	.17	.11	1/67	1		1
Females	I-E	4.81*	5.51	1/109	4.81*	5.51	1/109
TTT = T)	MC-SD	2.53	2.82	2.82 1/109	5.45*	3.11	2/108
*p < .05	15						

aBased on Pearson r or Bivariate r

bassed on Multiple R

CShared variance between I-E and MC-SD

Chapter IV

Discussion

The results of the present study indicated that social desirability did not appear to be related to internals' assertiveness scores. Thus, contrary to prediction, no support was obtained for the hypothesis that there are two groups of internals, those who truly perceive an internal locus of control and those who are actually external but are responding to the perceived social desirability of endorsing an internal orientation. Although the hypothesis was not supported, the locus of control dimension was related to social desirability in that subjects who scored low on the locus of control scale (i.e., internals) tended to score high on the social desirability measure. These results are similar to those cited earlier in Altrocchi, Palmer, Hellmann, and Davis (1967); Berzins and Ross (1970); Feather (1967); and Rotter (1966). Thus, subjects who reported an internal orientation and who scored high on the social desirability measure did not appear to be responding falsely to the I-E scale because of the I-E scale's possible socially desirable characteristics.

In addition, no significant relationships emerged among the independent variables within the middle or

external groups. Thus, it appears that social desirability did not increase accuracy of predictions in this investigation of the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness.

Within the entire sample of females assertiveness was related to social desirability in that females who scored high on the social desirability measure also tended to score high on the assertiveness measure. However, examination of the entire sample also revealed that social desirability scores did not contribute a significant amount of variance toward assertiveness scores for either males or females. Thus, it appears that an individual's degree of assertive behavior is not directly related to social desirability. The lack of support for any direct relationship between social desirability and assertiveness may be a result of the particular social desirability measure utilized. This hypothesis will be discussed later.

The results utilizing the entire sample perhaps present a clearer picture of the relationships between sex of subject, locus of control, and assertiveness. Among females locus of control accounted for a significant amount of variance in assertiveness scores in a manner such that internally scoring females scored in a more assertive direction than externally scoring females. These results are similar to those cited earlier in Bates and Zimmerman

(1971) and Gay, Hollandsworth, and Galassi (1975). One interpretation of these findings might be that internally oriented females are more assertive because they believe that the reinforcements which they receive for their behavior are contingent upon their own actions. Likewise, females with an external orientation may be less assertive because they believe that reinforcement is not contingent upon their own behavior.

Although locus of control scores were related to assertiveness scores for females, males received scores which were more internal than females' scores and also scored in a more assertive direction than did females.

Other studies corroborating the finding that males score more internally than females are those of Feather (1967, 1968). Rotter (1966) reported only one instance of similar significant sex differences on the I-E scale and suggested that regional differences may have resulted in males' receiving more internal scores than females. Although the tendency for males to score higher on the assertiveness measure than females was reported in all samples of Galassi, Delo, Galassi, and Bastien (1974), it was not significant.

One interpretation of the above results is that males' assertive behavior is not contingent upon perceived expected rewards. In order to explain the differences in assertiveness scores of males and females in relation to locus of

control it is suggested that what is perhaps being measured are differences in expected and learned male and female sex roles. Furthermore, these sex role differences are perhaps stronger among subjects in predominantly Southern rural areas.

Perhaps males learn a more internal orientation because society places them in positions where behavior or performance may be evaluated objectively, such as by scoring a touchdown. Females, on the other hand, have perhaps traditionally been rewarded for more subjectively-evaluated behaviors, such as social skills, and therefore develop a more external orientation. In an examination of the development of male and female self concepts, Kagan (1964) presents a more detailed discussion of this idea.

Males may also respond in a more assertive manner than females because traditional sex roles tend to carry the expectation that males should be the spokesmen in situations where either a male or female must assert. Predominantly Southern rural areas are perhaps likely to change such traditional sex role expectations more slowly than would urban areas where such changes are generally initiated. Furthermore, the notion that the I-E scale may be measuring expected sex roles would explain the large amount of shared variance which was found between locus of control and sex of subject.

Two factors may be responsible for the lack of significant findings in certain areas of the present study. The lack of support for a relationship between assertiveness and social desirability may be a result of the particular areas of social desirability assessed by the Marlowe-Crowne scale. It may be that the MC-SD scale measures areas of social desirability which are only tangentially related to the areas of social desirability associated with degree of assertiveness. True-false questions such as "I can remember 'playing sick' to get out of something" and "I always try to practice what I preach," found in the MC-SD scale, may have little relation to the social desirability needs and individual experiences during an assertive interaction. spectrum of social desirability needs assessed by the MC-SD scale is perhaps too broad for successful utilization of the scale in an investigation of the relationship between social desirability and assertiveness.

The lack of significant findings within the internal, middle, and external groups was perhaps partially the result of the variance that was lost when analysis was performed on groups which were established from scores falling within a particular range. Evidence that the loss of variance affected results is seen in the differences in significant effects of I-E scores between individual groups and the entire sample.

Future research using scales employed in the present study should consider the effects of variance lost when analysis is performed on groups established from a particular range of scores. Also, future researchers concerned with the social desirability needs of individuals in assertive situations should carefully consider the social desirability measure used. Development of a new social desirability scale which applies more directly to personal interactions may be necessary.

In conclusion, further research is needed to assess
the effects that broad variables, such as expected sex
roles, have on the scales used in the present study.
Clarification of the effects of such variables on assertiveness and locus of control appears needed at this point.

References

- Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. Your perfect right: A guide to assertive behavior. San Luis Obispo,
 California: Impact, 1970.
- Altrocchi, J., Palmer, J., Hellmann, R., & Davis, H. The

 Marlowe-Crowne, Repressor-Sensitizer, and Internal
 External scales and attribution of unconscious hostile

 intent. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1229-1230.
- Bates, H. D., & Zimmerman, S. F. Toward the development of a screening scale for assertive training. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 99-107.
- Berzins, J. I., Ross, W. F., & Cohen, D. I. Skill versus chance activity preferences as alternative measures of locus of control: An attempted cross-validation.

 Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 18-20.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. <u>Journal of</u>
 Consulting Psychology, 1960, <u>24</u>(4), 349-354.
- Feather, N. T. Some personality correlates of external control. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1967, 19, 253-260. (Joe, V. C. Review of the Internal-External

- control construct as a personality variable. <u>Psycho-logical Reports</u>, 1971, 28, 619-640.)
- Feather, N. T. Change in confidence following success or failure as a predictor of subsequent performance.

 Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 38-46.
- Galassi, J. P., Delo, J. S., Galassi, M. D., & Bastien, S.

 The College Self-Expression Scale: A measure of
 assertiveness. Behavior Therapy, 1974, 5, 165-171.
- Galassi, J. & Galassi, M. D. Validity of a measure of assertiveness. <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, 1974, 21(3), 248-250.
- Galassi, J. P., Galassi, M. D., & Litz, M. C. Assertive training in groups using video feedback. <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, 1974, <u>21</u>(5), 390-394.
- Gay, M. L., Hollandsworth, J. G., Jr., & Galassi, J. P. An assertive inventory for adults. <u>Journal of Counseling</u> Psychology, 1975, 22(4), 340-344.
- Hewitt, J., & Goldman, M. Self-esteem, need for approval, and reactions to personal evaluations. <u>Journal of</u>

 Experimental Social Psychology, 1974, <u>10</u>, 201-210.
- Joe, V. C. Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 619-640. (Monograph)

- Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1).

 New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.
- McFall, R. M., & Twentyman, C. T. Four experiments on the relative contributions of rehearsal, modeling, and coaching to assertion training. <u>Journal of Abnormal Psychology</u>, 1973, 81(3), 199-218.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for social sciences.

 New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Phares, E. J. Locus of control in personality. Morristown,

 New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement.
 Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(1, Whole No. 609).

Footnotes

1 It should be observed that social desirability appeared to contribute more variance toward assertiveness when it was analyzed with the other variables than it contributed when analyzed separately. This is a result of multicolinearity or the situation where independent variables are highly intercorrelated and thus confound the results of multiple regression analysis (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Since the resulting difference is small it is doubtful whether this aspect of the results is meaningful.

Appendices

7 -		- 3	1	78
Ap	be	na	TX	A

Social	Security	#	
	Se	x	

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spand too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you most strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

When you have made your choice, circle the letter (either a or b) of the statement which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Circle the letter directly on the test sheet itself. Again, choose only one statement for each statement pair, but be sure to answer every number (choose one of the statements from each numbered pair).

EXAMPLE:

- 30. a Questionnaires are fun to fill out and provide a lot of information.
 - b. Questionnaires are boring and serve no purpose.

In this case the person chose statement "a" as the one in which he more strongly believed to be as far as he was concerned.

ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

- a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
 - b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
- a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
 - b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
- a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
 - b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
- 4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
 - b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
- 5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
 - b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
- 6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
 - b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
- a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
 - b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
- a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
 - b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
- 9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
 - b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

- 10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
 - b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
- 11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
 - b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
 - b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much that the little guy can do about it.
- 13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
 - b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- 14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
 - b. There is some good in everybody.
- 15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
 - b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
- 16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
 - b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
- 17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
 - b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
- 18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
 - b. There is no such thing as "luck."
- 19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
 - b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

- a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
 - b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
 - b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
 - b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
 - b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
 - b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
 - b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
 - b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
 - b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
 - b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
 - b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Appendix B

		Social Security #
		Sex
		Personal Reaction Inventory
	pers deci pert	ed below are a number of statements concerning onal attitudes and traits. Read each item and de whether the statement is true or false as it ains to you personally. Please mark your answer ue) or F(False) beside each statement.
	1.	Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
	2.	I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
_	3.	It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
	4.	I have never intensely disliked anyone.
_	5.	On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
	6.	I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
	7.	I am always careful about my manner of dress.
	8.	My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
	9.	If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
_	10.	On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
	11.	I like to gossip at times.
	12.	There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even when I knew they were right.
	13.	No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

—	14.	I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
-	15.	There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
	16.	I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
	17.	I always try to practice what I preach.
_	18.	I don't find it particularly difficult to get alon with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
—	19.	I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
_	20.	When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
—	21.	I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
-	22.	At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
_	23.	There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
	24.	I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
	25.	I never resent being asked to return a favor.
	26.	I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
_	27.	I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
_	28.	There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
	29.	I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
	30.	I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
_	31.	I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

- ___ 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
- ___ 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

Appendix C

				Social Security #				
						Sex		
					Tì	ne College Self-Expression Scale		
oir	е	ct	ic	ons:	ini	e following inventory is designed to provide formation about the way in which you express urself. Please answer the questions by rcling the appropriate number from 0 to 4.		
						Almost Always or Always = 0 Usually = 1 Sometimes = 2 Seldom = 3 Never or Rarely = 4		
						uld reflect how you generally express your- uation.		
) 1	L	2	3	4	1.	Do you ignore it when someone pushes in front of you in line?		
) 1	L	2	3	4	2.	When you decide that you no longer wish to date someone, do you have marked difficulty telling the person of your decision?		
) 1	L	2	3	4	3.	Would you exchange a purchase you discover to be faulty?		
) 1	L	2	3	4	4.	If you decided to change your major to a field which your parents will not approve, would you have difficulty telling them?		
)]	L	2	3	4	5.	Are you inclined to be over-apologetic?		
נכ	L	2	3	4	6.	If you were studying and if your roommate were making too much noise, would you ask him to stop?		
0 1	L	2	3	4	7.	Is it difficult for you to compliment and praise others?		
0 1	L	2	3	4	8.	If you are angry at your parents, can you tell them?		

Usually = 1 Sometimes = 2Seldom = 3Never or Rarely = 4 0 1 2 3 4 9. Do you insist that your roommate does his fair share of the cleaning? 0 1 2 3 4 10. If you find yourself becoming fond of someone you are dating, would you have difficulty expressing these feelings to that person? 0 1 2 3 4 11. If a friend who has borrowed \$5.00 from you seems to have forgotten about it, would you remind this person? 0 1 2 3 4 12. Are you overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings? 0 1 2 3 4 13. If you have a close friend whom your parents dislike and constantly criticize, would you inform your parents that you disagree with them and tell them of your friend's assets? 0 1 2 3 4 14. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favor for you? 0 1 2 3 4 15. If food which is not to your satisfaction is served in a restaurant, would you complain about it to the waiter? 0 1 2 3 4 16. If your roommate without your permission eats food that he knows you have been saving, can you express your displeasure to him? 0 1 2 3 4 17. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show you some merchandise which is not quite suitable, do you have difficulty in saying no? 0 1 2 3 4 18. Do you keep your opinions to yourself? 0 1 2 3 4 19. If friends visit when you want to study, do you ask them to return at a more convenient time? 0 1 2 3 4 20. Are you able to express love and affection to

people for whom you care?

Almost Always or Always = 0

Sometimes = 2Seldom = 3Never or Rarely = 4 0 1 2 3 4 21. If you were in a small seminar and the professor made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it? 0 1 2 3 4 22. If a person of the opposite sex whom you have been wanting to meet smiles or directs attention to you at a party, would you take the initiative in beginning a conversation? 0 1 2 3 4 23. If someone you respect expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, would you venture to state your own point of view? 0 1 2 3 4 24. Do you go out of your way to avoid trouble with other people? 0 1 2 3 4 25. If a friend is wearing a new outfit which you like, do you tell that person so? 0 1 2 3 4 26. If after leaving a store you realize that you have been "short-changed," do you go back and request the correct amount? 0 1 2 3 4 27. If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse? 0 1 2 3 4 28. If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance? 0 1 2 3 4 29. If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans would you tell them of your preference? 0 1 2 3 4 30. Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified? 0 1 2 3 4 31. If a friend does an errand for you, do you tell that person how much you appreciate it? 0 1 2 3 4 32. When a person is blatantly unfair, do you

fail to say something about it to him?

Almost Always or Always = 0

Usually = 1

Usually = 1 Sometimes = 2Seldom = 3Never or Rarely = 4 0 1 2 3 4 33. Do you avoid social contacts for fear of doing or saying the wrong thing? 0 1 2 3 4 34. If a friend betrays your confidence, would you hesitate to express annoyance to that person? 0 1 2 3 4 35. When a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you, do you call his attention to the matter? 0 1 2 3 4 36. If you are particularly happy about someone's good fortune, can you express this to that person? 0 1 2 3 4 37. Would you be hesitant about asking a good friend to lend you a few dollars? 0 1 2 3 4 38. If a person teases you to the point that it is no longer fun, do you have difficulty expressing your displeasure? 0 1 2 3 4 39. If you arrive late for a meeting, would you rather stand than go to a front seat which could only be secured with a fair degree of conspicuousness? 0 1 2 3 4 40. If your date calls on Saturday night 15 minutes before you are supposed to meet and says that she (he) has to study for an important exam and cannot make it, would you express your annoyance? 0 1 2 3 4 41. If someone keeps kicking the back of your chair in a movie, would you ask him to stop? 0 1 2 3 4 42. If someone interrupts you in the middle of an important conversation, do you request that the person wait until you have finished? Do you freely volunteer information or 0 1 2 3 4 43. opinions in class discussions?

Almost Always or Always = 0

Almost Always or Always = 0

Usually = 1

Sometimes = 2

Seldom = 3

Never or Rarely = 4

- 0 1 2 3 4 44. Are you reluctant to speak to an attractive acquaintance of the opposite sex?
- 0 1 2 3 4 45. If you lived in an apartment and the landlord failed to make certain necessary repairs after promising to do so, would you insist on it?
- 0 1 2 3 4 46. If your parents want you home by a certain time which you feel is much too early and unreasonable, do you attempt to discuss or negotiate this with them?
- 0 1 2 3 4 47. Do you find it difficult to stand up for your rights?
- 0 1 2 3 4 48. If a friend unjustifiably critizes you, do you express your resentment there and then?
- 0 1 2 3 4 49. Do you express your feelings to others?
- 0 1 2 3 4 50. Do you avoid asking questions in class for fear of feeling self-conscious?