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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Kelly, St. Lawrence, Bradlyn, and Himadi (1982) noted that while assertion training was one of the most common treatments recommended for interpersonal difficulties, there had been little research on how others in the environment react to individuals' assertive responses. The social consequences of assertive responses, however, have recently come under empirical scrutiny. Kern (1982) states that the accurate prediction of reactions to assertive behavior involves the consideration of person, behavior, and situation variables. Reactions to assertiveness may be a function of whether a behavior is perceived as assertive, aggressive, or nonassertive, the sex of both the asserter and the assertee, and the specific response class of assertiveness (Hull & Schroeder, 1979).
Consequently, studies have suggested that the interpersonal consequences of assertive and unassertive responses may be more complex than thought previously (Epstein, 1980).

Ironically, while the goal of assertion training is theoretically the attainment of instrumental goals, enhanced self-respect, and improved interpersonal relationships (Kern, 1982), Epstein (1980) has suggested that while initially assertion results in compliance for a positive outcome for the individual, a long-term effect may be negative affect from others. Due to the prevalence and popularity of assertion training, it would appear important to clarify the consequences of assertion, in light of relevant person, behavioral and situational variables.

Definitions of Assertion and Assertive Behavior

Several definitions of assertive behavior and assertion can be found in the literature. Assertion has been defined as "the proper expression of any emotion other than anxiety toward another person" (Wolpe, 1973, p. 81). While some studies have found differences between nonassertive and assertive individuals in their personality and self-actualizing profiles (Galassi & Galassi, 1974a, 1974b; Paterson, Dickson, Layne, &
Anderson, 1984; Ramanaiah, Heerboth, & Jinkerson, 1985) and cognitive complexity (Bruch, 1981; Bruch, Heisler, & Conroy, 1981), assertiveness is generally conceptualized as a series of learned situation-specific verbal and non-verbal behaviors rather than a personality trait (Galassi & Galassi, 1978). Others have defined assertion as standing up for "legitimate rights" (Alberti & Emmons, 1974; Lazarus, 1971; Jakubowski-Spector, 1973). Assertive behavior is often confused with aggressive behavior but Galassi and Galassi note that if assertive behavior is understood to include not only expressions of negative feelings but also caring and other positive feelings, then confusion with aggressive behavior becomes less likely. For instance, Alberti and Emmons (1974) have employed a broader definition of assertion, extending it to encompass the honest expression of a broad range of feelings including justified anger, caring, and affection.

Heimberg, Montgomery, Madsen and Heimberg (1977) question popular definitions of assertive behavior which stress the "rights" of the individual. Specifically, they question the idea that assertion is behavior in which people act in their own best interests, stand up for themselves without undue anxiety, express their honest feelings comfortably and/or exercise their own
rights without denying the rights of others. Heimberg et al. criticize the concept of interpersonal rights for placing assertive behavior in a value-oriented moralistic framework in which assertive behavior is "good" because the rights of everyone concerned are protected, and non-assertive and aggressive behaviors are viewed as "bad" because the rights of one party are ignored or violated. However, their own definition is very similar. They define assertive behavior as behavior that is performed in order to maximize the total reinforcement value of a social interaction for all persons involved. They suggest that assertive behavior may be conceptualized as "effective social problem solving" and recommend that assertion training be directed at helping clients select the most "effective response" from the available alternatives (Heimberg, Montgomery, Madsen, & Heimberg, 1977).

Galassi and Galassi (1978) delineate three main components of assertion. These three components include a behavioral dimension (e.g., standing up for rights, initiating and refusing requests, giving and receiving compliments, initiating, maintaining and terminating conversations), a person's dimension (e.g., friends, acquaintances, spouses, parents, strangers), and a situational dimension, all of which exist within a cultural or subcultural context. In order to better
understand the social consequences of assertion, behavioral, person, and situational variables all need to be considered.

According to the assertion literature, assertion, nonassertion and aggression are characterized by the following behavior patterns (Alberti & Emmons, 1974). Nonassertion is characterized by little eye contact, a soft, timid voice with little intonation, unclear communication, hesitation and a slouched posture. Assertive behavior involves direct eye contact, facing the subject, a firm voice with lively intonation to convey sincerity, clear communication of wants and no hesitation. Aggressive behavior is characterized by "glaring" at the subject, using a loud, angry tone of voice and interrupting the subject (Hull & Schroeder, 1979).

Relatively few studies have looked at why certain individuals do not exhibit assertive behavior, though several theories have been postulated. Schwartz and Gottman (1976), Bruch et al. (1981), and Heimberg et al. (1983) have suggested that assertive behavior fails to occur due negative self-statements, while Galassi and Galassi (1978) have attributed it to lack of assertive skills. Fiedler & Beach (1978), Kelly et al. (1980), and Kelly et al. (1982) have suggested a performance
deficit in which individuals fail to exhibit assertive skills that they possess due to a history of or the anticipation of, negative reaction from others.

Several studies have looked at the role of self-statements and attributions in nonassertion. Alden and Cappe (1981) and Alden (1984) did not find skill deficits in nonassertive subjects but found that subjects failed to exhibit the self-serving bias that assertive subjects showed. In other words, while assertive subjects assigned responsibility to themselves for successful outcomes and assigned responsibility to environmental factors for failure, nonassertive subjects assigned blame for failure partly to themselves and partly to environmental factors, similar to depressed individuals. Nonassertive subjects also expected to perform more poorly in assertive situations. Schwartz and Gottman (1976), Alden and Cappe (1981), Bruch et al. (1981), and Heimberg, Chiauzzi, Becker, & Madrazo-Peterson (1983) found nonassertive subjects to report a higher number of negative self-statements regardless of psychiatric patient or student status, with patients endorsing the most. It may be that nonassertive individuals may perceive themselves as less successful in their attempts at assertion and be more discouraged when their attempts at assertion do not achieve the intended results.
Nonassertive individuals, therefore, may not behave assertively due to expectations of failing to be effective. The self-serving bias of the assertive individuals, on the other hand, maintains not only general self-esteem and motivation but also attempts at assertion, since they are more likely to perceive their attempts at assertion as successful. Assertive individuals would be more likely to expect their behavior to be rewarded.

Galassi and Galassi (1978) suggest that nonassertion may result from a skills deficit involving failure to discriminate when assertive responses are warranted, lack of knowledge concerning what constitutes an appropriate response, or inhibition of assertive behavior due to anxiety. Bruch et al. (1981) found significant differences between the performance of assertive and nonassertive individuals in complex social situations and extended interactions. Galassi and Galassi, Bruch et al. and others advocate taking a cognitive/skill-building approach when teaching assertion, including the use of modeling, cue discrimination, changing expectations about consequences and changing beliefs about personal rights and socially appropriate behavior.

One possible explanation for why some people behave assertively while others do not may be their ability to
discriminate between situations in which assertion is appropriate and situations in which it is not. The perceived and actual consequences of assertion may vary with the characteristics of the individual engaging in the assertive behavior and the characteristics of the person at whom the assertive behavior is directed (Kern, 1980; Gormally, 1982). Situations can vary regarding the nature of the relationship between the asserter and assertee, their sexes, and the reasonableness of the assertion. If the asserter cannot discriminate between situations in which assertion is appropriate and those in which it is not, he is more likely to suffer from negative consequences since his assertive behavior is more likely to occur at inappropriate times.

According to Wolpe and Lazarus, punishment of assertive behavior results in the pairing of anxiety (due to fear of punishment) and assertive behavior. Eventually, anxiety also becomes a conditioned response to assertive cues, resulting in the inability to effectively behave in an assertive manner (Wolpe, 1958, 1969; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966). Kelly et al. (1982) also suggest that whether an individual will behave assertively in social conflict situations will be influenced by the probable consequences of assertive responses. They believe that one reason people may
begin or continue acting passively in interpersonal conflict situations is that assertiveness may elicit more negative reactions from others than does passivity. Recent studies, however, have shown that when reasonable assertions are presented empathically, the response to assertions are not overly negative and are often as positive as those to submissiveness (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Kern, 1982). Again, unassertive individuals may have experienced negative reactions to assertion in the past because these individuals behaved assertively in situations in which such behavior was perceived as inappropriate or because they did not present their assertion in the most skilled manner (empathically). In addition, nonassertive individuals may have been recipients of negative reactions (e.g., anger, rejection) to their assertions because their assertions were more unreasonable, trivial, or numerous than those of presently assertive individuals.

Social Perception of Submissive, Assertive, Emphatic-Assertive and Aggressive Responses

Research to date has focused on the differential social perception of submissive, assertive, assertive plus empathy or consideration, and aggressive responses, and the influence of sex, race, response class, mode of
presentation, reasonableness of request, rater characteristics and nature of relationships on the social evaluation of these types of responses.

Several studies have looked at how people evaluate assertive, aggressive and submissive behavior (Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Kelly, Kern, Kirkley, Patterson, & Keane, 1980; Keane, Wedding, & Kelly, 1983b; St. Lawrence, Hansen, Cutts, Tisdelle, & Irish, 1985; Frisch & Froberg, 1987). While most subjects were college students, Keane et al.'s (1983b) study obtained similar results with their population of medical and psychiatric outpatients at a Veterans Administration clinic. In general, studies have found that subjects gave favorable ratings to submissive or nonassertive behavior, but such responses do not allow goals to be reached. Assertive responses were perceived as effective, appropriate and generally positive and allowed goals to be reached. In addition, responses to assertion were relatively positive. Assertive responses, however, were viewed less positively than nonassertive or submissive responses. Finally, aggressive responses allowed goals to be reached, but resulted in very negative responses from others.

Since it appeared that assertive skills were caused the asserter to be perceived as less likeable by others,
several researchers focused on possible ways to decrease the noxious qualities of assertion. One successful approach was the addition of empathic or understanding comments to the assertive communication (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Romano & Bellack, 1980; Mullinix & Galassi, 1981; Kelly et al., 1982; Kern, 1982; Kern et al., 1985; Rakos & Hrop, 1983). Empathic assertion may include a brief explanation, a short apology, a compromise, and/or an empathic statement in addition to the assertion (Hrop & Rakos, 1985). When perceptions of nonassertive, empathic-assertive, aggressive behavior were compared, studies generally found that when politeness, kindness and empathy are included in assertive communications, the social consequences of assertion become as positive or at least close to as positive as those for non-assertion. Such behavior is viewed as competent, kind, and nonhostile, suggesting that in addition to training people to be assertive, an effort needs to be made to improve skills involved in perspective-taking and prosocial communication to round out the individual's repertoire of cognitive and behavioral social skills (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Kern, 1982; Rakos & Hrop, 1983; Kern et al., 1985).

Frisch and Froberg (1985) developed a form of empathic-assertion called "specific assertion" for
handling aggressive criticism. In this approach the asserter goes one step further than empathic-assertion, agreeing with some aspect of aggressive criticism and soliciting additional thoughts and feelings from the aggressor, allowing the asserter to gain control of the conversation. Some think that the main goal of assertive behavior is gaining such control (Rotheram, 1984). This form of empathic-assertion, however, appears to border on submissiveness in some respects. Specific assertion was seen as even more competent and likeable than empathic-assertion (Frisch & Froberg, 1985).

Similarly, when assertive models were observed engaging in assertive, commendatory behavior (e.g., expressing liking or appreciation) assertively harsh judgments of the asserter's likeability were ameliorated (Levin & Gross, 1984; St. Lawrence et al., 1985). It appears that commendatory and empathic behavior are effective in reducing the negative impact of assertion when they are presented as part of the assertion or during a separate interaction between the asserter and the recipient (Heisler & McCormack, 1984).
Influences on the Social Perception of Submissive, Empathic-Assertive, and Assertive Responses

Person Variables

Sex Differences The results of studies looking at the interaction of behavioral style, sex of recipient or observer and sex of asserter or stimulus person in situations concerning negative assertion have been mixed.

Sex of Judge or Rater With respect to the sex of the observer, many have failed to obtain significant interactions (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein, 1980; Keane et al., 1983b; Lawrence et al., 1985). Other investigators, however, have noted differences in the way male and female subjects perceive behavior.

In terms of the influence of the observer's sex on their perceptions of others, Kern (1982) found that models of the opposite sex tend to be rated more favorably by both sexes, as did Hull and Schroeder (1979), Kelly et al. (1980), Keane et al. (1983a), and Lewis and Gallois (1984).

St. Lawrence et al. found that male raters assigned higher ratings on appropriateness and superiority regardless of the model's behavior or sex. Kelly et al. (1980) found males rated all models as friendlier than females did, while Kelly et al. (1982) found males rated
all models higher on flexibility and sympathy than females did. Romano and Bellack (1980) found that black male judges gave higher overall ratings on social skills than did black female judges.

Kelly et al. (1982) found that females rated all models as higher in appropriateness, tactfulness, education, and intelligence. St. Lawrence et al. (1985) found that females assigned higher ratings on the adjectives agreeable and attractive.

The sex of the judge or rater sometimes had an effect on the perception of the various behaviors. Kelly et al. (1980) found that female judges rated unassertive individuals as more tactful, thoughtful, and unassertive than did male judges, and rated assertive models as less desirable to meet at a party or serve on a committee than did male judges. Lewis and Gallois (1984) found females were less likely to become the asserter's friend.

Hess et al. (1980) and Schroeder et al. (1983) found that females perceived assertive models as more assertive than did males. Female judges also perceived aggressive models as more aggressive and more masculine than did male judges (Hess et al.), suggesting that females are more sensitive to assertion and aggression. On the basis of these findings, Hess et al. suggest that females may perceive assertive responses as unpleasant, overly
assertive and masculine and therefore inhibit them. Since the assertive expression of positive feelings by models was perceived as feminine by male and female judges in Hess et al.'s study, Hess et al. also suggest that males may inhibit the expression of positive feelings since such expression is considered "feminine."

Delamater and McNamara (1986), however, found that female judges did not devalue female assertive behavior relative to female unassertive behavior, although their study involved little or no social or personal risk to the recipient of the assertion.

Romano and Bellack (1980) found an interaction between the sex of the judge, the sex of the model, and the model's behavior. They found that male judges demonstrated a positive correlation between female models' compliance with other's requests and their level of social skill. Female judges' ratings of model's social skills were negatively correlated with female models' compliance with requests from both sexes in a variety of 50 situations.

Kern, Cavell and Beck (1985) report the subjects' attitude toward women in society is a strong moderator of reactions to assertive and empathic assertive women. They found that subjects who scored low (have a negative attitude toward women) on the Attitude Towards Women
Scale (ATWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1985) devalued female's assertions and empathic assertions, regardless of the rater's sex, though more males than females received low scores on the ATWS. St. Lawrence, Hansen, Cutts, Tisdelle, and Irish (1985), however, failed to find the observer's sex role orientation to affect the observers evaluations.

In summary, it appears that some studies have found that male and female judges perceive assertion differently. It is especially striking that women perceive noncompliance as socially skilled (Romano & Bellack, 1980), but evaluate assertive behavior more negatively than male judges (Kelly et al., 1980). The majority of studies, however, while representing a wide variety of situations, subject populations (in terms of type of major, year in school, type of university and geographical location; only Keane et al.'s (1983b) study used a non-college population) and measures, have not produced consistent significant rater or judge sex effects in the perception of assertion. The studies mentioned above appear to be the exception.

**Sex of Asserter** With respect to the influence of the sex of the asserter on the evaluation of assertive behavior, most studies found no significant effect (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein,
Examining the general impact of the sex of the model, Lao, Upchurch, Corwin, and Grossnickle (1975) found that subjects of both sexes rated males as significantly more intelligent and likeable regardless of assertion level. Kelly et al. (1980) found that males were rated as more agreeable, kind, and socially skilled as well as rated more highly on an ability/achievement factor. Kelly et al. (1980) also found females rated other females lower on ability and achievement than did other groups. In Keane et al.'s (1983a) study, black females were rated higher than black men on education and intelligence.

There have been several studies that looked at whether male and female assertion were perceived differently. Kern (1982) did not find that females' assertions were devalued relative to males' assertions, while Schroeder et al. (1983) found that female asserters were rated more positively than male asserters by male and female judges on an evaluative factor (including such bipolar items as appropriate-inappropriate, fair-unfair, rational-irrational, likeable-unlikeable, and sensitive-insensitive) across all assertiveness response classes.
Kelly et al. (1980) reported assertive female models were judged more harshly by judges of both sexes than assertive male models on many criteria. Specifically, male asserters received the highest ratings on how much subjects would like to talk to them at a party and on an ability/achievement factor. Female asserters were rated lower on friendliness, pleasantness, consideration, open-mindedness, good-naturedness, kindness, likeability, thoughtfulness, and warmth than male asserters. They were also perceived as less attractive and less desirable to have on school committees than male asserters.

Kern et al. (1985) also found that conservative, low-ATW subjects rated male assertive and empathic-assertive models more positively than females displaying the same behaviors. There were no such differences found for high-ATW subjects, however.

Lao et al. (1975) found that while medium assertiveness was rated as most likeable and intelligent for both sexes, high assertiveness led to high ratings for intelligence and likeability for males and low ratings on these adjectives for females.

There has also been evidence of an interaction between the judge's or rater's sex, the sex of the model, and the response style. One study, already described,
found an interaction in which compliant female models were rated as more socially skilled by male judges and as less socially skilled by female judges (Romano & Bellack, 1980).

Many factors may have contributed to the discrepancies in the findings of the studies. Other investigators have found that opposite-sex ratings of positive attributes tend to be higher than same-sex ratings (Kern, 1982; Keane et al., 1983; Lewis & Gallois, 1984). Kelly et al.'s (1980) study had twice as many female subjects as male subjects. Studies have also found that female subjects have a stronger, more negative reaction to assertion (Schroeder et al., 1983; Hess et al., 1980), again putting female asserters at a disadvantage in Kelly et al.'s study. Kelly et al.'s study also presented the raters with one model engaging in four assertive interactions a time, whereas many of the other studies presented a single episode of assertion per model or included at least two models. Kelly et al.'s procedure may have given raters the impression that assertive responses dominated all of that individual's interactions indiscriminately, increasing the impact of the above effects. Schroeder et al.'s study's results may have been influenced by the fact their study took place in 1982 at a northern university (Kent State) and used
only psychology students, who may have been more liberal than students from a variety of disciplines, at a southern university in 1979. In addition, Schroeder et al.'s study used descriptions of interactions rather than dialogues.

Lao et al.'s study was conducted before 1975, over eight years before Schroeder et al.'s, in the generally conservative south. Attitudes towards women may have changed since then. There were also problems with Lao et al.'s design. Their study's "high assertive" behavior may have been aggressive rather than assertive and with 53 subjects per cell, even small differences will be significant.

To conclude, it appears that no definitive conclusions can be drawn at this time regarding the social evaluation of male versus female asserters. Aside from the considerations mentioned above, there are no glaring methodological difference between Kelly et al.'s Lao et al.'s, and Schroeder et al.'s studies, which found significant sex effects, and many of the other studies, which did not. Two possible differences, however, may be the relative number of students with positive versus negative attitudes toward women and the number of subjects per cell. On the average, studies finding sex effects had almost twice the number of subjects per cell
as those which did not. Statistical power, then, may be a factor.

Race of Participants Race has also emerged as a factor influencing the social impact of assertions, with both blacks and white feeling less comfortable in assertive interaction with individuals of a different race (Cheek, 1976; Kelly et al., 1982; Hrop & Rakos, 1985), although within both races results are similar (Keane et al., 1983). Dura (1985) found, however, that blacks gave higher likeability ratings to assertive and empathic-assertive models than did whites, so some differences may exist.

Relationship Between Participants The characteristics of the person at whom the request or refusal is directed may also influence the evaluation of the behavior (Lewis & Gallois, 1984; Kern, 1980). Lewis and Gallois (1984) found differences in subjects' reactions to friends versus strangers' assertions, but their "assertions" were described by subjects as "aggressive" and also appeared more aggressive than assertive. Heisler and McCormack (1984) also found that familiarity with the speaker effected the way the content of a message was received, with more familiarity inducing greater comfort and liking.
Kirschner and Galassi (1983) found that the performance of subjects interacting with male confederates was influenced by both the familiarity of the confederate and the type of assertion required. In scenes with a female confederate, performance was influenced only by the degree of familiarity. Subjects responses to unfamiliar confederates were seen as more highly assertive than familiar confederates in positive assertion situations, but no significant differences were found in negative assertion situations.

More study is needed regarding how the relationship between the two individuals influences the social perception of assertion.

Assertion Level Kern (1980) found that subjects rated models who were similar to them in assertion level more favorably on items in a desirability factor than those who were dissimilar. He also found that high assertive individuals gave higher likeability and competence ratings to empathic-assertive and assertive behavior than did low assertive individuals. Low assertive individuals likewise gave higher competence ratings to nonassertive behavior than did high assertives. The low and high assertive individuals', however, both rated nonassertive behavior as most likeable, followed by empathic-assertive and then assertive behavior. Both also rated empathic-
assertive as most competent, followed by assertive and then nonassertive behavior.

Gormally (1982) also found highly assertive subjects rated unassertive models less positively than did less assertive subjects.

Other Factors Influencing Social Perception of Submissive, Empathic-Assertive, and Assertive Behavior

Response Class Other factors, such as response class and mode of presentation, have also been examined with respect to their impact on the perception of assertion. Schroeder et al. (1983) found that expressing positive feelings, initiating interactions and making behavior change requests received the most positive social evaluations, while making behavior change requests, expressing unpopular opinions and initiating interactions were rated highest on assertiveness. Hull and Schroeder (1979) found that behavior change requests (e.g., asking someone to turn down the music) were rated by subjects as more fair and less likely to be resisted by the assertee than refusals (e.g., saying "no" to a request). Their study, however, did not include any statistical proof that one can generalize across a response class.

Mode of Presentation With respect to mode of presentation, Rakos and Hrop (1983) concluded that only minimal differences result from the different modes of
presentation (people presented via typescript were rated as more submissive across behavior styles than people portrayed by videotape or audiotape) and that they can be used interchangeably as substitutes for live presentations. Gormally (1982) found that subjects observing an interaction rate assertion more positively than subjects placed in the position of receiving the assertive request.

Conclusion

From these studies it appears that perhaps assertion training should include practice in detection and sensitivity to cues about how various individuals are likely to perceive their behavior in a variety of situations. Such training would allow the asserter to prepare for reactions from others or allow the asserter to respond in a manner that is optimal with each person.

Galassi and Galassi (1978) note that neither Wolpe and Lazarus' (1966) theoretical formulations nor any of the studies to date are sufficiently comprehensive to explain the development or modification of nonassertive behavior and to guide further assertion training research. More research is needed to understand the etiology, as well as the social consequences of assertion.
The purpose of this study will be to examine two additional influences on assertive behavior that may need to be considered in the course of assertion training programs.

The first influence concerns the nature of the relationship between the two people in the interaction. Using the three of the four relationship types found by Rudy, Merluzzi, and Henahan (1982), the study will look at whether evaluations of submissive, assertive, and empathic-assertive response styles differ with the nature of the relationship. While the nature of the assertions in Lewis et al.'s (1984) study bordered on aggressiveness, the different responses provided by raters to assertions by friends as opposed to assertions by strangers suggests that this variable needs to be considered. Rudy et al. (1982) also found that subjects' levels of anticipated anxiety and difficulty in making assertive responses varied as a function of their relationship to the other individual. We would predict, for instance, that submissive or nonassertive responses would be perceived by college students as most appropriate from a low-status individual (a paper person) and least appropriate from the high-status individual (a professor). Assertive responses, on the other hand, may be perceived as more appropriate for high-status
individuals, such as the professor, than empathic-assertive responses, but as inappropriate for low-status individual like the paper person. Finally, we would predict that empathic-assertive responses would be most appropriate for interactions with friends. Aggressive responses will not be represented since they have previously been shown to be aversive and maladaptive across a wide range of situations involving college students (Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein, 1980). Thus, in order to interact most adaptively with individuals of differing levels of status and familiarity, assertion training clients may need to learn to differentiate between responses that are appropriate in the context of different relationships, or at least become aware of the nature of the reactions their assertions are likely to elicit.

The second influence concerns the nature of demand and refusals and has implications for both the development of nonassertion and the development of assertion training programs. This part of the study will examine the difference between the behavior change requests and refusals that high, low, and middle assertive individuals make or desire to make. It may be that unassertive people's demands are such that they are more likely to elicit negative responses. Perhaps their
demands are less reasonable, more trivial or greater in number than those of individuals who become assertive. Epstein (1980) has found that reasonableness and amount of sacrifice required influence the social consequences of assertive and unassertive requests.

We would expect that unassertive individuals would have more needs or more unreasonable needs than moderately and highly assertive individuals. If it is found that the nature of the demands and refusal of unassertive individuals differs from that of assertive individuals, it may be necessary to help the unassertive individuals change the nature of demands and refusals (or perhaps the expectations behind them) in order to increase the probability that the skills they acquire in assertion training will be maintained and generalized into real life situations.

Finally, the sex of the character in the vignette and sex of the subject will be taken into account. Since the typescripts in the present study are written in a manner that places the subject in an interaction with the model, the results may differ from those of most studies which employ subjects only as observers. We would predict that sex-role stereotypes would influence perceptions such that submissive responses would be perceived more positively for females than for males.
within a relationship type. Submissiveness, however, should be perceived as less appropriate for professors than for paper persons.

Overview

The present study consisted of two main experiments. The first experiment examined the differences among low, moderate, and high assertiveness individuals in the assertions they make or desire to make. Part one of the first experiment involved having 129 male and 126 female undergraduate students describe three assertions they would like to make (if they are not assertive) or three assertions they have recently made (if they are assertive). They were also asked for details of the situation and what consequences they might anticipate in reaction to their assertions. Finally, the subjects completed the College Self-expression Scale (Galassi, Delo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974). In part two of the first experiment 161 male and 158 female undergraduate students rated a set of the anonymous, edited, retyped, compiled assertions generated by subjects from part one who received high, medium or low scores on the College Self-expression Scale. The subjects in part two rated the assertions with respect to reasonableness, importance, sacrifice, and how likeable the asserter appeared to be. They also rated the assertions on the
reasonableness of the basic expectations behind the assertions and the appropriateness of their expression. They also completed the College Self-expression Scale.

The hypothesis is that unassertive individuals will make assertions that are less reasonable, more trivial, more numerous, require more sacrifice, based on less reasonable expectations, and less appropriately expressed than those of assertive individuals and this will account for unassertive individuals being punished more frequently for their attempts at assertion.

The second experiment examined the parameters which appear to influence the social evaluation of behavior, such as the sex of the asserter or nonasserter, the sex of the recipient, the type of response (submissive, empathic-assertive or assertive) and the nature of the relationship between the two people in the interaction. Two hundred twenty-eight male and 227 female undergraduate students rated four situations each in which a male or female close friend, professor, or paper boy/girl acts in a submissive, empathic-assertive or assertive manner towards them. Subjects rated each of the situations on a list of adjectives found by other investigators to be appropriate for measuring perceptions of assertion with students (Kern, 1982; Kelly et al., 1982). The subjects then completed the College Self-
expression Scale. It was predicted that assertion is likely to be viewed as most appropriate for the professor and least appropriate for the paper boy/girl, while empathic-assertive responses are likely to be perceived as most appropriate between peers.
CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENT ONE: DIFFERENCES IN THE NATURE OF THE ASSERTIONS THAT LOW, MEDIUM, AND HIGH ASSERTION COLLEGE STUDENTS WOULD LIKE TO MAKE

Method - Experiment I, Part One

Subjects.

Subjects were 239 undergraduate students participating in the experiment to fulfill the course requirements for Introductory Psychology.

Procedure.

Each subject was asked to describe three situations they had encountered in which they would have liked to behave more assertively. They filled out a form (see Appendix A) requesting the following information: situation and background information, relationship of the other person to the subject, how the subject would act in...
the situation if the subject were assertive, how the subject would currently act in the situation, how the other person might react to assertion and how the other person might argue their side.

Each subject then completed the College Self-expression Scale (Galassi, Delo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974) (see Appendix B) and answered seven questions regarding their perception of their assertive behavior (see Appendix C). The College Self-expression Scale was selected based on its reliability, external validity and appropriateness for this population (Galassi & Galassi, 1974a & 1974b; Galassi & Galassi, 1978; Beck & Heimberg, 1983; Kirschner & Galassi, 1983; Swimmer & Ramanaiah, 1985).

Subjects were then divided into groups of low, medium, and high assertiveness based on their scores on the College Self-expression Scale. The 35 least assertive, 35 most assertive, and 35 subjects falling closest to the mean score on the College Self-expression Scale were assigned to these three groups. The mean of this sample of subjects was 126.81, with a standard deviation of 25.35. These values are consistent with norms reported previously (Galassi and Galassi, 1974; Galassi, DeLo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974; Kirschner & Galassi, 1983).
Method - Experiment I, Part Two

Subjects.

Subjects were 161 male and 158 female undergraduate students participating in the experiment to fulfill the course requirements for Introductory Psychology.

Procedure.

The situations generated by subjects in part one of the present study were edited by the present investigator without knowledge of the assertion level of the subject in order to make the assertions similar in length and content. As a check on editorial bias 20% of the edited assertions were compared with the originals and rated for bias by three research assistants who were blind to the purpose of the experiment. Their ratings of each of the randomly selected assertions were averaged and a $2 \times 3$ (Sex of Asserter x Assertion Level) analysis of variance was performed for each descriptor. There was no evidence of significant Sex or Assertion Level bias found for any of the descriptors (all effects and interactions $p < .20$). The significance levels of the effects are presented in Table 1. The typed, edited assertions were randomly assigned to one of 16 sets of 20 situations each.

Each undergraduate student participating in part two of Experiment I was randomly assigned one set of 20
Table 1

Significance levels of Sex of Asserter, Assertion Level, and Sex of Asserter x Assertion Level Interaction Effects for Analyses Conducted to Test for Editing Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex of Asserter Effect</th>
<th>Assertion Level Effect</th>
<th>Sex of Asserter by Assertion Level Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>( p &lt; .31 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .91 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .31 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>( p &lt; .20 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .43 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .29 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice Required</td>
<td>( p &lt; .39 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .27 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .32 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>( p &lt; .80 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .65 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .81 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Basic Expectation</td>
<td>( p &lt; .32 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .83 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .68 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Expression</td>
<td>( p &lt; .96 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .30 )</td>
<td>( p &lt; .87 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

items to rate. Subjects rated the assertion samples on a 7-point bipolar scale (see Appendix D) reflecting the perceived reasonableness and importance of the assertion, as well as the amount of sacrifice required of the other person for each of the assertions. Subjects also rated how much they thought they would like each asserter on a 7-point scale and whether they thought the asserters'
basic expectations were reasonable and appropriately expressed. Subjects then completed the subject information form (Appendix C) and the College Self-expression Scale.

Nine subjects from part one of the experiment were eliminated from the study due to poorly written examples, missing data, and scoring errors. A total of 46 males and 50 females classified as low, moderate, or high in assertiveness were included in the present study. The breakdown of this group of subjects by sex is presented in Table 2 along with their ages and College Self-Expression Scale scores. There was not a significant difference in the ages of the males and females at the various assertion levels (p < .85).
Table 2

Breakdown of Asserters in Experiment I, Part Two by Sex and Assertion Level

with Means and Standard Deviations of Ages and CSES Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Assertiveness (n=35)</th>
<th>Moderate Assertiveness (n=28)</th>
<th>High Assertiveness (n=33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males (n=17)</td>
<td>Females (n=18)</td>
<td>Males (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSES</td>
<td>77.12</td>
<td>86.94</td>
<td>125.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rater's reactions to each of the bipolar pairs of descriptors (see Appendix D) regarding the nature of the desired assertion were averaged across same sex raters for each question to yield six scores for each assertion. Two (one for male raters and one for female raters) 2 x 3 (sex of asserter x assertion level) repeated measures multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were performed on the descriptors for the three sequential assertions generated by subjects in part one of the experiment in order to control for experiment-wise error.

Answers to questions on the Subject Information Sheet (see Appendix C) were also analyzed using a 2 x 3 (Sex of Asserter x Assertion Level) multivariate analysis of variance. Analyses that were originally planned to be performed between the raters' scores on the CSES and their ratings of the assertions in order to determine whether raters' reactions to the assertions are related to their own levels of assertiveness (e.g., more assertive individuals rate assertions more positively than less assertive individuals) were done instead on data from Experiment II, the vignette study, in order to produce less ambiguous results.
Results

Assertion Ratings

Separate 2 X 3 (sex of person making assertion X person's level of assertiveness) repeated measures multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAS) were performed on sets of ratings of the nature of desired assertions by male and female raters for each asserter's three desired assertions. The Hotelling-Lawley Trace was used to estimate an F-value for each of the analyses. Post-hoc contrasts were conducted for meaningful cell comparisons. The Bonferroni procedure was used (due to unequal cell sizes) to control the overall comparison error rate and Type I errors.

Male Raters A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Sex of Asserter ($F(1,81) = 6.76, p < .012$). A Level x Sex interaction approached but did not reach significance ($F(2,81) = 2.36, p < .101$) Ratings were then collapsed across assertion levels, added across all three assertions and reanalyzed since no effects for level or repeated measures within subject effects were found. A significant MANOVA between subjects main effect remained for Sex of Asserter ($F(6,80) = 2.45, p < .032$). There were significant univariate effects for Reasonableness ($F(1,85) = 4.74, p < .032$), Importance ($F(1,85) = 6.59, p$
<.012), Reasonableness of Basic Expectation ($F(1,85) = 5.86, p<.018$), and Appropriateness of Expression ($F(1,85) = 9.62, p<.003$). Means corresponding to significant main effects are presented in Table 3.

**Reasonableness** Males rated female assertions ($\bar{X} = 15.29$) as significantly more reasonable than male assertions ($\bar{X} = 14.17$).

**Importance** Males also rated assertions made by females as significantly more important (males $\bar{X}$'s = 13.64, females $\bar{X}$'s = 14.82), although the actual difference in ratings was small; approximately 1.2 points on scale with a range of 3 - 21 points.

**Likeability** Males rated assertions made by females as more likely to increase their liking for the asserter (male $\bar{X}$'s = 11.84, female $\bar{X}$'s = 12.66), although, again, this difference is small.

**Reasonableness of Basic Expectation** The basic expectations behind assertions made by females were rated as significantly more reasonable than those behind male assertions (male $\bar{X}$'s = 14.44, female $\bar{X}$'s = 15.51).

**Appropriateness of Expression** Once again, females were rated more positively than males, this time being seen as significantly more appropriate in their expression of expectations behind their assertions (male $\bar{X}$'s = 12.62, female $\bar{X}$'s = 14.19).
Table 3

Ratings by Male Subjects of Males' and Females' Assertions; Significant Main Effects for Sex of Asserter and Comparisons Between Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Male Asserters</th>
<th>Female Asserters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness</td>
<td>4.74*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>15.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.59*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Basic Expectation</td>
<td>5.86*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only significant main effects are shown. Means above 12 (range of possible scores is 3 to 21) denote positive ratings.

* p < .05
** p < .01
Female Raters  A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Sex of Asserter ($F(1,83) = 5.78, p < .018$). A significant repeated measures MANOVA within subjects Sex of Asserter X Assertion Level interaction was also found ($F(4,162) = 4.63, p < .001$). Significant univariate repeated measures main effects were found for Sex of Asserter for ratings of Importance ($F(1,84) = 6.40, p < .013$), Reasonableness ($F(1,84) = 6.41, p < .013$), and Appropriateness of Expression ($F(1,84) = 5.40, p < .023$). Significant repeated measures within subjects Sex by Level interaction effects were found for Reasonableness ($F(4,164) = 4.42, p < .002$), Reasonableness of Basic Expectation ($F(4,164) = 4.29, p < .003$), and Appropriateness of Expression of Basic Expectation ($F(4,164) = 5.12, p < .0006$). Because of these interactions, it was appropriate to examine simple group effects within each assertion level across the three assertions for these three adjectives. Means and standard deviations of ratings by female subjects of low, moderate, and high assertiveness subjects' three assertions are presented in Table 4. These data are presented in more detail (by assertion order, assertion level, and sex) than data from male raters due to the significant interactions found for female ratings.
Significant interactions were not found for ratings done by male subjects.

Descriptors for which no within subject interaction effects were found were summed across all three of the individual demands and reanalyzed. A significant univariate main effect for Sex of Asserter was found for Importance (males, $\bar{X} = 13.80$, $SD = 2.34$; females, $\bar{X} = 15.03$, $SD = 1.87$; $F(1,88) = 7.76$, $p < .007$). The assertions of female subjects were rated as more important (less trivial) than those of male subjects. There were non-significant trends in a similar direction for the other descriptors with the exception of Sacrifice Required of Other Person.

**Reasonableness** A separate 2 x 3 (Sex of Asserter by Assertion Level) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the first, second, and third desired assertions. A significant Sex of Asserter by Assertion Level Interaction ($p < .0007$) was found for the third assertion, as well as a significant main effect for Sex of Asserter ($p < .007$). As illustrated in Figure 1, simple group effects within assertion level comparisons revealed that there was a trend for Low Assertiveness Females' first assertion to be rated as more reasonable than the Low Assertiveness Males' first assertion, and that this difference was larger for their second
assertions, but still did not reach significance. The difference in the reasonableness of their third assertions, however, was significant ($p < .0001$) with females' assertions seen as more reasonable. While the reasonableness of the Low Assertiveness Females' assertions increased over their three requests, the reasonableness of the Low Assertiveness Males' demands decreased over the three requests.

**Reasonableness of Basic Expectation Behind Assertion**

A separate $2 \times 3$ (Sex of Asserter by Assertion Level) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the first, second, and third desired assertions. A significant Sex of Asserter by Assertion Level interaction ($p < .0005$) was found for the third assertion, as well as a Sex of Asserter main effect ($p < .036$). Simple group effects within assertion level comparisons revealed once again as shown in Figure 2, that while the basic expectations behind the assertions of Low Assertiveness Females became more reasonable over the three assertions, those of Low Assertiveness Males became less reasonable. The difference was not significant for the first and second assertions, but did reach significance for the third ($p < .0001$).

**Appropriateness of Expression of Assertion**

The examination of ratings of assertions within assertion
level showed a significant within subject effect for Sex of Asserter for both Low Assertiveness ($p < .002$) and High Assertiveness ($p < .04$) individuals. In the case of the Low Assertiveness group a pattern similar to those of the above descriptors was found. As shown in Figure 3, across the three assertions, the appropriateness of the expression of assertions increased for females, but not for males, with the difference between males and females reaching significance ($p < .0001$) for the third assertion. In the High Assertiveness group, the males tended to increase in the appropriateness of expression of assertions, while the appropriateness of expression did not change for females. The sexes did not differ significantly when compared for each assertion.

Other Descriptors Trends consistent with the patterns noted above were found for some of the other descriptors as well, although these did not reach significance. The assertions of Low Assertiveness Females tended to be rated more positively over their three desired assertions, while those of Low Assertiveness Males were rated more negatively. Conversely, the desired assertions of High Assertiveness Males tended to be rated more positively across assertions. Overall, females received higher ratings.
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings by Female Subjects of Low, Moderate, and High Assertiveness Males' and Females' Assertions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>First Assertion</th>
<th>Second Assertion</th>
<th>Third Assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Assertion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Basic Expectation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Expression</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Assertion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Basic Expectation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Expression</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Assertion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of Basic Expectation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Expression</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only descriptors with significant interactions are shown. Ratings above 4 (range of possible scores is 1 to 7) should be considered positive. Means with different subscripts (a, b) differ significantly (p < .0001).
Figure 1. Ratings by Female Subjects of the Reasonableness of Assertions Made by Low Assertiveness Males and Females
Figure 2. Ratings by Female Subjects of the Reasonableness of the Basic Expectations Behind the Assertions Made by Low Assertiveness Males and Females.
Figure 3. Ratings by Female Subjects of the Appropriateness of the Expression of the Basic Expectations Behind the Assertions Made by Low Assertiveness Males and Females.
Subject Information Sheet

A 2 X 3 (Sex of asserter X Assertion level) multivariate analysis of variance was conducted for information on the Subject Information Sheet to determine whether these groups responded differently to the various questions. The Hotelling - Lawley Trace was used to estimate an F-value in the analysis. Post-hoc contrasts were conducted for meaningful cell comparisons. The Bonferroni procedure was used (due to unequal cell sizes) to control the overall comparison error rate and Type I errors.

A significant MANOVA interaction was found for Sex of Asserter and Assertion Level ($F(16,352) = 2.84, p < .0003$). Two significant univariate interactions were also found. There was a significant univariate interaction effect for Perceived Number of Daily Situations Requiring Assertion ($F(2,186) = 3.74, p < .026$) and Perceived Number of Times subjects "Get Even" when they are not assertive ($F(2,186) = 5.14, p < .007$). Due to these interactions, it was appropriate to examine simple group effects of Assertion Level within Sex of Asserter for these questions. Means and standard deviations for these interactions are presented in Table 5.

A significant MANOVA Assertion Level main effect was also found. Significant univariate effects were found
for Perceived Assertiveness ($F(2,189) = 78.23, p < .0001$), Satisfaction with own Assertiveness ($F(2,189) = 50.44, p < .0001$), and Number of Times Assertive per Day ($F(2,187) = 19.39, p < .0001$). Means and standard deviations for the comparisons are presented in Table 6.

**Number of Daily Situations** Examining simple effects within sex revealed no significant differences for females across assertion levels. The trend for females was that as their level of assertion increased they perceived more situations requiring assertion. For males the differences between levels was significant ($p < .015$). The results were as follows; the moderately assertive males reported perceiving a greater number of situations requiring assertive behavior than the low assertion ($p < .39$, ns) or high assertion ($p < .006$) males, with the low assertion males perceiving a higher number than the high assertion males ($p < .036$, ns; Bonferroni significance level set at .017).

**Getting Even After Not Being Assertive** The study of simple group effects within each sex showed no significant differences across assertion levels for females ($p < .89$). Differences between assertion levels were significant for males ($p < .0001$). Moderately assertive males were significantly more likely to "get even" later if they were not initially assertive than low
assertion (p < .0003) or high assertion (p < .0001) males. Low and high assertion males did not differ significantly in their answers to this question (p < .38).

Perceived Assertiveness Individuals of both sexes in the high assertion group perceived themselves as significantly more assertive than individuals in the middle assertion group thought themselves to be (p < .0001). The middle assertion group perceived themselves to be more assertive than the low assertion group perceived themselves to be (p < .0001).

Satisfaction with Assertion Level Individuals in the high assertion group were more satisfied with their own level of assertion than those in the middle assertion group (p < .0001), who were more satisfied than the low assertion group (p < .0001).

Number of Times Assertive Per Day Individuals in the high assertion group report behaving assertively with greater frequency than do those in the middle assertion group (p < .009), who report behaving assertively more frequently than the low assertion group (p < .001).
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of Answers to Questions on the Subject Information Sheet by Sex and Assertiveness Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Low Assertiveness</th>
<th>Moderate Assertiveness</th>
<th>High Assertiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Number of Daily Situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 4.47</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.00a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 2.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Number of Times Subject &quot;Gets Even&quot; When Not Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 3.18b</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.83a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.78</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only questions with significant interactions are shown. Range of possible scores for perceived number of daily situations requiring assertion is 0 to 12, range of possible scores for perceived number of times "gets even" is 1 to 7. Different subscripts (a, b) denote significant differences (p < .006).
Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Answers to Questions on the Subject Information Sheet by Assertiveness Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertiveness Level</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Rated Assertiveness Level</td>
<td>3.43a</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.43b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Assertiveness Level</td>
<td>2.86a</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>3.82b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Times Assertive per Day</td>
<td>2.17a</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.57b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only means for significant main effects are shown.

Range of possible scores for assertiveness level self-rating and satisfaction is 1 to 7, range for assertion frequency is 1 to 12. Different subscripts (a, b, c) denote significant differences, p < .009.
Discussion

Assertion Ratings

Several patterns emerged from the results of the present study. Male raters rated females' assertions more favorably than they did males' assertions. Males rated females' assertions as significantly more reasonable, more important, more likely to increase likeability and more appropriately expressed. Male raters also rated the basic expectations behind females' assertions as more reasonable. There was not a significant difference between the perceived amount of sacrifice required by males' and females' assertions.

Female raters rated females' assertions as more important than males' assertions. Female raters also tended to rate females assertions more positively on most of the other descriptors, but these differences were not significant.

Females' ratings of the assertions of Low Assertiveness Females became more positive across the three desired assertions they had listed. For Low Assertiveness Males the ratings became more negative for Reasonableness of Basic Expectation, Reasonableness of Assertion, and Appropriateness of Expression. There was also a similar trend for the other descriptors for the
female raters, as well as a trend for ratings to become more positive across desired assertions for High Assertiveness Males, while the ratings of assertions of High Assertiveness Females did not change. It is interesting that the extreme groups that are most consistent with society's sex role stereotypes (females who are low in assertiveness and males who are high in assertiveness) both showed improved ratings over the three desired assertions. While this within subject effect was not significant for male raters, their ratings also showed trends in a similar direction. Previous studies have noted that females generally tend to be more sensitive to the nuances of social interaction and that this may account for the stronger effects for female raters (Conger et al., 1980).

It is possible that the higher ratings of females' assertions might be due to the demand characteristics of the study. Both of the research assistants assisting with this study were female and this may have impacted on what subjects perceived as appropriate responses to the assertions they rated. Subjects may have felt pressure to respond more positively to female assertions than they might have otherwise. On the other hand, the same research assistants conducted Experiment Two and no evidence of preferential treatment of females was found.
in the results of that study (see Chapter III). Consequently it appears that the differences found in the present study are likely to be due to actual differences in the nature of the assertions.

An issue that might be raised is why the sex of the asserter was included in their assertions to begin with, since it might influence perception of assertion. First of all, in real life one's sex is going to be apparent to others, and may be taken into account in their reactions to assertions. This part of the study was designed to look at the nature of reactions that people would be likely to get if they were to be assertive and whether these reactions would serve to maintain or deter assertive behavior. Secondly, the second part of this study (Experiment Two, the vignette study) will examine the impact of one's sex in a more controlled manner so that its impact can be evaluated in conjunction with a number of other possible influences such as sex of rater, relative status of participants, and manner in which assertion is presented.

Another question concerns the use of typed, edited assertions as opposed to typed versions of the original assertions. The rationale for having subjects rate edited assertions rather than verbatim descriptions of the assertions was to control for length of assertion, to
make the information available to the rater limited to that which might be available in a real situation, and to make the rater a participant rather than an observer. Gormally (1982) noted that simulating participation in an interaction may be more effective at eliciting typical responses to interactions compared to placing the rater in the observer role where social desirability might be more influential. This principle was also utilized in the vignette study so that results could be compared. It might be argued that the editing made some of the assertions sound stilted and would be better left to the general consensus of the subjects themselves rather than to a single, perhaps arbitrary editor. The raters themselves could discriminate between the reasonableness of the basic expectations and the reasonableness of the actual assertions. It would be interesting to see how or whether the results would differ. Nonetheless, it would appear likely that the additional information not usually available to the other participant as well as being in more of an observer's than a participant's role, would allow the ratings to be less representative of the true impact of the assertion.

The results of the present study suggest that Low Assertive Males and Females are different in some respects. It appears as if females may remain low in
assertiveness because it is rewarded; others see them as reasonable and appropriate and may respond to them accordingly. It could be argued that females have learned to maximize reinforcement by reducing their demands; that social desirability is more of an influence. They may be overly concerned with what others think of them, and so inhibit what they consider undesirable responses.

Low assertive males appear to become less reasonable and appropriate when given the license to express themselves. Their low level of assertion would be more likely to be the result of suppression of responses due to punishment or negative reactions from others. This would suggest that they would be likely to become unreasonable and inappropriate were sufficient controls on their behavior to be removed.

There is evidence in the literature that suggests that female nonassertion may be maintained by reinforcement and preference whereas male nonassertion is the result of repeated punishment. Kelly et al. (1980) found that females rate unassertive individuals as more tactful and thoughtful, and as more desirable to meet at a party or have serve on a committee than did male judges. Lewis and Gallois (1984) found that females were less likely than males to become the asserter's friend. In Kern's (1982) study that found low assertives to
prefer nonassertive behavior, low assertive females outnumbered low assertive males two to one. Hess et al. suggest females perceive assertive responses as unpleasant, overly assertive, and masculine. Although Delamater and McNamara (1986), Schroeder et al. (1983), and others have not found significant differences in the way males and females perceive unassertive and assertive behavior, it appears that males generally perceive assertion in more positive terms than do females. When differences are found, they typically consist of females rating nonassertion more positively or assertion more negatively than do males. Generally speaking, the research suggests that females would be likely to choose to behave unassertively out of personal preference for that form of behavior, whereas males would not. The dynamics behind their lack of assertion would appear to be different from those of low assertive females.

It is also possible, however, that at least in certain populations, female assertion may elicit negative evaluations. Lao et al. (1975), Kern et al. (1985), and Kelly et al. (1980) all present data suggesting devaluation of female assertion relative to male assertion occurs in populations with conservative or negative attitudes towards women. When female assertion is devalued relative to male assertion, it is possible
that negative consequences also serve to cause females to inhibit assertive responses.

Another possible explanation for the maintenance of female nonassertion is that Low Assertiveness Females feel and project through self-statements (as well as scores on the CSES) the self-perception that they are unassertive, while actually possessing good self-assertion skills. Alden (1984) failed to find skill differences between low, medium, and high assertive female college students other than those of self-ratings of skill.

Schwartz & Gottman (1976), Alden & Cappe (1981), and Heimberg et al. (1983) found differences in the causal attributions of assertive versus nonassertive individuals. In general they found that assertive subjects attributed positive outcomes more internally than negative outcomes, whereas nonassertive subjects attributed both positive and negative outcomes more evenly and internally than did assertive subjects. The attributional system used by Nonassertive Females has been found to be similar to that used by depressed individuals. This may account for the low frequency of assertion despite objectively successful attempts at assertion.
In addition, it could also be argued that Low Assertive Females become increasingly conscious of their assertions after their initial assertion and reduce their demands. Chiauzzi et al. (1983) found that female subjects reported fewer positive thoughts in response to moderately legitimate demands than males and that nonassertive individuals reported fewer positive thoughts than assertive individuals. They found that as the legitimacy of demands decreased from high legitimacy to moderate legitimacy, Low Assertiveness Females experienced more negative cognitions regarding making assertions. This balance may be affected as the number of assertions increase (as one makes more assertions the overall perceived legitimacy may decrease), thereby increasing females negative cognitions regarding their assertiveness and reducing their tendency to make further or greater demands. All of the above biases decrease the probability of females perceiving their attempts at assertion as rewarding or effective, thereby increasing their feelings of helplessness and decreasing their likelihood of engaging in assertion.

It would be interesting to see how Low Assertive Males and Females differ in their personality profiles. Ramanaiah, Heerboth, and Jinkerson (1985) found that Assertive Males and Females scored significantly higher
on the Personality Research Form Affiliation, Change, Sentience, and Understanding scales than did nonassertive individuals. The assertive group also scored significantly lower on the Abasement, Defendence, Harm-avoidance, and Social Recognition scales. The assertive group was more gregarious, adaptable, sensitive, and rational, while the nonassertive group was found to be more subservient, defensive, self-projecting, and approval seeking. They also found assertive people to be more present oriented, inner directed, existentialistic, and spontaneous as well as higher in self-regard, social sensitivity, and the ability to develop intimate relationships.

Galassi & Galassi (1974a) found that scores on the College Self-expression Scale correlated positively with ratings by others on the words defensiveness, favorable, self-confidence, achievement, dominance, intraception, heterosexuality, exhibition, autonomy, and change. They described assertive individuals as expressive, spontaneous, well-defended, confident, and able to influence and lead others. Negative correlations were found for the adjectives unfavorable, succorance, abasement, deference, and counseling readiness. These results suggest that nonassertive individuals are inadequate, evaluate themselves negatively, feel
inferior, are overly solicitous of support and experience excessive interpersonal anxiety.

Neither Ramanaiah et al. (1985) nor Galassi and Galassi (1974a), however, analyzed the data in such a way as to allow sex differences in the personality styles of male and female nonassertives to emerge. It may be that their descriptions of nonassertive people generalize and combine the attributes of males and females, glossing over the differences and resulting in a profile that is not truly representative of either group. One possible future study would involve administering the California Psychological Inventory or Personality Research Form to male and female nonassertives and to determine whether their personality profiles parallel their different behavioral patterns as portrayed in this study.

In fact, Paterson et al. (1984) found that nonassertive males were similar to aggressive males in their scores on the Socialization, Self-control, and Achievement via Conformity scales on the California Psychological Inventory, suggesting difficulty with authority and institutional relations as well as a more adroit personal style. It appears that unassertive males fail to stand up for themselves and at the same time reject rules and regulations. They may therefore benefit less from their style than do aggressive males;
aggressive males are more likely than nonassertive males to achieve their objectives through their behavior. On the other hand, Epstein (1980) noted that passive-aggression is more likely to elicit positive social consequences than direct aggression if situational demands are not too high. This study reveals a side of nonassertive males that is consistent with the pattern of results found in this study. Paterson et al. (1984) suggest that nonassertive males are suppressing aggressive, somewhat rebellious, maladaptive social responses, and may experience anger and frustration as a result.

**Subject Information Sheet**

Both male and female asserters produced a similar pattern of results on the questions regarding self-perception of assertion level, satisfaction with assertion level, and the number of times they are assertive per day. For both males and females, High Assertive individuals rated themselves as more assertive, more satisfied with their assertion level, and more frequently assertive than did Moderately Assertive individuals. Moderately Assertive individuals rated themselves as more assertive, more satisfied with their assertion level, and more frequently assertive than Low Assertive individuals. Moderately Assertive Males were
also significantly more likely than Low or High Assertive Males to "get even" later if they were not initially assertive.

The correspondence between the global self-ratings and the CSES determined assertiveness levels is not surprising considering that the literature reports similarly high convergent and discriminant validity ratings for both. The literature also shows good reliability and predictive validity for both the CSES and global self-ratings (Swimmer & Ramanaiah, 1985).

While there were no significant sex or assertion level main effects or interactions found for estimates of the Percentage of Daily Situations Calling for Assertive Behavior (question #7), Moderately Assertive Males reported encountering a significantly higher number of situations (question #3) in which they would like to be assertive than did High Assertive Males. There was also a trend for Low Assertive Males to see more situations in which they would like to be assertive than do High Assertive Males.

If one looks at these results in conjunction with the results of the assertion ratings, it appears that although Moderately Assertive Males see a relatively high number of potentially assertive situations, their desired assertions tend to be consistently reasonable and
appropriately expressed. Low Assertive Males, on the other hand, become increasingly unreasonable in their expectations and assertions and increasingly inappropriate in their expression of them. In addition, there is a trend for them to see a relatively high number of situations in which they would like to be assertive, although they were not significantly more likely than any other group to take steps to become more assertive. According to the hypothesis proposed in the Introduction to this paper, these individuals are likely to have been punished more frequently for their attempts at assertion. Low Assertive Males' pattern of becoming increasingly unreasonable and inappropriate and wanting to make relatively more assertions would appear to be maladaptive in terms of relations with others and raises the question of how this pattern relates to the devaluation of Low Assertive Males by this society.

From this study it would appear that High Assertive males tend (non-significantly) to become more reasonable in their expectations and assertions as well as more appropriate in their expression of them as they proceed to enumerate them. In addition, they see a significantly lower number of situations in which they would like to be assertive than do Moderately Assertive Males and nearly significantly fewer than Low Assertive Males. They do,
however, report being assertive more often than Moderate or Low Assertive Males. There appears to be a trend, then, for High Assertive Males not only to make more positively rated assertions as they proceed, but perhaps to make fewer assertions as well. This fact could possibly account for an increase in the probability that assertive behavior would be reinforced.

The Low Assertive Females also tend to become more reasonable in their expectations and assertions, and to express their expectations and assertions more appropriately. There was a trend for Low Assertive Females to report encountering fewer situations in which they would like to be assertive as well as significantly fewer occasions on which they actually are assertive than the other groups. This is consistent with Bruch et al.'s (1981) study that found that nonassertive females were less likely than assertive females to be repeatedly assertive over more than one or two situations.

An argument could be made that if the Low Assertive Females' self-report data are accurate and they do in fact exhibit a behavior pattern consisting of increasingly reasonable and appropriate assertions that are relatively few in number, then they are likely to be reinforced for their behavior. Such behavior would appear to demand very little of others. While not achieving
certain goals, they may in fact be getting other forms of reinforcement and other needs met, such as support or positive relations with others. These female subjects also indicated that they were not significantly more likely than other subjects to seek out and join an assertion training group. In addition, their self-ratings indicated that they were generally unlikely to join an assertion training group. One might postulate, however, that if behavioral contingencies change and they find themselves in a situation where their behavior is not rewarded, then they may feel dissatisfied and motivated to become more assertive. In general, this behavior pattern appears likely to be reinforced, perpetuating society's sex-role stereotypes.

It is curious that despite their dissatisfaction with their assertion level neither the Low Assertive Females nor the Low Assertive Males were inclined to join an assertion training group. This brings into question whether it might be useful to study individuals who are interested in assertion training in order to determine what the special characteristics and needs of this population might be and how they might differ from this more general population. Unfortunately, there was not a
sufficient number of subjects per cell to run analyses that only included subjects likely to seek assertion training.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENT II: THE VIGNETTE STUDY; THE INFLUENCE OF RESPONSE STYLE AND THE SEX AND RELATIONSHIP OF PARTICIPANTS ON THE SOCIAL EVALUATION OF ASSERTION

Method - Experiment II, Part One

Subjects.

Subjects were 455 (228 male, 227 female) undergraduate students participating in the experiment to fulfill the course requirements for Introductory Psychology.

Procedure.

Each subject was randomly assigned a set of the four vignettes depicting a male or female intimate (best friend), service person, or authority figure making an assertive, empathic-assertive, or submissive response involving a behavior change request or a refusal (see
Appendix E). (Aggressive responses were not included since they have been found to be maladaptive in most everyday situations. While they allow the goal to be accomplished, they do so with very negative social repercussions (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Hull & Schroeder, 1979)). The order in which the vignettes were presented as well as the combination of sex of asserter, relationship of interactants, and the type of response were all randomly determined with two restrictions. First of all, the cells were to have an equal number of subjects. Secondly, the two refusals rated by an individuals were to be identical in terms of sex and relationship of interactants and type of response to allow for a repeated measures design. The two behavior change requests were also to be identical in terms of these parameters. For reasons to be described later, however, only the data from two (the two refusal vignettes) of the four vignettes were used in the analyses.

Three person categories (close friend, professor, paper person) were selected based on a study by Rudy et al. (1982) that showed four clusters reflected types of relationships influenced subjects' perceptions of assertion similarity. Three members of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy verified the
response styles as accurately depicting submissive, empathic-assertive and assertive behavior. The vignettes were written such that they placed the subject in the position of the person at whom the request or refusal is directed.

After reading each vignette, the subject was asked to complete a 7-point rating form of bipolar adjectives describing the asserter in the interaction (see Appendix F). The adjectives were drawn from previous factor analyses (Kern, 1982; Kelly et al., 1982) which demonstrated that these items are appropriate for measuring perceptions of assertion with students. Each subject then filled out the College Self-expression Scale.

Two repeated measures $2 \times 2 \times 3 \times 3$ (sex of subject x sex of asserter x relationship x response style) multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted. (The original design called for four separate repeated measures MANOVAs; two for refusals and two for behavior change requests. This statistical design was discarded because the observations would not be independent. It was decided that only the behavior change request vignettes or the refusal vignettes could be used, but not both. For this reason it was necessary to select the two situations (either the two refusal
situations or the two behavior change requests) that occurred most frequently in the college population. An informal content analysis of the assertions described by subjects in the first experiment revealed that the refusal situations (dealing with unexpected visitors and being asked to lend valuable belongings) were more frequently mentioned than the two behavior change situations (requesting that others be quiet and asking someone to call ahead when they will be late). Therefore, the refusal situation results were chosen to be analyzed.) The repeated measures design was used to determine whether subjects responded similarly to the two examples of refusals, which would suggest that it may be possible to generalize across this class of assertions.

Kern et al. (1985), Kern (1982), Kelly et al. (1982) and St. Lawrence et al. (1985) have found two main factors in their analyses of the adjectives on the Interpersonal Attraction Questionnaire. These factors seem to represent likeability and ability/competence. Adjectives closely and consistently related to these factors were included in the analyses. For the likeability factors these descriptors were assertive, offensive, friendly, agreeable, pleasant, considerate, flexible, open-minded, sympathetic, kind, likeable, thoughtful, and good natured. For the competence factor
the adjectives were assertive, appropriate, tactful, educated, intelligent, socially skilled, superior and good to have on a committee. A separate MANOVA was conducted on each of the two factors for each assertion.

Method - Experiment II, Part Two

Subjects:
Subjects from Experiment II, part one, were used in these analyses.

Procedure:
The basic procedures described in the procedure section for Experiment II, part one were followed. Subjects were divided into low, moderate, and high assertiveness groups by the following cutoff method. The low assertive group consisted of subjects scoring more than one standard deviation below the mean on the College Self-expression Scale. The moderate assertive group consisted of the 30 subjects falling closest to the mean. The high assertive group consisted of subjects scoring more than one standard deviation above the mean.

A 2 x 3 x 3 (Sex of Rater x Rater's Assertion Level x Response Style) MANOVA with repeated measures was conducted over the composite scores for the Competence and Likeability factors in order to examine the impact of these variables (the sex of the rater, the rater's
assertion level, and the response style) on the evaluation of assertiveness. A 3 x 3 (Rater's Assertion Level x Response Style) ANOVA with repeated measures was also conducted for the adjective "assertive" to see if individuals of different assertiveness levels are differentially sensitive to assertion.

Results - Experiment II, Part One

One 2 x 2 x 3 x 3 (Sex of rater x Sex of asserter x Relationship x Response style) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs) with repeated measures was conducted for each of the two factors' (Likeability and Competence) set of adjectives to evaluate the influence of these variables on the evaluation of behavior and to determine whether raters responded similarly to the two examples of refusals. An additional 2 x 2 x 3 x 3 (Sex of rater x Sex of asserter x Relationship x Response style) multivariate analysis of variance with repeated measures was conducted for the competence and likeability factors using composite scores in order to evaluate the overall pattern of evaluation of these factors. Composite scores were calculated by summing the ratings received across the sets of adjectives related to each factor for each vignette. The Hotelling-Lawley Trace was used to estimate an F-value in each analysis. Post-hoc contrasts were
conducted for meaningful cell comparisons. The Bonferroni procedure was used (due to unequal cell sizes) to control the overall comparison error rate and reduce the probability of Type I errors.

**Composite Scores - Competence and Likeability Factors**

A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Response Style for Competence and Likeability composite scores across both vignettes ($F(2,415) = 65.04$, $p < .0001$). A significant repeated measures MANOVA within subjects main effect was also found for Response Style ($F(2,415) = 244.84$, $p < .0001$), as was a significant repeated measures MANOVA within subjects main effect for Sex of Rater ($F(1,415) = 5.965$, $p < .016$).

**Competence Factor Composite Score** There was a significant repeated measures between subjects univariate effect for Response style for the Competence composite scores ($F(2,449) = 195.27$, $p < .0001$). A significant repeated measures within subjects univariate effect was also found for Response Style ($F(2,449) = 75.78$, $p < .0001$), so it was necessary to evaluate the results for each vignette separately. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8.

For vignette one, models who behaved in an empathic-assertive manner were perceived as significantly more
competent than models behaving assertively ($p < .0001$), who were perceived to be more competent in turn than those behaving submissively ($p < .0001$).

The pattern of results was similar for vignette two, although the magnitudes of the ratings differed. Empathic-assertive models were perceived as significantly more competent than assertive models ($p < .0025$), who were seen as more competent than submissive models ($p < .0001$).

There was also a significant univariate repeated measures within subject effect for Sex of Rater for the competence composite ($F(1,450) = 4.47, p < .035$), but the effect was not significant for the individual vignettes. In one vignette female raters gave higher ratings, while in the other, males gave higher ratings. This may serve as another indicator that evaluations of behavior are influenced by specific situations.

**Likeability Factor Composite Score** There was a significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects Response Style main effect for the Likeability composite scores ($F(2,449) = 85.46, p < .0001$). There was also a significant repeated measures MANOVA within subjects Response Style main effect, so the vignettes were examined separately. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 9.
Vignette one showed a significant main effect for Response Style ($F(2,450) = 124.52, p < .0001$). Submissive individuals were seen as significantly more likeable than empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .0001$), who were seen as significantly more likeable than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$).

Vignette two showed a different pattern, with the empathic-assertive individuals being rated as significantly more likeable than both the submissive ($p < .0001$) and the assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive individuals were again rated as more likeable than assertive individuals ($p < .012$).

**Individual Adjectives - Competence Factor**

**Relationship Main Effect** A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Relationship for the Competence Factor. Three significant repeated measures univariate effects were also found. There was a significant repeated measures univariate effect for Education ($F(2, 450) = 23.58, p < .0001$), Intelligence ($F(2, 450) = 33.53, p < .0001$), and Superiority ($F(2, 450) = 4.32, p < .014$). There were no significant within subjects effects so the vignettes were not examined separately. Ratings were summed across vignettes. Means and standard deviations for these adjectives by relationship type are presented in Table 7.
In terms of the influence of relationships, the professor was perceived as significantly more educated than the close friend ($p < .0001$) or the paper boy/girl ($p < .0002$). The close friend and paper boy/girl were rated similarly.

The professor was perceived as significantly more intelligent than both the close friend ($p < .0001$) and the paper boy/girl ($p < .0001$). There were no significant differences between the ratings of the intelligence of the close friend and the paper boy/girl.

The professor was also rated as more superior than either the close friend or paper boy/girl. This difference was only significant for the comparison with the close friend ($p < .004$). There was no significant difference between ratings of the close friend and paper boy/girl.

A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Response Style for the Competence Factor ($F(2, 416) = 201.81, p < .0001$). Significant univariate repeated measures between subjects effects were found for Assertiveness, $F(2, 450) = 515.46, p < .0001$, Appropriateness, $F(2, 450) = 103.03, p < .0001$, Tactfulness, $F(2, 450) = 32.99, p < .0001$, Education,
Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations for Competence Adjectives by Relationship Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Relationship of Asserter to Recipient</th>
<th>Professor (n=150)</th>
<th>Close Friend (n=152)</th>
<th>Paper Boy/Girl (n=151)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.85a</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>8.86b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.93a</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>8.82b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.73a</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>7.91b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only means for significant effects are shown. Ratings above 8 (range of possible scores is 2 to 14) should be considered positive. Different subscripts (a, b) denote significant differences, p < .005.
\[ F(2,450) = 43.99, \ p < .0001, \ \text{Intelligence}, \ F(2,450) = 34.42, \ p < .0001, \ \text{Social Skillfulness}, \ F(2,449) = 46.44, \ p < .0001, \ \text{Superiority}, \ F(2,450) = 75.62, \ p < .0001, \ \text{and Usefulness on a Committee}, \ F(2,450) = 97.43, \ p < .0001. \]

The repeated measures MANOVA also indicated a significant within subject effect for Response Style. As a result, the two refusal vignettes were examined separately. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8.

**Assertiveness.** In both vignettes, individuals who behaved submissively were seen as significantly less assertive than those behaving empathic-assertively (vignette one, \( p < .0001 \); vignette two, \( p < .0001 \)) or assertively (vignette one, \( p < .0001 \); vignette two, \( p < .0001 \)). The empathic-assertive and assertive individuals did not differ significantly in ratings of assertiveness in the case of either vignette (vignette one, \( p < .07 \); vignette two, \( p < .46 \)).

**Appropriateness.** Submissive individuals were seen as significantly less appropriate than empathic-assertive individuals in both vignettes (vignette one, \( p < .0001 \); vignette two, \( p < .0001 \)). Submissive individuals were seen as significantly less appropriate than assertive individuals for vignette two (\( p < .0001 \)), but not vignette one (\( p < .051, \ ns \)). Empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly more appropriate
than assertive individuals for vignette one \( (p < .0001) \), but not vignette two \( (p < .47) \).

**Tactfulness** Empathic-assertive individuals seemed to be perceived as most tactful. This effect was significant in comparisons involving submissive individuals for vignette one \( (p < .005) \) and vignette two \( (p < .0001) \). Empathic-assertive models were seen as significantly more tactful than assertive models in vignette one \( (p < .0001) \), but this trend only approached significance for vignette two \( (p < .02) \) according to the Bonferroni procedure for these three comparisons. The results were mixed for differences between submissive and assertive models, with submissive models receiving significantly higher tactfulness ratings in vignette one \( (p < .002) \) and assertive models receiving significantly higher tactfulness ratings in vignette two \( (p < .0001) \).

**Education** Empathic-assertive models were rated as better educated than submissive models in both vignettes (vignette one, \( p < .0001 \); vignette two, \( p < .0001 \)). Empathic-assertive models were rated better educated than assertive models in vignette one \( (p < .0001) \) and vignette two \( (p < .006) \). Results were mixed regarding differences between submissive and assertive individuals. In vignette one there was no significant difference \( (p < .88) \), while in vignette two, assertive models were rated
as better educated than submissive models ($p < .0001$).

**Intelligence** Empathic-assertive models were rated as more intelligent than submissive models (vignette one, $p < .0006$; vignette two, $p < .0001$) and assertive models (vignette one, $p < .0001$; vignette two, $p < .001$). There was no difference between ratings of submissive and assertive individuals in vignette one ($p < .12$), but in vignette two assertive models were rated as significantly more intelligent ($p < .0001$).

**Social Skillfulness** Empathic-assertive models were seen as significantly more socially skilled than submissive models (vignette one, $p < .0002$; vignette two, $p < .0001$) or assertive models (vignette one, $p < .0001$; vignette two, $p < .001$). There were no significant differences between submissive and assertive models for vignette one ($p < .025$), but in vignette two, assertive models were rated as significantly more socially skilled ($p < .0001$) than submissive individuals.

**Superiority** Submissive models were rated as significantly more inferior compared to both empathic-assertive (both vignettes, $p < .0001$) and assertive models (both vignettes, $p < .0001$). The empathic-assertive and assertive models did not vary significantly in their ratings (vignette one, $p < .84$; vignette two, $p < .10$).
## Table 8

### Means and Standard Deviations for Competence Adjectives by Response Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Style</th>
<th>Adjective, vignette</th>
<th>Submissive</th>
<th>Empathic Assertive</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assertive 1</td>
<td>M 152 2.39a 1</td>
<td>153 5.79b 149 6.09b 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.49</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive 2</td>
<td>M 153 2.00a 1</td>
<td>153 5.42b 148 5.53b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.40</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness 1</td>
<td>M 152 3.46a 1</td>
<td>153 4.75b 149 3.85a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.49</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness 2</td>
<td>M 153 3.24a 1</td>
<td>153 5.82b 148 5.70b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.65</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactfulness 1</td>
<td>M 152 3.90a 1</td>
<td>153 4.46b 149 3.28c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.67</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactfulness 2</td>
<td>M 153 3.93a 1</td>
<td>153 5.75b 148 5.32b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.75</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 1</td>
<td>M 152 4.20a 1</td>
<td>153 4.76b 149 4.17a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.27</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 2</td>
<td>M 153 3.88a 1</td>
<td>153 5.48b 148 5.05c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.26</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 1</td>
<td>M 152 4.29a 1</td>
<td>153 4.72b 149 4.09a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.19</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence 2</td>
<td>M 153 4.02a 1</td>
<td>153 5.39b 148 4.95c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills 1</td>
<td>M 152 3.76a 1</td>
<td>152 4.45b 149 3.38a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills 2</td>
<td>M 153 3.55a 1</td>
<td>153 5.47b 148 4.94c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority 1</td>
<td>M 152 3.46a 1</td>
<td>153 4.47b 149 4.44b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority 2</td>
<td>M 153 3.07a 1</td>
<td>153 4.83b 148 5.50b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee 1</td>
<td>M 152 3.22a 1</td>
<td>153 4.66b 149 4.08c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.71</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee 2</td>
<td>M 153 2.81a 1</td>
<td>153 5.48b 148 5.10b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 1.81</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composites</td>
<td>Competence 1</td>
<td>152 28.68a</td>
<td>152 38.12b 149 33.37c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 7.57</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence 2</td>
<td>153 26.50a</td>
<td>153 43.62b 148 41.22c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD 7.51</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Only means for significant effects are shown. Ratings above 4 (range of possible scores is 1 to 7) are to be considered positive ratings for the individual adjectives, ratings above 32 (range of possible scores is 8 to 56) are to be considered positive ratings for the composite scores.

1. Different subscripts (a, b, c) denote significant differences, *p* < .004.
2. An asterisk (*) preceding the mean denotes the response style rated most positively on the adjective.
Usefulness on Committee Submissive models were seen as significantly worse to have on a committee than either empathic-assertive (both vignettes, $p < .0001$) or assertive models (both vignettes, $p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive models were rated as better to have on a committee, but this effect was only significant for vignette one (vignette one, $p < .004$; vignette two, $p < .042$).

Individual Adjectives - Likeability Factor

Response Style Main Effect A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects main effect was found for Response Style for the adjectives related to the Likeability Factor ($F(2, 416) = 87.03, p < .0001$). A significant within subjects main effect was also found for Response Style ($F(2, 416) = 3.83, p < .022$). Due to the within subjects effect, the two vignettes will be evaluated separately. Significant univariate repeated measures between subjects effects were found for assertiveness ($F(2, 450) = 515.46, p < .0001$), offensiveness ($F(2, 450) = 46.36, p < .0001$), friendliness ($F(2, 450) = 75.35, p < .0001$), agreeableness ($F(2, 450) = 37.53, p < .0001$), pleasantness ($F(2, 450) = 59.06, p < .0001$), consideration ($F(2, 450) = 42.98, p < .0001$), flexibility ($F(2, 450) = 180.02, p < .0001$), open-mindedness ($F(2,
450) = 66.64, p < .0001), sympathy (F(2, 450) = 118.64, p < .0001), kindness (F(2, 450) = 89.95, p < .0001), likeability (F(2, 450) = 38.78, p < .0001), thoughtfulness (F(2, 450) = 67.32, p < .0001), and nature (F(2, 450) = 35.28, p < .0001). Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 9.

**Assertiveness** These results are the same as the results for assertiveness for the Competence factor. When the individual in the vignette behaved submissively he or she was perceived as significantly less assertive than individuals behaving either empathic-assertively (vignette one, p < .0001; vignette two, p < .0001) or assertively (vignette one, p < .0001; vignette two, p < .0001) in the vignettes. There was no significant difference regarding how empathic-assertive and assertive individuals were perceived in the vignettes (vignette one, p < .07; vignette two, p < .46).

**Offensiveness** Effects differed for the two vignettes regarding perceived offensiveness. For vignette one, the individual in the vignette was viewed as significantly less offensive if he or she behaved submissively rather than empathic-assertively (p < .0001) or assertively (p < .0001). Individuals behaving in an empathic-assertive manner in the vignette were seen as significantly less offensive than those behaving assertively (p < .0001). On
the other hand, in vignette two, individuals behaving in a submissive manner were not seen as significantly different in terms of offensiveness from those behaving in an empathic-assertive ($p < .15$) or assertive manner ($p < .12$) (all were on the inoffensive side of the scale). Individuals behaving in an empathic-assertive manner were seen as less offensive than assertive individuals ($p < .003$).

Friendliness In vignette one, individuals behaving in a submissive manner were perceived as significantly friendlier than those behaving in either an empathic-assertive ($p < .0001$) or an assertive manner ($p < .0001$). Individuals behaving in an empathic-assertive manner were seen as significantly more friendly than those behaving assertively ($p < .0001$). In vignette two, empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly friendlier than submissive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive and assertive individuals were seen as similar in friendliness ($p < .77$).

Agreeableness For vignette one, there were significant differences between individuals behaving submissively in the vignettes compared to those behaving empathic-assertively ($p < .0001$) or assertively ($p < .0001$) with submissive individuals seen as most
agreeable, followed by empathic-assertive, then assertive individuals. Empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly more agreeable than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). For vignette two, individuals behaving submissively and empathic-assertively did not differ significantly in ratings of agreeableness ($p < .025$), while assertive individuals were rated significantly less agreeable than empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). The difference between assertive and submissive conditions was also significant ($p < .009$).

**Pleasantness** For vignette one, the difference in ratings of pleasantness was significant for submissive and empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .002$), and for submissive compared to assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were perceived as significantly more pleasant than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive individuals were seen as most pleasant, followed by empathic-assertive, then assertive individuals. For vignette two, individuals behaving in an empathic-assertive manner were rated as significantly more pleasant than those behaving submissively ($p < .0001$) or assertively ($p < .0001$). The submissive and assertive conditions did not differ in ratings of pleasantness ($p < .77$).
Consideration For vignette one, individuals behaving in a submissive manner were seen as significantly more considerate than those behaving empathic-assertively ($p < .0001$) or assertively ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly more considerate than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). For vignette two, individuals behaving assertively were rated significantly less considerate than those behaving submissively ($p < .0005$) or empathic-assertively ($p < .0001$). There was no significant difference in the ratings of the submissive and empathic-assertive conditions on this adjective ($p < .15$).

Flexibility Both vignettes followed a similar pattern regarding ratings on this adjective, but there were some differences in significance levels. For both vignettes, individuals behaving submissively received the highest ratings on flexibility, surpassing both empathic-assertively behaving (vignette one, $p < .0001$; vignette two, $p < .004$) and assertively behaving (vignette one, $p < .0001$; vignette two, $p < .0001$) individuals. For both vignettes, empathic-assertively behaving individuals were rated as more flexible than assertive individuals (vignette one, $p < .0001$; vignette two, $p < .0001$).

Open-mindedness For vignette one, submissively behaving individuals were rated as significantly more
open-minded than empathic-assertively ($p < .0001$) or assertively behaving ($p < .0001$) individuals. Empathic-assertive individuals were rated as significantly more open-minded than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). For vignette two, individuals behaving in an empathic-assertive manner were perceived as significantly more open-minded than submissive ($p < .0006$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissively behaving individuals were perceived as significantly more open-minded than those behaving assertively ($p < .0001$). In both vignettes, individuals behaving assertively were perceived as significantly less open-minded than the other groups.

Sympathy In both vignettes, assertive individuals were perceived as significantly less sympathetic than submissive or empathic-assertive individuals. For vignette one, submissive individuals were perceived as significantly more sympathetic than either empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly more sympathetic than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). For vignette two, empathic-assertive individuals were seen as significantly more sympathetic than submissive individuals ($p < .015$). Assertive individuals were seen as significantly less
sympathetic than either submissive ($p < .0001$) or empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .0001$).

**Kindness** In both vignettes, assertive individuals were perceived as significantly less kind than submissive or empathic-assertive individuals. In vignette one, submissive individuals were rated as significantly more kind than either empathic-assertive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were rated as significantly more kind than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). In vignette two, assertive individuals were rated as significantly less kind than either submissive ($p < .0001$) or empathic-assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive and empathic-assertive individuals did not differ significantly in the ratings that they received ($p < .19$).

**Likeability** In vignette one, submissive individuals were perceived as significantly more likeable than either empathic-assertive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were perceived as significantly more likeable than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). In vignette two, empathic-assertive individuals were perceived as significantly more likeable than either submissive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive and
### Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations for Likeability
Adjectives by Response Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective, Attribute</th>
<th>Response Style</th>
<th>Submissive</th>
<th>Empathic-Assertive</th>
<th>Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.35a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.28a 1</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2.00a</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoffensiveness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.54a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoffensiveness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.36a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.05a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.91a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.76a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.70a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasantness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.63a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.75a 1</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.33a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5.28a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.74a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.74a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.01a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.84a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.22a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>5.26a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.63a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.77a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.06a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtfulness 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.91a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtfulness 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.32a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4.95a 1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.08a</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>152*53.64a</td>
<td>153*4.78b</td>
<td>148 31.50c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>153 56.29</td>
<td>153*46.02b</td>
<td>148 53.47c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Only means for significant effects are shown. Ratings above 4.00 (range of possible scores is 1 to 7) are to be considered positive ratings for the individual adjectives. Ratings above 5.5 (range of possible scores is 12 to 13) are to be considered positive ratings for the composite scores.

1 Different subscripts (a, b, c) denote significant differences, p < .01.

2 An asterisk (*) preceding the mean denotes the response style rated most positively on the adjective.
assertive individuals did not differ significantly in likeability ratings in this vignette ($p < .45$).

**Thoughtfulness** In vignette one, individuals who behaved submissively were rated as significantly more thoughtful than empathic-assertive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were perceived as significantly more thoughtful than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). In vignette two, empathic-assertive individuals were rated as significantly more thoughtful than either submissive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Submissive individuals in the second vignette were rated as significantly more thoughtful than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$).

**Nature** For vignette one, submissive individuals were seen as significantly better natured than either empathic-assertive ($p < .0001$) or assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). Empathic-assertive individuals were rated as significantly better natured than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). In vignette two, empathic-assertive individuals were rated as significantly better natured than assertive individuals ($p < .0001$). The difference between submissive and empathic-assertive ratings was significant ($p < .002$) with the empathic-assertion receiving better natured ratings. The ratings for the
submissive and assertive conditions were not significantly different ($p < .07$).

Results, Experiment II, Part Two

Relationship Between Assertion Level and Preferred Response Style

A $2 \times 3 \times 3$ (Sex of Rater x Rater's Assertion Level x Response Style) repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed over the composite scores for Competence and Likeability ratings that were discussed above. Post-hoc contrasts were conducted for meaningful cell comparisons. The Bonferroni procedure was used to control overall comparison error rate and reduce the probability of Type I errors.

Assertion Level by Response Style Interaction

A significant repeated measures MANOVA between subjects interaction was found for Response Style and Assertion Level ($F(4,210) = 2.83, \ p < .026$). Significant repeated measures between subjects univariate Assertion Level by Response Style interaction effects were also found for the Competence composite ($F(4,220) = 2.92, \ p < .023$) and Likeability composite ($F(4,219) = 2.42, \ p < .05$). Significant repeated measures within subjects univariate Response Style main effects were found for both Competence ($F(2,220) = 33.32, \ p < .0001$) and Likeability
(F(2,219) = 37.56, p < .0001) composites, so each vignette was examined separately. Means and standard deviations for the comparisons are presented in Table 10.

**Competence** There was a significant Assertion Level by Response Style interaction effect for vignette one (F(4,220) = 2.77, p < .029). While Low, Moderate, and High Assertiveness groups were not significantly different in their evaluations of the Submissive and Assertive Response Styles, the High Assertiveness group gave the Empathic-Assertive Style significantly higher competency ratings than did the Low Assertiveness (p < .005) or Moderate Assertiveness (p < .004) groups. The Low and Moderate Assertiveness groups did not differ significantly in their ratings (p < .99). All three assertiveness level groups rated the Empathic-Assertive Style as significantly more competent than the Submissive Style (p < .0001 for all three). While all three groups also rated the Empathic-Assertive Style as more competent than the Assertive Style, this difference was only significant for the High Assertion group (p < .0001) and Moderate Assertion group (p < .005) and approached significance for the Low (p < .039) assertiveness group (Bonferroni significance level for alpha = .05, is alpha / k comparisons (.05 / 3), or .017.). All groups rated the Assertive Style as more competent than the Submissive
Style. This difference was significant for the High Assertiveness group ($p < .008$) but only approached significance for the Low Assertiveness ($p < .06$) and Moderate Assertiveness ($p < .047$) groups. To summarize, subjects from all three assertiveness levels perceive the Empathic-Assertive Style as most competent, followed by the Assertive, then the Submissive Style.

The pattern was similar for vignette two. There was a significant main effect for Response Style ($F(2,220) = 147.90, p < .0001$). The Empathic-Assertive Style was rated as significantly more competent than the Assertive Style ($p < .0001$), which was rated as significantly more competent than the Submissive Style ($p < .0001$).

Likeability There was a significant main effect for Response Style both for vignette one ($F(2,219) = 56.41, p < .0001$) and vignette two ($F(2,220) = 35.93, p < .0001$). For vignette one, the Submissive Style was perceived as significantly more likeable than the Empathic-Assertive Style ($p < .0002$), which was perceived as significantly more likeable than the Assertive Style ($p < .0001$). For vignette two the pattern was different. The Empathic-Assertive Style was perceived as significantly more likeable than the Submissive Style ($p < .0001$), which was perceived as significantly more likeable than the Assertive Style ($p < .002$). Once again, note that
### Table 10

**Means and Standard Deviations for Analysis of the Relationship Between Assertion Level and Preferred Response Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Competence 1 M</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 1</td>
<td>28.26x</td>
<td>28.97x</td>
<td>26.67x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 2</td>
<td>27.78x</td>
<td>26.53x</td>
<td>24.96x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td>53.59x</td>
<td>55.27x</td>
<td>51.42x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td>60.26x</td>
<td>55.67x</td>
<td>56.33x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Competence 1 M</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 1</td>
<td>37.64ay</td>
<td>37.64ay</td>
<td>43.73by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 2</td>
<td>44.00y</td>
<td>42.39y</td>
<td>47.50y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td>43.12y</td>
<td>43.11y</td>
<td>51.32y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td>68.00y</td>
<td>62.43y</td>
<td>73.00y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Competence 1 M</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 1</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>32.50x</td>
<td>32.32z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 2</td>
<td>38.68z</td>
<td>39.12z</td>
<td>42.04z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td>32.14z</td>
<td>32.27z</td>
<td>30.32z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td>51.00z</td>
<td>50.58z</td>
<td>52.24z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Only means for significant effects are shown. Ratings above 32 (range of possible scores is 8 to 56) are considered positive for the Competence composite, ratings above 52 (range of possible scores is 13 to 91) are to be considered positive for the Likeability composite.

1 Different subscripts (a, b, c) denote significant differences between the Assertion Level groups on the ratings determining that Composite Score, $p < .005$.

2 Different subscripts (x, y, z) denote significant differences between the ratings given to the three Response Styles, $p < .008$. 

### Assertiveness Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertiveness Level</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Competence 1 M</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th>Moderate Assertive</th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 1</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence 2</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 1</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability 2</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure       | Competence 2 M | 42.39y        | 47.50y             |                |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|                |
| Likeability 1 | 43.11y         | 51.32y        | 16.83              |                |
| Likeability 2 | 62.43y         | 73.00y        | 6.53               |                |

| Measure       | Competence 1 M | 32.50x        | 32.32z             |                |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|                |
| Likeability 1 | 32.27z         | 30.32z        | 13.86              |                |
| Likeability 2 | 50.58z         | 52.24z        | 12.76              |                |
vignette two's Empathic-Assertive Response adds an element of compromise. It may be that individuals who use an Empathic-Assertive response with compromise may be viewed more favorably than individuals responding submissively, regardless of the assertiveness level of the recipient of the assertion.

Sensitivity to Assertiveness

This analysis was conducted to see whether subjects of different assertiveness levels were differentially sensitive to assertiveness. There was a significant between subjects main effect for Response Style ($F(2,211) = 269.87, p < .0001$) and a significant within subjects interaction for Response Style, Assertiveness Level, and Sex of Rater, as well as a significant within subjects main effect for Assertiveness Level. Because of this, the two vignettes were examined separately. No significant univariate effects were found for vignette one (interaction, $F(4,211) = 1.22, p < .31$; assertion level, $F(2,211) = 1.51, p < .23$). Nor was there any significant interaction ($F(4,222) = .99, p < .42$) or assertiveness level main effect ($F(2,222) = .45, p < .64$) found for vignette two. It does not appear that subjects of different sexes and assertion levels are differentially sensitive to assertiveness. There was a significant between subjects repeated measures main effect for
Response Style for this subset of subjects as there was for the original set ($F(2, 220) = 274.69, \ p < .0001$). For both vignettes the submissive response style was rated as significantly less assertive than the empathic-assertive or assertive response styles (all $p < .0001$), while the empathic-assertive and assertive styles were rated similarly ($p < .86, \ p < .53$, for vignette one and vignette two, respectively).

**Discussion - Experiment II, Part One**

Generally speaking, the results of the present study are consistent with those of a number of other studies that found that the empathic-assertive response style is perceived as more competent than both the submissive and the assertive response styles (Kern et al., 1982; Kern et al., 1985; Rakos & Hrop, 1983). Also consistent with other studies is the finding that the empathic-assertive response style is similar in likeability to the submissive response style. The present study found that relationship or relative status of the participants influences some of the adjectives related to the competence factor, but not those related to likeability. Not surprisingly, the professor was seen as significantly more educated, more intelligent, and superior in comparison to both the close friend and the paper
boy/girl regardless of response style. This study did not reveal any significant effect for sex of rater or sex of asserter. Other studies have produced mixed results regarding the effects of both relationship and of sex on evaluations of assertive behavior (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Kelly et al., 1980; Schroeder et al., 1983).

Response Style

Despite the fact that the two vignettes were both of the response class called "refusals", they elicited different responses. There are a number of possible explanations for this. One explanation might stem from differences in the content of the two vignettes. Vignette one includes an empathic statement and a suggestion to save the other person trouble in addition to the assertion. It reads as follows:

You are always dropping in on people without any warning. Once again, you haven't called ahead, but you drop by anyway to visit your (insert professor, close friend, or paper boy/girl). (He or She) answers the door. You ask if you can come in. (He or She) says in a firm but apologetic voice, "I hate to have to tell you this after you've taken the time and effort to come by, but
I'm going to sleep now." Looking at you, (he or she) adds, "Give me a call next time so you won't risk wasting a trip."

On the other hand, the second vignette includes an empathic statement plus a compromise in addition to the assertion. It reads as follows:

You've borrowed your (insert professor's, close friend's, or paper boy's/girl's) car on numerous occasions. Once again, you would like to use it to drive somewhere. You find your (professor, close friend, or paper boy/girl) and ask (him/her) if you can borrow it. "No, I'm afraid you can't use it today," (he/she) says calmly and without hesitation, "I planned to visit a friend of mine." In a sincere voice he/she continues, "I know it's difficult not having a car around here - I could drop you off at the bus station if there's a bus going there."

The element of compromise may have increased the likeability of the asserter. While not decreasing the assertiveness or competence ratings of the behavior according to the ratings, it does improve the social impact of the behavior. It could be that simultaneously standing up for ones right, yet compromising is more satisfactory both in terms of attaining ones goals and in
terms of maintaining positive relations with others than is completely submitting to others' wishes. Frisch and Froberg (1984) found that adding "specific" empathy improved the likeability of their asserters. Specific empathy involved not only recognition of the others' point of view, but agreement with it, and an effort by the assertor to elicit more feelings and thoughts from the other person. This was similar to this study's findings in that Frisch and Froberg's study also included compromise, but it appeared that their compromise was almost to the point of submission.

More specifically, Frisch and Froberg (1987) found that a variation of empathic-assertion termed "specific assertion" was viewed as more effective, appropriate, and likeable than "general" (empathic) assertion as a response to aggressive criticism as rated by females. Their raters consisted of females rated by peers as effective in situations involving aggressive criticism. Specific assertion involves a combination of a submissive and an empathic-assertive response. In specific assertion the asserter agrees with the aggressor in some way about the asserter's behavior and then solicits the aggressor's view of the situation. While the asserter does not passively concede or become defensive, he or she does not
really assert themselves other than to actively structure the interaction.

There are other reasons why the two vignettes may have been rated differently even though they are from the same response class. Other studies have found factors that may account for situational differences (Woolfolk and Dever, 1979; Epstein, 1980; Lewis and Gallois, 1984). For example, it could be argued that the two vignettes were seen as differing in the reasonableness of the initial request or in the reasonableness of the rationale for refusing the request. It is possible that refusing to lend ones car is qualitatively different than refusing to allow someone in at night. Perhaps in the former situation a more assertive response is expected since lending ones car might be seen as a larger sacrifice or favor. Chiauzzi and Heimberg (1983) found that the legitimacy of request influenced the evaluation of the asserter in refusal situations. There may also have been subtle differences in the way the asserters in the two vignettes asserted themselves or in how the requester was seen. It may not be valid to assume that one can generalize across situations within response classes. Nevertheless, in future studies attempting to assess similar assertions it would be helpful to make greater
efforts to control for reasonableness and other qualities of the assertions in the vignettes.

The fact that two other vignettes were originally included in this study is a possible source of error. It is possible that exposure to them and the resulting comparisons among vignettes influenced the ratings of the vignettes used in these analyses. Their effect, however, should be randomly distributed across the conditions since their conditions and order of presentation among the two other vignettes was randomly determined. In addition, people encounter all situations in the context of their experience. Thus, while theoretically exposure to the two other vignettes may have influenced ratings through relative comparisons, the effects would be randomly distributed and not unlike the effects of prior experience.

**Relationship Between Participants**

This study found that professors are perceived as more intelligent, educated, and superior relative to close friends and paper boys/girls, regardless of their sex, their behavior, or the rater's sex. According to this study, then, there does not appear to be a reason to behave differently when being assertive with people of higher or lower status, or different degrees of intimacy. The literature reveals mixed results on this issue. While
Lewis and Gallois (1984) found that level of acquaintance had an impact on perceived likeability, aggressiveness, and respect, Frisch and Froberg (1987) found no such difference. Lewis and Gallois's results, however, dealt with interactions involving relationship and response class of assertion. Since there is no evidence that there is consistency within response classes of assertion, it is not possible to ascertain the meaning of their results.

**Sex of Rater and Sex of Asserter**

No significant effects were found for sex of rater nor sex of the individual in the vignette in this experiment. The literature has been inconclusive on this point as well. With respect to the sex of the rater, many have not found significant effects (Woolfolk & Dever, 1973; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein, 1980; Lawrence et al., 1985). Some have found differences related to the sex of the rater (Hess et al., 1980; Kelly et al., 1980; Romano & Bellack, 1980; Kern, 1982; Keane et al., 1983; Schroeder et al., 1983). Kern (1982) and Keane et al. (1983) found raters rated models of the opposite sex more favorably, while Kelly et al. (1980) found that females rated other females lower on ability and achievement than did other groups. Kelly et al. (1980) found females rated unassertive individuals more favorably than did males,
and Hess et al. (1980) and Schroeder et al. (1983) found females more sensitive to assertiveness and to perceive assertiveness as more masculine and less pleasant. Schroeder's study was very similar in format to the present study and yet his results are different. Other similar studies have also conflicted with these in their findings. Levin and Gross (1984), for instance, found females rated assertive females as more likeable and competent than nonassertive females when both were observed in both positive and negative assertion situations.

While some studies suggest males and females perceive assertiveness differently, the majority have not produced significant results. Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) suggest that subjects' attitudes towards women in society may be a strong moderator of reactions to female assertions. It may be that the discrepancies in the findings may be due to differences in the proportions of subjects in the various subject pools who have positive as opposed to negative attitudes towards women.

There is some evidence that females who are learning assertion skills may need to be sensitive to the other participant's attitude toward women (Kern et al., 1985). It may be helpful to conduct studies designed to develop and clarify effective ways to identify and deal with
those with negative attitudes towards women. An interesting field study would involve observing the interactions of a sample of individuals with a negative attitude towards women and noting how females in their work and social environment who are successful in dealing with these individuals (succeed in reaching their goals) approach and handle behavior change request, refusal, and other situations.

Previous studies have also been inconclusive in terms of determining the effect of the sex of the asserter, actor or model (person exhibiting assertive, empathic-assertive or submissive behavior). Some studies have found no effect (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein, 1980; Hess et al., 1980; Kern, 1982; Gormally, 1982; Keane et al., 1983a & 1983b; St. Lawrence et al., 1985a & 1985b), while some found female asserters were rated more favorably (Schroeder et al., 1983) and others favored male asserters (Lao et al., 1975; Kelly et al., 1980).

One possible explanation for why sex differences failed to emerge in the present and other studies may be that the situational demands used in the vignettes or videotapes are clearly consistent with assertive behavior. Chiauzzi and Heimberg (1983) found significant differences in the thought patterns (in terms of
objectivity, quality, and number of thoughts) of males and females only when the legitimacy of the assertion was unclear. It is possible that sex differences would emerge if the situations used did not so clearly require assertive behavior. On the other hand, it is encouraging that at least in terms of situations that definitely require an assertive response, there is no definitive evidence of devaluation of female assertion relative to male assertion.

Discussion - Experiment II, Part Two

There were two questions to be answered by this analysis. Originally, these questions were to be answered by data from the other part of this study (Experiment I, part two), however, since response style is presented more clearly in the vignette study and data were collected in a more structured manner, it was determined that answering questions on the basis of the vignette study data would produce less ambiguous and more interesting results.

One of the questions was whether the subjects' sex and assertion levels influenced their preference for a particular response style. In other words, did female subjects with a low score on the College Self Expression Scale prefer the submissive response style more than
female subjects with moderate or high scores? Were such preferences consistent with their scores or could it be that subjects prefer one style, regardless of their own assertiveness level? The other question concerned whether subjects of different assertion levels were differentially sensitive to assertiveness. In other words, did subjects low in assertiveness perceive assertive behavior as more strongly or overly assertive than those receiving high scores in assertiveness?

The present study found that for vignette one, High Assertive individuals showed a stronger preference for the empathic-assertive response style over the submissive and assertive response styles compared to Low and Moderate Assertive individuals. All three groups rated the empathic-assertive style as more competent than the assertive style (significant for the High and Moderate Assertive groups for vignette one, all groups for vignette two). All three groups rated the assertive style as more competent than the submissive style (significant for the High Assertive group for vignette one, for all groups for vignette two). In terms of the subjects' assertiveness levels and their consequent impact on the perception of competence and assertiveness, it appears to be a matter of degree of preference, with High Assertive college students showing a stronger preference for the
empathic-assertive style. This finding is consistent with that of Bruch et al. (1981) who found that assertive, high cognitive complexity females were more likely to include an empathic statement with their assertion than were Low Assertive females.

In terms of likeability, there was no main effect or interaction found involving assertion level. The results were the same as presented in the general vignette study. The submissive style was preferred over the empathic-assertive style by all groups for vignette one, while the empathic-assertive style was preferred by all groups for vignette two. In both vignettes the assertive response was seen as least likeable by all three groups.

These results are similar to those reported in previous studies. For example, Levin and Gross (1984) found no relationship between female subjects' level of assertion and their evaluation of females behaving assertively. Levin and Gross's findings differ from Kern's (1982) results. Levin and Gross note that Kern only used negative assertion situations, while Levin and Gross used both positive and negative assertion situations. On the other hand, Delamater and McNamara (1986) used only negative assertion in their study and failed to find any differences in the way high and low assertive females perceive assertive and nonassertive
behavior. This study, like Kern's, included only negative assertion, but did include empathic-assertion which appears to have the same impact as seeing a model in both positive and negative assertion situations. While Kern (1982) found that the competency ratings of assertive and empathic-assertive models did not differ significantly across subject groups, he found nonassertive models were evaluated as being more competent by low assertive subjects than by high assertive subjects. Kern's findings are consistent with those of the present study and Levin and Gross's in that there were similarities in the patterns for all three groups. In their studies, both nonassertive and assertive individuals rated empathic-assertion most competent, followed by regular assertion, followed by nonassertion. For likeability, the nonassertive model was rated most positively, followed by the empathic model, and then the assertive model.

In addition, the present study found that males and females in the three groups did not differ in their sensitivity to assertive behavior. No differences were found in terms of interactions between the sex of the rater and the rater's assertiveness level. This finding conflicts with those of Hess et al. (1980) and Schroeder et al. (1983) which found females to be more sensitive to the degree of assertiveness compared to males. Other
studies, however, have failed to find significant differences in the way the two sexes perceive assertiveness (Woolfolk & Dever, 1973; Hull & Schroeder, 1979; Epstein, 1980; Keane et al., 1983; Lawrence et al., 1985).
CHAPTER IV

GENERAL DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
FUTURE RESEARCH, AND TREATMENT IMPLICATIONS

Original Hypotheses and Recommendations
for Further Research

The original hypotheses for Experiment I held that Low Assertiveness individuals would present assertions that were more numerous, were less reasonable, were more trivial, required more sacrifice of the recipient, made the asserter less likeable, were based on less reasonable expectations, and were less appropriately expressed than those of High Assertiveness individuals. The present study found that overall, the three assertiveness level groups did not differ on any of the these dependent variables except for number of situations requiring assertion. Moderately Assertive Males reported a larger
number of situations requiring assertive responses compared to High Assertiveness Males. Low Assertiveness Males, however, did become more unreasonable in their assertions and expectations, as well as less appropriate in their expression of assertions as they described the three assertions they wanted to make. Thus, the behavior of Low Assertiveness Males is most consistent with the hypotheses presented for Experiment I.

It would appear that the etiology of low assertiveness in males is different than the etiology of low assertiveness in females. More studies need to be conducted in order to clarify these differences in terms of reinforcement history, personality, and cognitions related to their assertive behavior. It would be interesting to examine the personality profiles of low assertiveness females, as well as obtain more information regarding low assertiveness males.

It is possible that the expectations of others (in terms what subjects should be allowed to do and what others should do for them) that Low Assertive males and females have are different. According to the ratings of reasonableness of Low Assertive Males' expectations in the present study, some preparation may need to occur prior to assertion training for males concerning the legitimacy of their assertions. Males may also need to be
instructed on how to "choose their battles" in order to reduce the number of assertions they make while maximizing satisfaction. If assertion skills are taught without such preparation, their assertions may be experienced as unreasonable and too numerous and therefore may be unlikely to be reinforced. As a result, their skills would be unlikely to be maintained by their environment.

It is striking that females' assertions were rated as more reasonable, as based on more reasonable basic expectations, and as more appropriately expressed than those of males. It is also striking that this difference increased over the three assertions they described, in light of previous studies in which males were rated more positively. The present study, however, was the only study to examine differences in the nature of the assertions college students wanted to make. It does not appear that the nature of the assertions that females would like to make causes any negative repercussions. It may be that Low Assertive Females behavior is maintained by reinforcement rather than punishment.

The nature of anticipated consequences may differ for low, moderate, and high assertiveness groups and should continue to be studied with respect to its impact on the likelihood that assertion skills will be
demonstrated. In the case of Low Assertive Females it may be that their perception of their own efficacy and competence may serve to inhibit assertive responses. It would be worthwhile to conduct a study that examines the nature of cognitions and anticipated consequences related to situations requiring assertive responses. If it is found that cognitions cause assertive behavior to be inhibited then a cognitive component to assertion training aimed at increasing their perceptions of themselves as competent and effective in situations requiring assertive behavior may be helpful.

It is possible that social desirability may have influenced the subjects' choice of what assertions to list and the manner in which they were presented. Subjects may have censored their assertions due to concerns regarding how the experimenters would perceive them. Future studies might include a means of measuring the influence of social desirability or be conducted in settings such as dormitories, church groups, or clubs in which individuals are familiar with each other and can provide an additional perspective on the reasonableness and appropriateness of assertions subjects make.

Generally speaking, replication of Experiment I is recommended for a few reasons. First, there have been no similar studies done on college or other populations. The
present study only involved college students, so the results cannot be generalized outside of this population. Studies need to be conducted to determine whether differences exist between low, medium, and high assertiveness individuals in other populations. Secondly, although efforts were made to reduce the probability of Type I error with the use of MANOVAs and the Bonferroni procedure, the large number of comparisons, the small magnitude of some of the differences, and the potential amount of noise all argue in favor of a tentative stance until similar studies produce similar findings. In addition, many of the subjects in this study were not actually seeking assertion training. If one is interested in learning what kind of assertions individuals entering assertion training program will be using their skills to make, one should select a population of subjects who actually have joined or intend to join an assertion training group.

The hypothesis for Experiment II was that the sex of the rater, the sex of the character in the vignette, the response style of the character, and the relationship between the character and the recipient would all have a differential effect on the evaluation of the character in the vignette. More specifically, it was expected that ratings would be more positive for characters whose
behavior conformed to sex role stereotypes, that the
submissive and empathic-assertive response styles would
be rated most positively on the Likeability factor, and
that the empathic-assertive and assertive response styles
would be rated as more competent compared to the
submissive response style. It was also predicted that the
most positive ratings would be given to the
character relationship/response style combinations of low
status/submissive behavior, friend status/empathic-
assertive behavior, and high status/assertive behavior.
It was predicted that less positive ratings would be
given to the combinations low status/assertive behavior
and high status/submissive behavior. The present study
found no interactions between the sex of the rater, the
sex of the character, the relationship between the two
participants, and the response style of the character.
There was a main effect for relationship (professors were
perceived as more educated, intelligent, and superior
than close friends and paper boys/girls). The main
effects for response style indicated that submissive and
empathic-assertive responses were similar in likeability,
while and empathic-assertive behavior was rated as
similar to or more competent than assertive behavior, and
as more competent than submissive behavior.
The results of Experiment II support St. Lawrence et al.'s (1985) contention that it is one's behavior that overwhelmingly determines the social consequences of one's actions. According to the results of Experiment II, a person's behavior determines others' reactions more than one's sex, the other person's sex, or the relationship between the participants. While sex differences were found for Experiment I, these may be attributed to the difference between the nature of assertions presented by males compared to females. When the nature of the assertions was controlled in Experiment II, no sex differences emerged. Since there is no clear cut evidence provided by the present or previous studies regarding difference in reactions to male versus female assertion, it is difficult to say whether it is important for people, especially women, to be able to discriminate between individuals of different sexes or different attitudes towards women.

There may be other secondary influences that come into play when the legitimacy of assertions is more ambiguous. There is some evidence, for example, that more differences emerge between males and females of low and high assertiveness when situations are complex and ambiguous in their situational demands (Bruch et al., 1981). The clarity of the situational demands of these
vignettes may have prevented more subtle factors from surfacing. When the legitimacy of the assertions is not as high, situations are more ambiguous, or situations are more complex, differences may emerge. It would be interesting to repeat Experiment II with more complex situations of slightly lower legitimacy to determine whether differences would emerge.

The results of the present study also suggest that empathic-assertion is the method of choice when assertive behavior is required by a situation, regardless of the sex or the relationship of the interactants. This simplifies the task of the assertion trainer since it reduces the need for teaching subjects to base their responses on the sexes and relationship involved.

The results of the present study provide additional support for the notion that empathic behaviors be taught concurrently or prior to assertion skills since when empathy accompanied an assertion, the asserter appeared to be perceived as more likeable and competent than when the assertion was presented alone, and was still theoretically likely to attain their goal.

The present study is consistent with other studies concerning the positive impact of empathic and commendatory behavior. Heisler and McCormack's (1985) suggestion that these skills be taught and practiced
prior to assertion training appears well grounded. Heisler and McCormack's study showed that being warm and/or empathic before acting assertively produced more positive reactions than behaving assertively alone. Subjects were more likely to be responsive, to react positively, and to be comfortable with assertions preceded by supportive interactions. Consequently, they also recommend first teaching clients warm, empathic, commendatory behaviors and then assertive behavior. In addition, they recommend training clients to differentiate between situations in which assertion and other behaviors are effective. Such an approach is consistent with basic principles of learning. It is generally acknowledged that in order to be an effective source of interpersonal reinforcement it is necessary to continue to provide reinforcement while setting limits else one may be avoided, disliked, and become a less potent source of reinforcement. St. Lawrence et al. (1985) also recommends that individuals seeking assertion training first be taught commendatory skills, then assertion skills in order to increase the probability of being perceived as both competent and likeable.

It is possible that social desirability influenced the ratings. Subjects may perceive non-sexist attitudes as more socially desirable and yet behave in a more
sexist manner. Differences in the perception of male and female asserters may have been reduced due to social desirability. In vivo studies may be useful in getting more perspectives of individuals' behavior.

Another finding of Experiment II is that one cannot generalize across response classes. Although both situations used in vignettes were refusal situations, they were rated differently by subjects. No studies to date have provided any evidence that one can generalize across situations of a particular response class. An alternative explanation for the differences between the two vignettes is that they were the result of differences in the legitimacy and reasonableness of the basic situations. In future studies preliminary ratings should be conducted to control level of legitimacy and reasonableness.

General Design Issues

There are some general design issues and limitations that should be noted. Kazdin (1977) has suggested that subjective evaluations of behaviors are best made by individuals with expertise in that behavior. Frisch and Froberg (1987) used raters nominated by peers for their effectiveness in responding to aggressive criticism. While the present study did not use peer nominations to
select raters, scores on the CSES have been shown to have criterion validity based on peer evaluation. In other words, the low, medium, and high assertiveness individuals in the present study may bear some resemblance to the low, medium, and high assertiveness individuals that would be nominated by peers. The present study did not find any qualitative differences in the likeability and competence ratings of submissive, empathic-assertive, and assertive behavior among low, medium, and high assertiveness groups, only differences in degree of preference. Kern (1980 & 1982), and Gormally (1982) have also only found differences in the degree of preference for response styles of individuals obtaining low, medium, and high scores on the CSES. At least in terms of global ratings of these behaviors, perhaps expert and non-expert opinions are not significantly different. In addition, individuals do not interact solely with effectively assertive individuals. If differences in reactions to assertive behavior do exist among low, medium, and high assertiveness individuals, it would appear useful to gather information regarding how best to respond to a wide cross-section of individuals in the population rather than only those who are perceived as "effectively assertive".
It would be useful to gather more information regarding the importance of rater perspective and whether current methods of obtaining information on the social impact of assertion accurately reflect the actual impact of such behavior. For instance, it has yet to be determined whether rating differences occur depending on whether one is a participant, reading a typescript, or watching a videotape in which participation is simulated or one is put in the role of the observer. It may be possible to answer this question through in vivo research. For example, after obtaining consent, videotape a meeting of a newly formed club, seminar, student group, or similar situation in which submissive, empathic-assertive, or assertive behavior is likely to occur. A single meeting experimental group at a convention would also be a possibility. Have group members complete a form immediately after the meeting regarding their responses to the behavior of other group members. Later, the situation could be replayed and rated by other subjects, or transcribed into typed form. Reactions could then be compared, and an estimate of external validity obtained for different modes of presentation. Another possibility is a long-term follow-up of individuals participating in an assertiveness training group that includes ratings by significant others.
One foreseeable problem with all similar research is the presence of the effect of social desirability. It may be seen as socially desirable to hold a non-sexist attitude on current college campuses or react in particular ways to assertions. It is possible that individuals' attitudes and behavior are inconsistent as a result. The inclusion of a social desirability scale or peer ratings of behavior may be useful in teasing out the effects of social desirability.

Generalizability is another issue. The results of the present study are based on the responses of college students from a large, midwestern university and may not be generalizable to populations with other demographic characteristics. It would be useful to extend the subject population to include adults from a variety of backgrounds to see whether their perceptions differ.

Finally, although an attempt was made to lower the probability of type I error through the use of MANOVAs and the Bonferroni procedure, the sheer number of analyses increases the risk of obtaining statistical significance through chance. In addition, in Experiment I some of the differences in the ratings were small, as previously noted, and may not be clinically significant. It would be useful to replicate this study and see whether similar results are found.
Directions:

We are designing an assertion training program and would like input as to the kinds of situations people would most like to learn to deal with assertively. This will help us choose types of situations to practice on, as well as anticipate arguments from the other side. Consider this a chance to let off some steam by describing three specific, real situations in which you would like to behave assertively towards another person. These can involve situations in which you would like someone to change their behavior, situations in which you would like to express feelings, situations in which you would like to say "no," etc. If you consider yourself to be assertive, please give us examples of situations in which you have behaved assertively.

Again, please fill in the requested information about three situations in which you would like to learn to be (or, if currently assertive, have been) assertive. One information blank is provided for each situation. All information will be kept strictly confidential.
Subject #_____________________(1)

Situation Information Sheet

(1) General description of the situation:

(2) Relationship of other person to yourself (boyfriend, girlfriend, mother, clerk, boss, stranger, etc.).

(3) How do you currently respond to this situation; how do you act, feel, etc.?

(4) How would you respond to this situation if you were "assertive" (if you are assertive, answer "same").
Situation Information Sheet, Con't

Subject #________________________(1)

(5) How do you think the other person in this situation would react if (or how did the other person in this situation react when) you behaved assertively?

(6) How would the other person in this interaction argue for their side (what types of rationale might they give for their behavior)?
Situation Information Sheet

(1) General description of the situation:

(2) Relationship of other person to yourself (boyfriend, girlfriend, mother, clerk, boss, stranger, etc.).

(3) How do you currently respond to this situation; how do you act, feel, etc.?

(4) How would you respond to this situation if you were "assertive" (if you are assertive, answer "same").
(5) How do you think the other person in this situation would react if (or how did the other person in this situation react when) you behaved assertively?

(6) How would the other person in this interaction argue for their side (what types of rationale might they give for their behavior)?
Situation Information Sheet

(1) General description of the situation:

(2) Relationship of other person to yourself (boyfriend, girlfriend, mother, clerk, boss, stranger, etc.).

(3) How do you currently respond to this situation; how do you act, feel, etc.?

(4) How would you respond to this situation if you were "assertive" (if you are assertive, answer "same").
(5) How do you think the other person in this situation would react if (or how did the other person in this situation react when) you behaved assertively?

(6) How would the other person in this interaction argue for their side (what types of rationale might they give for their behavior)?
APPENDIX B

COLLEGE SELF-EXPRESSION SCALE

(GALASSI, DELO, GALASSI, & BASTIEN, 1974)
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

P. 135-138

--------------------

--------------------

--------------------

--------------------

--------------------
Subject Information Sheet

Sex: __________
Age: __________

Directions: Answer each question by circling the number that best describes how you feel.

1. How assertive do you consider yourself to be?
   - Very Unassertive
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   - Very Assertive

2. How satisfied are you with your current level of assertiveness?
   - Very Dissatisfied
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   - Very Satisfied

3. On a typical day, how many situations do you usually encounter in which you would like to be assertive?
   - None
     0 2 4 6 8 10 12+
   - Twelve Plus

4. On a typical day, how many times are you assertive?
   - None
     0 2 4 6 8 10 12+
   - Twelve Plus

5. How often do you end up "evening things up" with the other person when you aren't assertive?
   - Never
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   - Very Often

6. How likely would you be to actually seek out and join an assertiveness training group? (You will not be contacted. This is only a theoretical question.)
   - Very Unlikely
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   - Very Likely

7. On a typical day, what percentage of the situations you encounter call for assertive behavior? ________

Subject number: __________
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE SITUATION RATING

FORM FOR EXPERIMENT I, PART TWO
Instructions:

Please read each of these situations carefully and then circle the number (1-7) for each adjective which most closely represents your evaluation of the behavior or person. Please do not skip any.

1-100-1. D.L. is your best friend in the world and you feel nothing will ever change that. One day D.L. gives you many examples of how badly you've hurt her and brings up times when you've totally used her. She explains that she cares about you, but you've hurt her so many times.

D.L.'s Assertion:

Was very reasonable

Was very trivial

Required much sacrifice of the other person

Made me like him/her much more

The basic feelings and expectations behind this assertion were:

Very reasonable

Very inappropriately expressed

Very unreasonable

Very appropriately expressed
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE SUBMISSIVE, EMPATHIC-ASSERTIVE, AND ASSERTIVE VIGNETTES USED IN ANALYSES
Submissive Response Style:

Vignette One:

You are always dropping in on people without any warning. Once again, you haven't called ahead, but you drop by anyway to visit your professor. She answers the door. You ask if you can come in and she looks at the floor and says in a timid voice, "Well, I was going to sleep - I'm very tired, but I guess I can stay up a little longer." Hesitantly, she adds, "I really should sleep, but, okay, come in."

Vignette Two:

You've borrowed your professor's car on numerous occasions. Once again, you would like to use it to drive somewhere. You find your professor and ask her if you can borrow it. Studying the wall, she replies, in a barely audible voice, "I'd really rather you didn't because I had planned to visit a friend." She pauses and adds, "...but I suppose it's alright. I could really use the car today, though. Here are the keys."

1 Space for inserting relationship.

2 Space for inserting sex of character.
Empathic-Assertive Response Style:

Vignette One:
You are always dropping in on people without any warning. Once again, you haven't called ahead, but you drop by anyway to visit a close friend. She answers the door. You ask if you can come in. She says in a firm but apologetic tone of voice, "I hate to have to tell you this after you've taken the time and effort to come by, but I'm going to sleep now." Looking at you, she adds, "Give me a call next time so you won't have to risk wasting a trip."

Vignette Two:
You've borrowed your close friend's car on numerous occasions. Once again, you would like to use it to drive somewhere. You find your friend and ask her if you can borrow it. "No, I'm afraid you can't use it today," she says calmly and without hesitation, "I planned to visit a friend of mine." In a sincere voice, she continues, "I know it's difficult not having a car around here - I could drop you off at the bus station if there's a bus going there."

1 Space for inserting relationship.
2 Space for inserting sex of character.
Assertive Response Style:

Vignette One:

You are always dropping in on people without any warning. Once again, you haven't called ahead, but you drop by anyway to visit a close friend. She answers the door. You ask if you can come in and she says in a firm voice, "No, I'm going to sleep now." Looking at you, she continues, "I can't talk with you tonight."

Vignette Two:

You've borrowed a close friend's car on numerous occasions. Once again, you would like to use it to drive somewhere. You find your close friend and ask her if you can borrow it. After you ask, she replies, "No you won't be able to use it today," calmly and without hesitation. She then continues, "I planned to visit a friend of mine." Looking at you, she adds, "...so I cannot afford to be without it."

1 Space for inserting relationship.

2 Space for inserting sex of character.
APPENDIX F
INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
(ADJECTIVE RATING FORM) WITH SAMPLE VIGNETTE
You are always dropping in on people without any warning. Once again, you haven't called ahead, but you drop by anyway to visit your professor. She answers the door. You ask if you can come in. She says in a firm but apologetic tone of voice, "I hate to have to tell you this after you've taken the time and effort to come by, but I'm going to sleep now." Looking at you, she adds, "Give me a call next time so you won't have to risk wasting a trip."

| Subject # |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|

Please read each of the sets of descriptions carefully. Be sure to note that in some cases the more desirable attribute is on the left end, and in some cases it is on the right end. For each pair, circle the number (1 to 7) which most closely represents your evaluation of the person in the story. Please do not skip any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Assertive</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
<th>Very Tactless</th>
<th>Very Inoffensive</th>
<th>Very Truthful</th>
<th>Very Educated</th>
<th>Very Friendly</th>
<th>Very Disagreeable</th>
<th>Very Unpleasant</th>
<th>Very Considerate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Inflexible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Closed-Minded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Open-Minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Sympathetic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Kind</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Unkind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dislikeable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Likeable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unintelligent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Thoughtless</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Thoughtful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Attractive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Unattractive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfair</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good Natured</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Bad Natured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Socially Unskilled</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Socially Skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Superior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Inferior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad to Have on a Committee</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Good to Have on a Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good to Have at a Party</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Very Bad to Have at a Party</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Some people are more biased than others when they process and summarize information. This is especially true when people try to interpret others' behavior. In order to study this phenomena, we asked a group of people to edit and summarize some old data concerning assertiveness. We asked them to summarize the assertions (requests, demands, statements, etc.) that our subjects said that they would make if they were assertive. The "editors" were told to include (when available) information about the sexes of the people involved and a brief description of the situation and the way the student would behave, "If he/she were assertive...". They were also told to write the summary such that the subject's assertion would be directed at the reader. Some of the editors were very objective and accurate summarizers, while others had varying amounts of difficulty, depending on a variety of factors in the study.

DIRECTIONS:

Please assess the editors' accuracy regarding their description of the asserter's behavior. The asserter is the person represented by initials, who interacts with the reader. First, read the original (handwritten) description of the situation and how the person would have liked to act "if they were assertive...". Next, read its typed summary by one of the editors. Finally, rate the degree of bias you observe by circling the number that best represents the direction and amount of bias.

Pay careful attention to the degree of bias as well as its presence or absence. It is possible that all or some or none of the stories in your sample are biased.

Please send complete forms to: Lynn Collins, 1 Hillbrook Court, Timonium, MD 21093. Thank you!
Situation Information Sheet

(1) General description of the situation:

The building I live in is up for sale. Realtors have been showing my apartment to prospective clients without my knowledge or permission. The landlord does not inform me when these situations will occur.

(2) Relationship of other person to yourself (boyfriend, girlfriend, mother, clerk, boss, stranger, etc.).

Landlord / Friend

(3) How do you currently respond to this situation; how do you act, feel, etc.?

I refuse to allow my apartment to be toured without my permission - became extremely upset and went over my landlord's head and dealt directly with the realtors.

(4) How would you respond to this situation if you were "assertive" (if you are assertive, answer "same").

Same
1-312-1. You are a landlord and do not inform your tenant, D.M., when the realtors are going to show his apartment to buyers. D.M. refuses to allow the showing without his permission, goes over your head and deals directly with the realtors.

This summary presents the assertion as:

| Much more reasonable than the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Much more unreasonable than the original |
| Much more trivial than the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Much more important than the original |
| Requiring much more sacrifice of the other person than the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Requiring much less sacrifice of the other person than the original |
| Making the student much more likeable than the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Making the student much more dislikeable than the original |

This summary made the feelings and expectations that led to these assertions seem:

| Much more reasonable than they were in the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Much more unreasonable than they were in the original |
| Much more inappropriately expressed than they were in the original | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Much more appropriately expressed than they were in the original |
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