

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN ASSERTION SCALE

BY



WILLIAM NICHOLAS GREEN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHCLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1973

7

DEDICATION

For my wife Gloria,
who has asserted
her love with hard work
in this first year
of our marriage.

ABSTRACT

The writings of Joseph Wolpe with respect to assertion were used as the basis for the preparation of an instrument to measure assertion. The instrument, termed the Green Fox Scale to prevent biasing Ss responses, was prepared so that low scores reflect non-assertive behavior and high scores reflect assertive behavior.

An initial 40-item version was prepared and administered to a sample of 115 individuals. This sample of 115 represented a wide age range (18-60) and was selected to be representative of the socio-economic background of a large western Canadian city. On the basis of an item analysis, the test was shortened to 28 items. The 28-item version was subsequently used for all construct validation procedures involving 135 testees.

Test-retest reliability was estimated at .79 and the split-half reliability estimate was .66. Both procedures indicated an acceptable level of test consistency.

The relationship of Wolpe's conception of assertion to a number of other testable psychological constructs was discussed. Specific hypotheses were stated on the general hypothesis that the non-assertion-assertion continuum underlying the Green Fox Scale would occur in a construct validation network.

Hypothesis testing, and as a result, construct validation of the Green Fox Scale involved three separate but related procedures. First, validation involved the relationship of the Green Fox Scale to established psychological instruments. Second, validation involved the

7

establishment of differing scores on the Green Fox Scale for groups rated differently in assertion. Third, the relationship of the Green Fox Scale with other sociological and demographic variables was determined.

An examination of co-variance and an examination of differences between groups permitted the following conclusions. High assertion scorers as opposed to low assertion scorers are less neurotically reactive, less anxious and more likely to embrace logical ideas.

Nursing Orderly trainees rated as low asserters scored lower on the Green Fox Scale than those trainees rated as high asserters by their instructress. Passive non-assertive clients as rated by a counsellor scored lower on the Green Fox Scale than individuals randomly selected from a general sample. In addition, males scored higher on the Green Fox Scale than females.

Hypotheses predicting a relationship between birth order and scores on the Green Fox Scale; and that predicting a relationship between authoritarianism were not supported.

Results were interpreted as evidence that the Green Fox Scale is a valid and reliable measure of assertion as defined by Joseph Wolpe. Implications for the use of the Green Fox Scale in counselling and research were explored.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to recognize all those who contributed their understanding, concern and encouragement.

Dr. E.E. Fox (Supervisor)

Dr. L.L. Stewin

Dr. H.W. Hodysh

Miss J. Clack

Mrs. B. Pendergast

Mr. J. Dunne

Mrs. Gloria Green

Mrs. Anne Green

Mr. Mike Hwozdecki

Mr. John Bolechiwsky

Students of the Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton)

The many testees

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Wolpe's Principle of Reciprocal Inhibition . . .	1
	Assertive Training	2
	Evaluating Assertiveness	2
	Study Overview	4
II	RELATED LITERATURE	6
	Introduction	6
	Assertion Training and Related Therapeutic Techniques	6
	RELATED PERSONALITY FORMULATIONS	9
	Introduction	9
	Assertion, Anxiety and Neurotic Reactivity . . .	10
	Assertion and Irrational Ideas	11
	Assertion and Authoritarianism	13
	RELATED SOCIOLOGICAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES . .	13
	Introduction	13
	Passive Couselees and Assertion	14
	Passive Versus Assertive Nursing Orderly Trainees	14
	Sex and Assertion	14
	Birth Order and Assertiveness	15
	HYPOTHESES	16

CHAPTER		PAGE
III	CONSTRUCTION OF THE GREEN FOX SCALE	18
	Item Preparation	18
	Content Validity	18
	Weighting Procedure for Items on the Green Fox Scale	19
	Item Analysis Procedure	19
	Final Item Selection	20
	The Final 28-Item Green Fox Scale	22
	Scoring the 28-Item Green Fox Scale	22
	Validity Considerations	22
	Reliability Estimates	23
IV	PROCEDURE AND DESIGN	25
	The Samples	25
	Content Validity Sample	25
	Construct Validity Samples	26
	Sociology 20 Students	26
	Nursing Orderly Trainees	26
	INSTRUMENTS	26
	The Willoughby Personality Schedule	26
	The IPAT Anxiety Scale	28
	The Adult Irrational Ideas Inventory	28
	The California F-Scale	28
	Personal Data Collection	29

CHAPTER	PAGE
	29
	31
V	31
	31
	31
	32
	32
	32
	34
	34
	35
	35
	36
VI	38
	38
	38
	39
	40
	40
	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
APPENDICES	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	ITEM TOTAL CORRELATIONS FOR THE 40-ITEM INITIAL GREEN FOX SCALE	20
2	PSYCHOLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY	23
3	SUBJECTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN TEST-RETEST CONSISTENCY STUDY	24
4	PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT BETWEEN THE GREEN FOX SCALE AND VARIOUS PERSONALITY INSTRUMENTS	33
5	COMPARISON OF SCORES ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE OF PASSIVE COUNSELING CLIENTS TO A RANDOMLY SELECTED GROUP	34
6	RATED LOW ASSERTERS VERSUS RATED HIGH ASSERTERS	35
7	COMPARISON OF THE MEANS OF SCORES BY MEN AND BY WOMEN ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE	36
8	COMPARISON OF FIRST BORN TO LATTER BORN ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE	37
9	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM ON THE INITIAL FORM OF THE GREEN FOX SCALE	60
10	ITEM TOTAL CORRELATIONS FOR THE FINAL 28-ITEM GREEN FOX SCALE	68

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of client change upon the completion or cessation of psychotherapy remains a problem for the counselor regardless of his theoretical orientation (Rogers, 1961; Eysenck, 1964; Stollock, Guerney, and Rothberg, 1966). In his review of the client change evaluation area, Bergin (1971) summarizes his recommendations by calling for

Future progress ...[that could be]... assured by reducing the complexity of therapeutic practices to more specific operations upon homogeneous syndromes. This will require a departure from gross tests of the effects of therapy ...and it will require a good deal of technique innovation and testing of each techniques effects.
(p. 263)

In this vein, it is proposed herein to attempt to contribute to the literature available on the evaluation of client change by examining the technique of assertion training. Assertion training is a therapeutic technique first elaborated by Joseph Wolpe (1958). To the present no psychometrically specific and valid test of assertion appears to exist. Specifically, so as to conduct more meaningful evaluation of the effects of assertion training, an attempt will be made to create a valid instrument for measuring increments and decrements of assertion. The instrument will be so designed as to closely correspond to the definitions and theoretical framework provided by Wolpe's reciprocal inhibition theory.

Wolpe's Principle of Reciprocal Inhibition

Wolpe (1958) suggests that in any normal individual, drive states arise which excite overt action. The resultant action or behavior if adaptive, dissipates the drive state or internal excitatory stimulation.

However, if the behavior is "unadaptive", the individual sustains the excitement until it might be more adequately termed anxiety. This anxiety, Wolpe contends, all but precludes flexibility, or in other words results in persistent unadaptive behavior, which in the broadest sense of the word is termed neurosis. Wolpe's therapy, then, consists of the use of one or more techniques to reciprocally inhibit anxiety during which time the learning of adaptive behavior is actively facilitated.

Assertive Training

One such technique is that of assertive training, wherein the client is not only encouraged to engage in "more or less aggressive behavior, but also to ...[engage in]... the outward expression of friendly, affectionate and other non-anxious feelings" (Wolpe, 1958; p. 114). For example,

Suppose a university student goes to a meeting of a society that he has joined because of real interest in its field. A professor has been invited to lecture at this meeting and afterward, at discussion time, the student wishes to get up and ask a question or make a criticism. Although he has no doubts about the good sense of what he has to say, at the very thought of saying it his heart thumps, his knees tremble and his hands sweat. This fear is clearly unadaptive as, objectively, no dire consequences could reasonably be expected to ensue from his speaking. There are two possible outcomes - he may get up and speak in spite of his fear, or he may remain in his seat. He will in fact speak only if the motivation to speak is stronger than the fear. Just as fear tends to suppress the impulse to speak, this impulse, whenever it can be expressed, suppresses the fear to some extent and, through so doing, slightly weakens the habit of reacting with fear to this particular kind of situation. If the student should repeatedly speak on such occasions, this fear will be progressively weakened and eventually disappear. (Wolpe, 1958; p. 116).

The expression of assertive behaviors Wolpe contends, inhibits anxiety and facilitates adaptive behavioral responses.

Evaluating Assertiveness

In an attempt to evaluate the success of assertive training, Wolpe

resorts to Knight's (1945) criteria. That is, success in therapy has as its correlates,

...symptomatic improvement, increased productiveness, improved adjustment and pleasure in sex, improved interpersonal relationships, and ability to handle ordinary psychological conflicts and reasonable stresses. (Wolpe, 1958; p. 205).

In measuring client change Wolpe primarily depends on client self report. That is, as the client reports improvements with respect to these criteria, Wolpe would evaluate them as improving or progressing. In an attempt to establish a more objective measure of improvement, Wolpe uses an instrument that measures neurotic reactivity, the Willoughby Personality Schedule. As the client improves there is a decrease in his performance on a neuroticism scale.

From a measurement perspective, it is suggested that it might be useful to attempt to assess behavior change in terms of increasing assertive responses as a result of assertive training rather than decreasing amounts of neurotic reactivity. In an unpublished letter to the writer, Wolpe recognizes that the Willoughby questionnaire is a "rough measure" of "a diminution of interpersonal anxiety in correlation with increasing assertive behavior".*

Further limitations in the usefulness of the Willoughby questionnaire as a diagnostic aid in determining the appropriateness of assertive training resulted in Wolpe (1969) devoting considerable explanation and expansion of methods and means of evaluating the extent to which an individual asserts himself. Lazarus (1971) also discusses at length situations in

*Personal communication dated September 17, 1971. See Appendix A.

which a person ought to assert himself. He recognizes that the individual sometimes has difficulty discriminating between situations that require assertiveness and those which do not. In order to assist the practitioner and the client focus on "general deficiencies in assertive behavior", Lazarus presents an assertive questionnaire (pp. 132-133) of twenty items. Essentially Lazarus focuses on assertive behavior or the lack of it, rather than anxiety or the lack of it in the treatment situation.

This writer agrees, and contends that it is more useful from a clinical and a diagnostic perspective to assess deficiencies in assertive behavior rather than 'degree of neurotic reactivity'. It is proposed, therefore, to create an assertion scale that will yield a more direct measure of the effects of assertive training than any other instrument known at present.

Study Overview

The purpose of the present project is to create an instrument to measure the assertiveness with which an individual responds to his environment. The instrument, a short paper-and-pencil test will be developed in a study that would be so structured as to provide a rather extensive validation network for that test.

First, in order that the items can be created, extensive relevant literature will be reviewed. In order that the instrument have wide applicability, actual items will be framed at or below a grade eight readability level. These items will be submitted to several judges familiar with Wolpe's concept of assertion in an attempt to establish content validity. With the establishment of content validity, an initial form of the test

will be prepared and administered to a sample representing a wide range of age, occupation and educational background. From an analysis of the responses of these subjects to this initial form, a final form of the assertion scale will be developed using only the items found to have the most discriminative power. The final form of this assertion scale will be used in all subsequent construct validation procedures.

Basically, three types of construct criterion will be utilized. Firstly, the relationship between the final form of the assertion scale and established related personality measures will be examined. Specifically, sub-studies will be undertaken to discern whether logically predicted relationships exist between assertion as measured by the assertion test and neurotic reactivity, anxiety, authoritarianism and rationality. Secondly, specific criterion groups that may logically be argued to collectively hold differing levels of assertion will be examined. That is, students rated as passive by their instructor in the classroom ought to score significantly lower on the assertion scale than students rated as assertive by their instructor. Similarly, clients rated as non-assertive by their counselor in a clinical setting should score significantly lower on this scale than a similar number of people drawn from a normal population. Thirdly, variables other than those implicit in Wolpian theory that might account for considerable test variance will be investigated. In this category sex, birth order and age will be selected for scrutiny.

Finally, a name will be provided for this instrument, that for face validity considerations, would not blatantly affect the testees responses. Henceforth the assertion scale will be termed and referred to as the Green Fox Scale.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In keeping with the proposed outline of Chapter I, construction of the Green Fox Scale should first be preceded by a review of the relevant literature. This review of literature will include lengthy discussion of assertion training as well as the relationship of assertion to anxiety, irrationality and authoritarianism. As well, the relationship of assertion with other demographic variables will be scrutinized before any specific hypothesis will be stipulated.

Assertion Training and Related Therapeutic Techniques

The description of the nature of what constitutes assertive behavior is outlined by Wolpe (1969) during a discussion of the morality of behaving assertively when he states:

...there are three possible broad approaches to the conduct of interpersonal relations. The first is to consider oneself only and ride roughshod over others, if necessary to get what one wants. The psychopathic personality is the extreme expression of this basic attitude, and often of course, falls foul of society. He has not been conditioned to feel guilty or otherwise anxious in situations in which most people are so conditioned. The second possible approach to interpersonal relations is always to put others before one's self. Such unselfishness is the extreme opposite of the psychopathic personality. The patient fluctuates between guilt at falling short of his standards of selflessness and the frustrations that result from selfabnegation. No less than that of the psychopath, though in a different way, his behavior has unhappy results. The Talmudic saying, "If I am not for myself, who will be for me?" recognizes the biological truth that welfare of the organism begins with its own integrity. The third approach is the golden mean, dramatically conveyed in this fuller quotation from the Talmud: "If I am not for myself, who will be for me? But if I am for myself alone, what am I?" The individual places himself first, but takes others into account. He conforms to the requirements of social living while acceding to the biological principle that the adaptations of the

individual organism primarily serve the needs and the individual and not those of others. He fulfills his obligations to the group, but claims and is prepared to defend what he believes are his reasonable rights. (p. 19-20).

Following the above theme, there has been in the very recent past, an ever increasing number of studies exploring assertive behavior and assertion training in therapy. For example, Bach (1968, 1970) has published two books demonstrating that the means of having a healthy interpersonal relationship develop is by having the partners express themselves to each other assertively, thereby inhibiting anxiety. He also colorfully describes the process of not adaptively responding to a situation with a resultant increase in anxiety as "gunnysacking". Although Lazarus (1971) agrees in principle with Wolpe's (1958) definition of assertion and its relationship to anxiety, he prefers to speak in terms of "emotional freedom". Herein he describes clients who "have become more outspoken, less inhibited and able to stand up more for their rights" (p. 115). He further draws a distinction between standing up for rights and being authoritarian in the expression of these feelings. Emotional freedom results in "decreased anxiety, close and meaningful relationships, self-respect and social adaptivity" (p. 116). Piaget and Lazarus (1969) describe the specific technique of 'rehearsal desensitization' as a means of encouraging the elicitation of assertive responses. Herein the therapist constructs a hierarchy of interpersonal encounters of gradually increasing anxiety producing situations. Then, through modeling the patient is encouraged to attempt to enact the assertive role. Lazarus (1965) reports the successful treatment of sexual impotence in a male client as a result of a therapeutic procedure combining systematic desensitization and assertion training. Stevenson and

Wolpe (1960) report the treatment of pedophilia (sexual offenses against children) in a forty-two year old male. The treatment carried out is described as indirect in that it involved the teaching of assertive responses to counter an abnormal degree of servility towards, and dependence upon the patient's father. A six and one half year follow up revealed that the client had not exhibited the deviant sexual response. Homosexual pedophilia of 10 years duration in a 40 year old male was also successfully treated by Edwards (1972). Therapy consisted of the techniques of thought stopping and assertion training during 13 sessions. Two males with "obsessive compulsive disorders of recent origin" were reported by Bandura (1969). In one individual, a handwashing ritual which was believed to have evolved as a result of anxiety and guilt disappeared after the client received assertion training. In the second case, increasing self-assertion resulted in a decrease in obsessional thoughts about homosexuality and destructiveness assumed to have arisen from "anticipatory concern over negative social reaction to his obsequious behavior" (p. 394). Mitchell (1971) demonstrated that a greater reduction of migraine headaches occurred in a group (N=7) exposed to applied relaxation, desensitization and assertive training as compared to a group receiving relaxation (N=7) only, or as compared to a group receiving no treatment (N=3). Seitz (1971) reports the use of assertive training in combination with three other therapeutic techniques in the successful treatment of a neurotically depressed 36 year old male who had attempted suicide. Bean (1970) combined systematic desensitization with behavior rehearsal (assertive training) so that the two procedures might be mutually reinforcing when one procedure by itself fails. Sturm

(1971) suggests that role playing in a group context is reinforcing and the client's awareness of the context of the newly learned response is as important as the response itself. Ullman and Krasner (1969) provide an example of assertive training in the treatment of a college student "who was very shy with girls". Together with the therapist, the client developed a "script" to be used when telephoning girls for dates. Gradually deviations from the script required further improvisations on the part of the client. As sessions progressed into final stages of treatment, female therapists were used to help the client develop date-getting techniques.

RELATED PERSONALITY FORMULATIONS

Introduction

From the literature it is noteworthy that most of the studies were of the case study type demonstrating the effectiveness of assertion training in the treatment of various behavior disorders. It is also significant that as a result of these case studies considerable attention (Piaget and Lazarus, 1969; Lazarus, 1965; Edwards, 1972; Mitchell, 1971; Bean, 1970; Sturm, 1971) has been given to the development of new techniques of eliciting assertive responses and/or the use of traditional assertion training in combination with other therapeutic techniques. In order to evaluate the success of the aforementioned approaches and to stimulate "a good deal of technique innovation ...[will require the]... testing of each techniques effects" (Bergin, 1971; p. 263). Therefore it is proposed herein to establish the existence of an assertive personality dimension by creating a valid instrument that could measure

increments and decrements of assertive behavior. The validation will follow the procedures outlined in Cronbach and Meehl's (1955) discussion of construct validity in the creation of psychological tests.

Accordingly, an instrument (The Green Fox Scale) has been prepared to reflect Wolpe's concept of assertion. To establish the Green Fox Scale as a legitimate measure of the assertion construct, certain associations and interpretations are offered which lead to testable hypothesis. Specifically, assertion appears to be logically related to such psychological constructs as anxiety, neurotic reactivity, rationality and authoritarianism.

Assertion, Anxiety and Neurotic Reactivity

As stated above, assertion as behavior appears to be directly linked to anxiety and neurotic reactivity. Joseph Wolpe (1958) defines anxiety as "the autonomic response pattern or patterns that are characteristically part of the organism's response to noxious stimuli" (p. 34). This consistent response pattern by the organism excludes the possibility of flexibility of response to the stimulus as alternative ways of adapting to the situation. In order to provide for an increased probability that some other response be elicited, Wolpe, (1958) identifies three important classes of responses that clearly oppose the elicitation of an anxiety response. These are "(a) assertive responses, (b) sexual responses, and (c) relaxation responses" (p. 72). Therefore, when the organism's response to a stimuli can be classified in one of the above categories, then the autonomic anxiety pattern (often neurotic reactivity) is inhibited. Accordingly, the objective of the therapeutic relationship in the Wolpian sense is the elicitation of assertive responses that will

enable the passive, and/or anxious individual to speak and act for himself, thereby controlling the social situations in which he may find himself.

The relationship of anxiety and assertiveness is indirectly reflected in the work of Cattell. He describes anxiety (1957) as a syndrome comprising the qualities of tension, irritability, lack of self-confidence, unwillingness to take risks, tremor and various psychosomatic signs. Cattell also reports (1965) that the experimental approach to using factor analysis in the measurement of anxiety demonstrated clearly "that there is a single anxiety factor, but different from ...well-known drives ...such as sex, fear, assertion" (p. 114).

From the preceding discussion, it is clear then, that the measurement of increases in assertive behavior of necessity involves the measurement of decreases in anxiety and neurotic reactivity. It is logical therefore to predict a significant negative relationship between both assertion and anxiety, and assertion and neurotic reactivity. More specifically, high scores on the Green Fox Scale (assertion) should be significantly correlated with low scores on the IPAT Anxiety Scale and with low scores on the Willoughby Personality Schedule (neurotic reactivity).

Assertion and Irrational Ideas

Because of the reciprocal inhibiting relationship of assertion and anxiety it might be useful to examine the physiological and cognitive mechanisms that prevent assertive responses from occurring as a reactive response to noxious or ambivalent stimulus situations. Gellhorn and Loofbourrow (1963) demonstrate the inhibition of an assertive or

reactive response by describing the neurosis as

A strong excitation of the hypothalamus involving activation of both [sympathetic and parasympathetic] autonomic divisions. Behavior patterns are disturbed because patterns of cortical activity are disturbed. (p. 199)

Specifically, assertive (reactive) behavior is inhibited because of a disruption of cortical cognitive activity. As an explanation of neurosis, the Gellhorn and Loofbourrow model resembles remarkably the Rational Emotive Theory outlined by Ellis.

Herein Ellis (1962) demonstrates that the irrational ideas form the basis for emotional disturbance. Ellis explains the process as an ABC theory. A is the environmental event or stimulus and C is the resultant emotional reaction. B is the internalized "self-talk" or interpretation of A. Should B be fundamentally irrational, increments in anxiety and emotional disturbance will be noted. That is to say, the more irrational ideas an individual holds the more anxious and restricted he is in capably and assertively responding to his environment. In this vein, Taft (1968) found a significant relationship between anxiety and irrationality. Similarly, Davies (1970) contributed to the support of Ellis's theory by demonstrating that mental hospital patients and alcoholics possessed more irrational ideas than a normal population.

Accordingly, it would be logical to predict that the more anxious an individual is, the more irrational his ideas will be. Similarly, the antithetical relationship ought also to exist. That is, the less anxious and more assertive an individual is, the more rational his ideas ought to be. Specifically, a significant correlation ought to exist between high scores on the Green Fox Scale (assertion) and high scores on the Adult

Irrational Ideas Inventory (rationality).

Assertion and Authoritarianism

In the same vein, Wolpe discusses the elicitation of assertive responses that the rational individual believes are "his reasonable rights" (1969, p. 20). Lazarus echoes Wolpe's observation by referring to "emotional freedom" as the recognition and expression of each and every affective state" (1971, p. 116). Both theorists suggest that the assertive individual develops an ability to 'size up' the situation and react by using his own judgement rather than appealing to some external authority.

The relationship of authoritarianism and assertion is more clearly defined by Deutsch and Krauss (1964). When referring to performance on the California F Scale, they state that

...people who score high on authoritarianism are more likely to be low class, less educated, less intellectually sophisticated, less liberal, politically more prejudiced, less successful as patients in psychotherapy, more religious, and stricter in their child rearing practices than people who score low on authoritarianism. (p. 163)

Much of the above describes the antithesis of the rational assertive individual. Specifically a significant relationship should exist between high scorers on the Green Fox Scale and low scorers on the California F Scale (authoritarianism).

RELATED SOCIOLOGICAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Introduction

Up to this point, the relationship of specific psychological constructs to the assertion concept have been discussed. However certain sociological and demographic variables are also of use in establishing

the validity of the instrument. Assertion as examined in the discussion that follows should vary in small, but predictable directions with group affiliation with respect to sex, and birth order of individuals.

It will also be appropriate to note that the empirical testing will involve the Green Fox Scale (described in chapter 111) as the measure of assertion.

Passive Counselees and Assertion

Items on the Green Fox Scale are prepared so that they might discriminate between assertive acts that inhibit anxiety, and non-assertive acts that reflect anxiety. It is logical therefore, to assume that individuals who experience difficulty in coping with every day problems seek counseling and are categorized as passive withdrawals by practicing counselors. They should score significantly lower on the Green Fox Scale than the average individual who must assert himself many times throughout the day in coping with various interpersonal situations.

Passive Versus Assertive Nursing Orderly Trainees

In a similar manner to the above comparison, students might be rated as either passive-withdrawns or assertive within a class. This rating might then be statistically analyzed and results noted. Nursing Orderly trainees who were rated high in assertiveness should score high on the Green Fox Scale. Moreover, a significant difference in scores on the Green Fox Scale ought to exist between the group of trainees rated as high asserters when compared with the group rated as low asserters.

Sex and Assertion

Although there is little empirical evidence for assuming a distinction in assertiveness between males and females, a logical argument can be

constructed demonstrating that males in fact are more assertive than females. Social stereotypes show the male role as being the aggressive provider, contrasted with the passive role of woman. On many levels of social interaction the male must show initiative and leadership when interacting with the female sex. Recently as a reaction to this socialization process various writers (Greer, 1972; Friedan, 1963; de Beauvoir, 1952) attempt to revolutionize the passive non-assertive role of woman. As a result, it could be argued that a valid scale of assertion ought to be able to discriminate between responses of women and men.

Birth Order And Assertiveness

In the same manner that the sex role an individual learns is a determinant of personality, other variables such as birth order might also demonstrate an influence. That is, because of differences in ordinal position the individual is provided with experiences different from his brothers and/or sisters. Such a view would be compatible with the work of Lundin (1969) who presents a learning theory of personality development.

When first borns are compared to latter borns the results indicate that first borns demonstrate more anxiety (Schracter, 1959), more submissiveness (Sampson, 1965) and more dependency needs (Sears, 1951). These results indicate a less assertive propensity for first borns when compared to latter borns.

In hypothesizing a relationship between assertion and ordinal position, some restraint might be advisable. Fox (1969) presented the argument that pointed out projects "employing more objective measures of personality variables have failed to report any significant relationships [with birth order]" (p. 31). With this caution in mind, it is

hypothesized that first borns should be less assertive than latter borns.

HYPOTHESES

In the foregoing, many hypotheses have been inferred. Those that will be empirically tested are listed below. It will be recalled that the Green Fox Scale was so constructed that low scores indicate non-assertion and high scores indicate assertion. The basic general hypothesis which includes the specific hypotheses is that: The non-assertion - assertion continuum underlying the Green Fox Scale will occur in a construct validation network.

1. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in neurotic reactivity than will low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
2. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in anxiety than will be low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
3. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be less irrational in their belief system than will low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
4. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in authoritarianism than will low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
5. The Green Fox Scale scores of clients categorized by a counselor as non-assertive will be less than the Green Fox Scale scores of a normal population.
6. The Green Fox Scale scores of Nursing Orderly trainees rated as low asserters by their instructress will be less than scores on the Green Fox Scale by those trainees rated as high asserters.
7. Scores of men on the Green Fox Scale will be higher than scores

of women on the Green Fox Scale.

8. Scores on the Green Fox Scale of first borns will be less than will the Green Fox Scale scores of latter borns.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTION OF THE GREEN FOX SCALE

Item Preparation

The works of Joseph Wolpe (1958, 1969) which related to his particular conception of assertion were reviewed. In addition, the author corresponded with Dr. Wolpe in order to obtain further clarification and definition. Each statement made concerning assertion was noted. Subsequently, each of the noted characteristics (for example, the inverse relationship to and effect of assertion on anxiety) served as the basis for creating an item for the Green Fox Scale. Each test item was so structured as to allow for choice between an assertive, a neutral and a passive anxiety response. For example,

At your job, you are overdue for a raise.

Would you:

- A. ask your boss for a raise? (ASSERTIVE RESPONSE)
- B. say nothing, feeling upset that your boss does not come forward offering you a raise? (PASSIVE ANXIETY RESPONSE)
- C. give subtle hints about wanting a raise? (NEUTRAL RESPONSE)

A pool of 75 items of the above type was prepared. To insure readability of the items down to and inclusive of the grade eight reading level, a class of grade eight level adult students were asked to review the items and directions. Their reactions and comments served as an empirical test of readability and as a basis for revision and/or rejection of items.

Content Validity

Following this procedure the items were submitted to three judges familiar with Wolpe's concepts. Items which the judges were not able to

clearly differentiate as the assertive, the passive anxiety and the neutral response were rejected. Any item that was questioned or disagreed with by the judges was rejected. An initial version of the Green Fox Scale was then prepared, consisting of what appeared to be the most content specific items. There were 40 items in this first version, with each of the stems (assertive, passive anxious, and neutral) randomly presented. Appendix B contains a copy of this initial 40 item version of the Green Fox Scale.

Weighting Procedure For Items On The Green Fox Scale

The directions on the scale called for responses to be recorded as a forced choice of three alternatives on a separate answer sheet. The scoring procedure established weightings of 3, 2, and 1 - from strong assertive through neutral to passive anxious responses. A high score, thus, would reflect a high degree of assertion.

Item Analysis Procedure

The initial version of the Green Fox Scale was administered to 115 individuals. These persons, as far as practicable, proportionately represented the age, sex and socio-economic status of Edmonton as determined by the Blishen (1958, pp. 519-531) scale. A more detailed description of this sample is provided in a subsequent chapter.

The results of an item-total correlational analysis performed on the responses of these Ss are depicted in Table 1.

TABLE 1

ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATIONS FOR THE
40-ITEM INITIAL GREEN FOX SCALE (N=115)

ITEM NO.	ITEM- TOTAL r.	ITEM NO.	ITEM- TOTAL r.	ITEM NO.	ITEM- TOTAL r.	ITEM No.	ITEM- TOTAL r.
1	.157	11	.105	21	.478	31	.036
2	.271	12	.390	22	.396	32	.225
3	.094	13	.299	23	.468	33	.294
4	.449	14	.220	24	.252	34	.256
5	.535	15	.342	25	.531	35	.056
6	.397	16	.381	26	.149	36	.202
7	.087	17	.292	27	.408	37	.212
8	.194	18	.263	28	.357	38	.071
9	.377	19	.441	29	.536	39	.053
10	.115	20	.193	30	.263	40	.037

Final Item Selection

A three criteria procedure was employed to select 28 items for the final version of the scale. The first consideration was that the correlation between the item and the total score be between the .19 and the .55 range. Secondly, in order to qualify for selection, the mean response rating for the item had to fall between 1.5 and 2.5. A third qualification was that the standard deviation of the response rating had to be or exceed .4 units.

The rationale behind these criteria are well established (Cattell, 1965; Bass and Berg, 1959; Nunnally, 1967). In attempting to sample across role and personality factors, many stimulus situations were considered in item content. Moreover, many interrelated behavioral tendencies indicative of the degree to which an assertive act was required formed the basis of the study. Thus the homogeneity factor (the extent to

which the item measures what the whole test measures) could not be too high, lest, the broad concept of assertion be confused with some specific behavior. Nevertheless a fairly broad range of correlations of items with the total would still be justified. For example, item 20 on the initial version of the test samples a rather extreme aspect of assertion. Specifically, it was constructed to test an extreme lack of assertion in a situation where a minimum of assertion is required. Thus it should correlate rather minimally with assertion as a whole. Table 1 reveals a correlation of .193 for item 20 with the total 40 item Green Fox Scale.

- Item 40-20. Your evening meal is interrupted by a door-to-door salesman who "just wants a moment of your time to show his new product". Do you:
- A. have him/her come back in an hour even though you are not really interested in the product?
 - B. tell him/her that you are not interested and return to your meal?
 - C. listen politely, getting very upset at the thought of a cold meal?

On the other hand, an item such as item 29 on the initial form which contains content which tests a high degree of assertion in a situation involves a considerable amount of organismic excitation. The correlation of this item with the total test was .536. Because of the greater degree of assertion implicit in the content of item 29 the high correlation is most acceptable.

- Item 40-29. Someone whom you like has hurt your feelings. Do you:
- A. remain silent in order not to show you have been hurt?
 - B. try to hurt them back?
 - C. let that person know how they affected you?

The rationale behind the use of the mean and the standard deviation limits on the scale weightings resides in the extent to which they reflect

the normal probability curve. That is, assuming that the behavior depicted by the item is normally distributed, the mean and standard deviation of the weightings should reflect this factor. Table 9 in Appendix C depicts the means and standard deviations of the responses for each of the items on the initial 40 item test.

The Final 28-Item Green Fox Scale

Accordingly, the final 28-item version of the Green Fox Scale (see Appendix D) was prepared and administered to 85 Ss who were high school level adults attending a retraining program at the Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton). The results of an item total correlation analysis for the final 28-item version of the Green Fox Scale appears as Table 10 in Appendix E.

Scoring the 28-Item Green Fox Scale

Subjects are asked to read each question and choose among 3 alternatives. They must check the response that indicates what they might most likely do in each situation. Each alternative A, B, or C is weighted as 3, 2, or 1 depending on how assertive the individual is. High scores on the total test reflect high assertiveness in the testee. The scoring key for the final 28-item Green Fox Scale is presented in Appendix F.

Validity Considerations

The content validity of the instrument was established:

1. through adherence to the specific content described by Wolpe.
2. through acceptance only, of the items concerning which 3 competent judges reached perfect disposition according to Wolpian reciprocal inhibition (assertion) theory.
3. through the use of item total correlation analysis.

The concurrent validity and the construct validity (which will be discussed at length in succeeding chapters) was established:

1. through the comparison of scores obtained by criterion groups (Nursing Orderly students, counselees, first born Ss, latter born Ss, male Ss, female Ss).
2. through the use of the validated scales of related psychological constructs listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2

PSYCHOLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY

TEST	VARIABLE	SOURCE
1. Willoughby Personality Schedule	Neurotic Reactivity	Willoughby, 1932
2. IPAT Anxiety Scale (Self Analysis Form)	Anxiety	Cattell, 1957
3. California F-Scale	Authoritarianism	Adorno et al., 1950
4. Adult Irrational Idea Inventory (AII Inventory)	Irrationality	Davies, 1970

Reliability Estimates

Samples were drawn from the two groups and tested and retested over a 3 week interval. The estimate of test-retest reliability obtained by this procedure was .79. A further calculation of reliability was derived by determining split-half correlations using the Pearson Product-Moment r . This latter procedure yielded a result of .66. Evidence of

internal consistency or homogeneity utilizing Kuder Richardson 20 (KR-20) procedure is high, .93. The N was 119 and consisted of those groups listed in Table 3.

TABLE 3

SUBJECTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE
TEST-RETEST CONSISTENCY STUDY

GROUP	NUMBER IN SAMPLE
Adults in Upgrading Program at the Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton)	75
Nursing Orderly Trainees	44
TOTAL	119

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURE AND DESIGN

The Samples

There were two types of samples examined in this study. First, was a general sample used to help establish content validity. Second, were specific criterion groups that were tested and rated with various instruments in order to establish construct validity. Each type of sample is discussed in greater detail below.

Content Validity Sample

The first sample consisted of 115 individuals, 51 males and 64 females. These persons ranged in age from 18 to 60 and had an average age of 29.30 years. As far as practicable these persons represented the age, sex and socio-economic status of Edmonton as determined by the Blishen (1958) scale. This scale was developed with consideration given to the number of years of educational preparation for the occupation, and the responsibility required by the position. The Blishen Scale provides values for different occupations ranging from 32 to 90 and is distributed with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Elley (1961, pp. 69-70) found a mean of 51.63 and a standard deviation of 9.35 when using a randomly selected sample of over 400 Edmontonians. When the sample used in the present study was rated using the Blishen Scale, it was found that the mean was 51.45 and the standard deviation was 10.46. These figures closely resemble those found by Blishen and the random sample of Edmontonians rated by Elley. It was concluded that this sample was socio-economically representative of the population of Edmonton.

Construct Validity Samples

Described below are the two groups of students in attendance at the Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton) that provided the bulk of the construct validity data.

Sociology 20 Students

This sample consisted of 89 adult students enrolled in 3 high school level sociology classes. These classes were originally established in the school in order to facilitate the learning of "life skills" and improvement of interpersonal relations. The sample was composed of 76 females and 13 males. Participation in the three testing sessions was voluntary and occurred during regular class time.

Nursing Orderly Trainees

This sample consisted of 46 male students in two classes - junior and senior. The senior students had experienced approximately five months more training than their junior counterparts. The junior class attended the Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton) three days a week for theory sessions and spent two days a week in a hospital for field experience. For the senior class, the sequence was reversed with students receiving two days theory instruction per week alternated with three days field experience. Testing sessions involved two sessions for each class, and participation was voluntary.

INSTRUMENTS

The Willoughby Personality Schedule

This questionnaire is a self-administering paper-and-pencil test reported by Wolpe (1958) to be a highly significant indication of neuroticism

in a variety of common social situations. That is,

...when one is fearful at the prospect of displaying before an audience an activity one can otherwise do well, the fear arises in relation to no objective threat" (p. 107).

Situations of this sort are tapped by questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23. Positive answers to these questions indicate a high degree of neurotic reactivity. Positive answers to the remaining questions indicate an 'emotional sensitivity' other than unadaptive anxiety. Each question is answered by responding to a five point scale with values of 0 through to 4. The 0 choice indicates a negative response, while the other scores of 1 through 4 indicate increasing degrees of neurotic reactivity. The highest score possible on the questionnaire is one hundred. Extensive clinical use of the Willoughby attests to the validity and reliability of this instrument. Willoughby (1934) and Harvey (1932), discovered that fifty percent of university students scored above thirty while seventy-five percent scored above twenty. Wolpe (1958, p. 110) demonstrates that the Willoughby schedule can significantly (.001 level) distinguish between neurotics and normals. Taft (1968) reports a relationship between irrationality as measured by Zingle's Irrational Ideas Inventory and three established indices of anxiety, The Willoughby Schedule, The Maudsley Personality Inventory, and The Revised Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (p. 31). Further documentation of the effectiveness of the Willoughby Schedule as a measure of anxiety is available from its extensive clinical use in conjunction with Wolpian methods in psychotherapy. For example, Payne (1970) found significant decrements in anxiety as measured by the Willoughby and other indices, after a treatment by relaxation therapy.

The IPAT Anxiety Scale

Another instrument that purportedly measures anxiety is Cattell's (1963) IPAT Anxiety Scale. Identified as a single factor through the use of factor analysis, anxiety is defined as comprising the qualities of tension, irritability, lack of self confidence, unwillingness to take risks, tremor and various psychosomatic signs (Cattell, 1957; p. 7). Split-half reliability is reported in the order of .84 for normal adults (N=240) and .91 for a mixed normal and pathological population (1963, pp. 7-9). Validity of the scales is reported by the author in terms of construct validity. That is, Cattell's method of factor analysis largely determines the validity of his construct. He also relates interjudge agreement of two psychiatrists who interviewed subjects. In addition, he reports a 1959 study by Guilford that provides construct validity in the .85 to .90 range.

The Adult Irrational Ideas Inventory

Fox and Davies (1971) constructed and validated a 60 item instrument designed to tap Ellis's eleven irrational ideas. Based on Zingle's (1965) version for adolescents, an adult form was created. Much of the construct validation procedures involved the correlation (.70) of testees responses to the adolescent inventory (I-I) and the adult (AII-Inventory) version. In addition, construct validity was demonstrated using distinct criterion groups (alcoholics and mental hospital patients) in comparison to a normal population of a large western Canadian city. Reliability using two estimates is reported from .74 to .78.

The California F-Scale

The California F-Scale originally created to measure pre-disposition to Fascism (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford, 1950) was

later viewed as an instrument that measures authoritarianism (Titus and Hollander, 1957). In the original validation of the test, constructs that were hypothetical correlates included

...conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, anti-intraception, superstition and stereotype, power and toughness, destructiveness and cynicism, projectivity and sex (Christie and Jahods, 1954, p. 133).

In the 29-item form used for the present study subjects are asked to respond by indicating the degree to which they disagree (-3, -2, -1) or the degree to which they agree (+1, +2, +3) to each item. In order to yield only positive scores, a constant of 116 is added to the summed values of the test. Test-retest reliability has been reported from the .85 to .91 range (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 258).

Personal Data Collection

A confidential information section was provided on the upper part of the Green Fox Scale answer sheet (see Appendix G). In this space, subjects were asked to provide their name, age, sex, occupation, number of older brothers and sisters, and number of younger brothers and sisters.

During the testing of the general sample where occupation was an important variable for purposes of calculating Blishen Scale statistics (see Chapter 111), spouse's or parent's employment was accepted for subjects who had no legitimate occupation of their own. During the collection of data for the construct validity sample, subjects were asked to omit 'occupation'.

INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

Participation by all subjects in this project was voluntary. Administration and scoring of the instruments was done as described in their

respective manuals and elsewhere herein. A rating scale of assertion (see Appendix H) was developed and completed by the Nursing Orderly Trainee Instructress. In addition, all subjects in the construct validity samples were cross checked with counseling records and the most non-assertive individuals (rated by counselor) were pooled into one sample group. An equal sized group was randomly drawn from the remaining subjects.

All test and rating scale results were then put on IBM data cards. Subsequently, computer calculations were made generating item analysis, correlations, and one tail 't' tests of means.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Essentially, the validity of the Green Fox Scale was dependent upon three types of criteria. First, the relationship of the Green Fox Scale and established personality measures was examined. Second, the Green Fox Scale scores of specific criterion groups that could logically be argued to hold differing levels of assertion was examined. Third, variables other than those inferred in Wolpian theory that might account for test variance were examined. In this category sex and birth order were selected for study.

For purposes of examining the results and conclusions, hypotheses relating to each of these criterion areas will be first restated, followed by pertinent discussion.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO PERSONALITY CONSTRUCTS

1. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in neurotic reactivity than will low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
2. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in anxiety than will be low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
3. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be less irrational in their belief system than will be low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
4. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale will be lower in authoritarianism than will be low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.

Results

Calculation of Pearson Product-Moment correlations were undertaken with the view to deriving empirical support for each of the given hypotheses. Results depicted in Table 4 indicate significant correlations in the predicted direction for each of the hypothesis with the exception of that relating to authoritarianism.

Conclusions

The conclusions justified as a result of these analysis are:

- a. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale are less neurotically reactive than low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
- b. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale are less anxious than low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
- c. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale have fewer irrational ideas than do low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.
- d. High scorers on the Green Fox Scale do not differ in authoritarianism from low scorers on the Green Fox Scale.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 have been confirmed. Hypothesis 4, which contained the prediction that a negative relationship exists between the authoritarianism personality construct and assertion was not supported.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO CRITERION GROUPS

5. Green Fox Scale scores of clients categorized by a counselor as non-assertive will be less than Green Fox Scale scores of a normal population.
6. Green Fox Scale scores of Nursing Orderly trainees rated as 'low asserters' by their instructress will be less than scores on the Green Fox Scale by those trainees rated as 'high asserters'.

TABLE 4

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE GREEN FOX SCALE
AND VARIOUS PERSONALITY CONSTRUCTS

PERSONALITY INSTRUMENT	N	MEAN	S.D.	CORRELATION WITH GREEN FOX SCALE	P
WILLOUGHBY PERSONALITY SCHEDULE	135	35.56	15.49	-.49	.0001
IPAT ANXIETY SCALE	135	34.90	12.95	-.35	.0001
AII-INVENTORY	135	194.80	21.24	.33	.0001
CALIFORNIA F-SCALE	135	119.58	19.24	.03	.647

Results Related to Counselor Categorized Clients

To empirically test Hypothesis 5, the combined sample (N=135) was examined and cross checked with records at the Counseling Department, Alberta Vocational Center (Edmonton). From this examination, a counselor familiar with these students selected 17 non-assertive clients. A random sample of equal size of the remaining students was then generated. IBM data cards were prepared and submitted for computer analysis. A 't' test was performed with the results depicted in Table 5.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF SCORES ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE
OF PASSIVE COUNSELING CLIENTS TO A RANDOMLY SELECTED GROUP

CATEGORIZED GROUPS	N	MEAN	S.D.	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	T	P (one tail)
CATEGORIZED PASSIVE	17	58.29	5.14			
				32	-2.356	.012
RANDOM SAMPLE	17	62.88	6.16			

On the Green Fox Scale, a significant difference in the predicted direction exists between non-assertive clients and normals. This difference between means equals 4.59 units.

Results Of Nursing Orderly Trainees Rated On Assertion

As previously stated, the Nursing Orderly trainee sample was administered all of the instruments as well as evaluated on an assertion rating scale (see Appendix H) by their instructress. Scores were placed on IBM

data cards. Subsequently, computer calculations were performed yielding a significant ($p=.007$) positive correlation of .40. In addition, on the basis of the rating scale, trainees were divided into two groups - low asserters and high asserters. The two groups were compared utilizing a 't' test of significance with the results illustrated in Table 6.

TABLE 6

RATED LOW ASSERTERS VERSUS HIGH ASSERTERS						
RATED GROUPS	N	MEAN	S.D.	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	T	P (one tail)
LOW ASSERTERS	21	62.14	8.15			
				42	-2.81	.004
HIGH ASSERTERS	23	67.65	4.51			

A real difference between the means of the two groups was demonstrated with a size of 5.51 units or almost one standard deviation of the entire Nursing Orderly trainee sample (6.92). Thus Hypothesis 6 was supported.

HYPOTHESES RELATED TO OTHER POSSIBLE SOURCES OF VARIANCE

Results Related to Male Versus Female Responses

7. Scores of men on the Green Fox Scale will be higher than scores of women on the Green Fox Scale.

In order to test the above hypothesis the general validation sample (N=135) was divided into 59 male subjects and 76 female subjects. The two groups were then compared by the computer using a 't' test of significance.

Results of this procedure are demonstrated in Table 7.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF THE MEANS OF SCORES BY MEN
AND BY WOMEN ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE

GROUPS	N	MEAN	S.D.	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	T	P (one tail)
MALE	59	64.58	6.38			
				133	3.40	.0004
FEMALE	76	60.89	6.13			

A significant difference in the means (3.69 units) of males and females was noted in the predicted direction. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 which stated that scores of men would be higher than scores of women on the Green Fox Scale found empirical support.

Results Relating To Birth Order And Assertion

In order to test the hypothesis that

8. Scores on the Green Fox Scale of first borns will be less than will the Green Fox Scale scores of latter borns.

the general sample was divided into two groups - first borns, and latter borns (those who were raised with an older sibling). Results of their responses were submitted for computer analysis using a 't' test to determine the significance of difference between the means of the two groups. The outcome of this procedure is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF FIRST BORN TO LATTER BORN
ON THE GREEN FOX SCALE

GROUPS	N	MEAN	S.D.	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	T	P (one tail)
FIRST BORN	41	63.59	6.99			
				133	1.283	.1008
LATTER BORN	94	62.03	6.23			

Hypothesis 8 must be rejected because in fact, the difference in means was not significant at a satisfactory criterion level (.05). Moreover, the difference in means was in the opposite direction from that originally predicted.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

DISCUSSION

Assertion And The Green Fox Scale

Assertion as defined by Joseph Wolpe has been shown to be objectively measurable. Several established psychological constructs were found to co-vary with assertion. Typically, people who assert or 'stand up' for themselves to a great extent are less tense, more relaxed, less likely to 'take things the wrong way' and more likely to be rational in interpersonal situations than is an individual who typically does not assert himself. However, from the results of the study, it would be inappropriate to conclude that a person who scores high on the Green Fox Scale necessarily is less anxious or indeed is more rational than others. Rather, the results indicate a 'tendency' for such relationships to exist. It is not necessary to re-examine these relationships at length as they have already been discussed in Chapter II. Nevertheless, further examination of theory and the results of this project are justified.

In an attempt to empirically validate the existence of various postulated constructs by personality theorists, exponents of the behaviorist school (Wolpe and Rachman, 1960; Lundin, 1969) operationalize definitions in order to lead to empirically valid hypothesis testing. As a result, learning theory based on the scientific method can more pragmatically explain the acquisition of behavior patterns that are collectively

termed personality. From this perspective, the significantly different scores of men and women on the Green Fox Scale are not surprising.

The results of this project are also interesting from another point of view. Empirical evidence can attest to the fact that the Green Fox Scale can discriminate between assertive and non-assertive individuals as rated by instructors and counselors in the helping professions. Of particular significance is the manner in which the Green Fox Scale related to the evaluation of an individual's assertiveness by a counselor. The underlying assumption herein is that the counselor is a professionally trained 'expert' in the evaluation of human behavior, although perhaps less socially accepted than a medically trained psychiatrist.

Unsupported Hypothesis

The rejection of the hypothesis relating authoritarianism to assertion requires some explanation. As previously quoted in Chapter IV, Christie and Jahoda (1954), enumerated among others "authoritarian aggression ...power and toughness, [and] destructiveness" (p. 133) as correlates of authoritarianism. It is possible that these constructs singly or in combination correlate positively with assertion as defined by Wolpe (1958). That is, assertion is the elicitation of "more or less aggressive behavior, but also to ...[engage in]... the outward expression of ...other non-anxious feelings" (Wolpe, 1958, p. 114). Should such a positive relationship exist, then it should logically follow that the originally predicted negative relationship be negated. On the other hand, further examination and validation of the Green Fox Scale might demonstrate a weakness of the instrument.

The second hypothesis that was rejected concerned the relationship of birth order to scores on the Green Fox Scale. It might be remembered (Chapter II) that the hypothesized relationship was established with some hesitation in the light of the reservation expressed by Fox (1969).

IMPLICATIONS

The Green Fox Scale And Counseling

The role that the Green Fox Scale could play in counseling at first glance appears to be obvious. It would be a useful validated instrument that could be used to assess the effectiveness of assertive training. However, the writer first recommends the establishment of norms and further validation procedures before the Green Fox Scale is so used.

The Green Fox Scale And Research

Further validation procedures might examine any hypothesized differences in scores on the Green Fox Scale between mental hospital patients, used car salesmen, practicing surgeons, business executives and a normal population of a large city. In addition, variables such as intelligence and age might be scrutinized.

During the course of this project, the writer became aware of aspects of assertiveness that relate to constructs espoused by such theorists as Maslow - self-actualization (1962); Jourard - transparency (1971); Shostrom - self-actualization as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (1963).

Finally, The Green Fox Scale might be used in research where an estimate of non-assertion through to assertion is required. Such was the situation with Hay (1970), who found that the Bass Social Acquiescence Scale was "questionable as an index of non-assertion" (p. 34).

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Adorno, T. w., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else and Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Bach, G. and Deutsch, R. Pairing. New York: Avon Books, 1970.
- Bach, G. and Wyden, P. The intimate enemy. New York: Avon Books, 1968.
- Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. Toronto, Ontario: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Bass, B. M. and Berg, I. A. (Eds.) Objective approaches to personality assessment. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1959.
- Bean, K. L. Desentization, behavior rehearsal, then results: A preliminary report on a new procedure. Behavior Therapy, 1970, 1, 4, 542-545.
- Bergen, A. E. The evaluation of therapeutic outcomes. In Bergin, A. E. and Garfield, S. (Eds.) Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. Toronto, Ontario: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- Blishen, B. R. The construction and use of an occupational class scale. Canadian Journal of Economic and Political Science, 1958, 24, 519-531.
- Cattell, R. B. Personality and motivation structure and measurement. New York: World Book, 1957.
- Cattell, R. B. The scientific analysis of personality. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1965.
- Cattell, R. B. and Scheier, I. H. Handbook for the IPAT Anxiety Scale Questionnaire. Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1963.
- Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (Eds.) Studies in the scope and method of the authoritarian personality. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.
- Cronbach, L. J. and Meehl, P. E. Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 281-302.
- Davies, R. Relationship of irrational ideas to emotional disturbance. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.
- de Beauvoir, S. The second sex. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952.

- Deutsch, M. and Krauss, R. M. Theories in social psychology. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Edwards, N. B. Case conference: Assertive training in a case of homosexual pedophilia. American Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 1, 55-63.
- Elley, W. B. A comparative analysis of the socio-economic bias in selected intelligence tests. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.
- Ellis, A. Reason and emotion in psychotherapy. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1962.
- Eysenck, H. J. Sense and nonsense in psychology. London: Penguin Books, 1964.
- Fox, E. E. A life orientation scale: Correlates of biophilia and necrophilia. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University Of Alberta, 1969.
- Fox, E. E. and Davies, R. L. Test your rationality. Rational Living, 1971, 5, 2, 23-25.
- Friedan, B. The feminine mystique. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1963.
- Gellhorn, E. and Loofbourrow, G. N. Emotions and emotional disorder: A neurophysiological study. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Greer, G. The female eunuch. London: Paladin, 1971.
- Harvey, O. L. Concerning the Thrustone "Personality Schedule". Journal of Social Psychology, 1932, 3, 200.
- Hay, I. Group assertion therapy and the resolution of anxiety. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1971.
- Knight, R. P. The relationship of psychoanalysis to psychiatry. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1945, 6, 777-782.
- Lazarus, A. A. The treatment of a sexually inadequate man. Case studies in behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Lazarus, A. A. Behavior therapy and beyond. Toronto, Ontario: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

- Lundin, R. Personality: A behavioral analysis. Toronto, Ontario: The MacMillan Co., 1969.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Mitchell, R. A psychological approach to the treatment of migraine. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1971, 119, 552, 533-534.
- Nannally, R. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Payne, K. An evaluation of relaxation in anxiety resolution. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1970.
- Piaget, G. W. and Lazarus, A. A. The use of rehearsal-desensitization. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1969, 6, 264-266.
- Rogers, E. R. On becoming a person; a therapists view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Sampson, E. E. The study of ordinal position: Antecedents and outcomes. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research. New York: Academic Press, 1965, Vol. 2.
- Schraeter, S. The psychology of affiliation. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1959.
- Seitz, F. C. A behavior modification approach to depression: A case study. Psychology, 1971, 8, 1, 58-63.
- Shostrom, E. Personal Orientation Inventory. San Diego, Calif.: Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1963.
- Standards for educational and psychological tests and manuals. Wash., D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1966.
- Stevenson, I. and Wolpe, J. Recovery from sexual deviations through overcoming non-sexual neurotic responses. Behavior Therapy. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Stollak, G. E., Guernsey, B. G. Jr., and Rothberg, M. (Eds.) Psychotherapy research: Selected readings. Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNally, 1966.
- Sturm, I. E. Implications of role playing methodology for clinical procedure. Behavior Therapy, 1971, 2, 1, 88-96.
- Taft, L. M. A study to determine the relationship of anxiety to irrational ideas. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Alberta, 1968.

- Titus, H. E. and Hollander, E. P. The California F-Scale in psychological research: 1950-1955. Psychological Bulletin, 1957, 54, 1, 47-64.
- Ullman, L. P. and Krasner, L. A psychological approach to abnormal behavior. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Willoughby, R. R. Norms for the Clarke-Thurstone Inventory. Journal of Social Psychology, 1934, 5, 91.
- Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Press, 1969.
- Wolpe, J. and Rachman, S. Psychoanalytic evidence: A critique based on Freud's treatment of Little Hans. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1960, 130, 135-148.
- Zingle, H. W. A rational therapy approach to counselling under-achievers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1965.

A P P E N D I C E S

A P P E N D I X A

A P P E N D I X B

THE GREEN FOX SCALE

Directions: Following are questions about how you would act in certain situations. Look at each question and fill in the space of the item on the answer sheet that most closely describes how you would behave, not how you think you would like to react. Your answer must show how you would actually behave in such a circumstance. There are no right or wrong answers to this scale.

Example: While at work/school your boss/teacher stops at your place to watch you work. Do you:

- A. stop working and get very upset because it bothers you to have someone watch you working?
- B. chat with your boss/teacher while you do your work?
- C. do your work the same as always?

Alright now, decide which one of the three ideas best describes how you would really act. Write down the letter of your answer in the space given on the answer sheet. Remember do not write down what you think you would like to do, write down what you would most likely do in each case.

1. Your friend who had wronged you has come over to apologize. Would you:
 - A. forgive him, but let him know how much he had upset you?
 - B. tell him to forget it?
 - C. change the subject each time he comes close to apologizing because the situation still really upsets you?

2. Most of the group goes for a beverage after work on Friday. Would you:
 - A. go, and pretend you are having a good time because you are afraid to get your co-workers mad at you?
 - B. go, but show your reluctance?
 - C. not go, because you are not interested?

3. While at work, you need help to complete a particular task. As it happens, everyone else is busy. An hour later your supervisor comes by demanding to know why the task is not finished. Would you:
 - A. say nothing, resenting your superior because he cannot see for himself the difficulties you encountered?
 - B. explain that you had no available assistance?
 - C. apologize, and then explain?

4. At your job, you are overdue for a raise. Would you:
 - A. ask your boss for a raise?
 - B. say nothing, feeling upset that your boss does not come forward offering you a raise?
 - C. give subtle hints about wanting a raise?

5. This time you have really made an effort on a project and feel very pleased with the result. Your boss/teacher comes and criticizes one little part of your work. Would you:
 - A. object, directing his/her attention to the rest of the work?
 - B. get upset by the criticism, but say nothing to your boss/teacher?
 - C. be indifferent to his/her comments?

6. Upon receiving disrespectful service from the salesperson at a department store, do you:
 - A. ask to speak to his/her manager in order to complain?
 - B. ignore the salesperson and make your purchase anyway?
 - C. quickly leave that department?

7. A friend of yours wishes to purchase a personal possession that you really do not wish to part with. Do you:
 - A. state a price which is much more than the item is worth?
 - B. tell him/her that you will not sell?
 - C. sell it to him/her because you really cannot say no?
8. While at a party, you notice how attractively the hostess has prepared the food. Do you:
 - A. not show your appreciation because you would feel embarrassed?
 - B. tell her how nice the food looks?
 - C. eat a lot of food, in this way showing your appreciation?
9. You are in a theatre, watching a show. Two people in front of you are talking loud enough to distract you from following the program. Do you:
 - A. start talking yourself, hoping they will take the hint?
 - B. ask them to stop talking?
 - C. say nothing, and put up with it?
10. A very eager friend wants to help you, even though you would like to work on your favorite project alone. Would you:
 - A. let him/her help out with something little?
 - B. let him/her take over, resenting his/her intrusion, but afraid to decline an offer of help?
 - C. ask him/her not to help?
11. You bought a sweater at a store. Upon getting it home you find a hole in the material. Would you:
 - A. return it for one without a flaw?
 - B. buy thread and get upset as you try to repair it?
 - C. complain about the poor quality of the store?
12. While standing in a line-up to get into a theatre, a person pushes in ahead of you. Do you:
 - A. get upset about it but do nothing?
 - B. grumble about it to a friend, but nothing else?
 - C. tell the person to step to the back of the line?
13. Your friend embarrassed you in public. Would you:
 - A. try to embarrass him/her?
 - B. try not to let him/her know that you are upset?
 - C. let him/her know of your embarrassment?

14. You have agreed to meet your friend at a certain place. He/she is a half hour late. Do you:
- A. wait for an explanation and accept any reasonable excuse?
 - B. say nothing but are upset because you feel so taken for granted?
 - C. express your annoyance?
15. You have been wrongly charged with a traffic violation. Would you:
- A. pay the fine but feel very unhappy and bitter about your bad luck?
 - B. hire a lawyer and fight the injustice?
 - C. pay the fine because it will be less trouble in the long run?
16. A relative asks you for some help but you are busy with another project. Would you:
- A. let the relative know that you are busy but help him/her anyway?
 - B. let the relative know that you are busy?
 - C. drop everything and help your relative because you do not want him/her to get mad?
17. You are at an art gallery opening and an artist friend indicates enthusiasm about a painting that you do not really like. Would you:
- A. disagree with him/her and tell why?
 - B. say nothing?
 - C. agree with the artist so that he/she will not force you to defend your opinion?
18. You are trying to further your education by going to school. Your teacher gives you a written assignment. Do you:
- A. write the way you want?
 - B. try to get the work done?
 - C. try to write for what the teacher wants, but get upset about it?
19. Your friend wishes to borrow one of your books after you have decided not to loan them out anymore. Would you:
- A. let him/her take the book but indicate that you have no wish to part with it?
 - B. say nothing, but get very upset inside?
 - C. refuse to part with the book?

20. Your evening meal is interrupted by a door-to-door salesman who "just wants a moment of your time to show his new product". Do you:
- A. have him/her come back in an hour even though you are not really interested in the product?
 - B. tell him/her that you are not interested and return to your meal?
 - C. listen politely, getting very upset at the thought of a cold meal?
21. A person with whom you work closely has an annoying personal habit. Would you:
- A. say nothing because you feel that it is none of your business?
 - B. tell him/her what bothers you?
 - C. suffer with it even though the habit really bothers you?
22. While eating dinner with company, you make a bad mistake. Would you:
- A. apologize over and over again, getting more and more upset each time?
 - B. apologize and continue with the meal?
 - C. continue with the meal?
23. Your friend borrows an electric appliance from you. After he/she returns it, you try to use it, but it will not start. Would you:
- A. do nothing but get upset at how your friends mistreat you?
 - B. try to fix the appliance yourself?
 - C. let your friend know that it will not work and ask him/her to repair it?
24. With members of the opposite sex, would you usually:
- A. enjoy talking about yourself, your interests and your work?
 - B. feel nervous talking about yourself and avoid every chance to do so?
 - C. feel indifferent in talking about yourself, your interests, and your work?
25. You feel that your help is taken for granted by someone you like very much. Would you:
- A. continue to help but grumble loud enough to be heard by that person?
 - B. make your feelings known?
 - C. say nothing and do what is expected of you, feeling upset that you are taken for granted?

26. There is a person at work/school that you feel attracted to, and with whom you enjoy yourself. Do you:
- A. share how you feel with that person?
 - B. say nothing, so that you do not ruin a good thing?
 - C. believe that nothing has to be said?
27. You walk into a room full of strangers. Do you:
- A. make an effort to meet some of these new people?
 - B. get upset because you are the centre of attention?
 - C. look for someone you know?
28. You have given your co-worker/classmate twenty-five cents in order that he/she might buy you a beverage for ten cents. Upon returning he/she brings you your beverage but does not give you the change. Do you:
- A. ask for your change?
 - B. say nothing but feel badly about people's dishonesty?
 - C. drink your beverage, and continue with your work?
29. Someone whom you like has hurt your feelings. Do you:
- A. remain silent in order not to show that you have been hurt?
 - B. try to hurt them back?
 - C. let that person know how they affected you?
30. When you are feeling ill, do you:
- A. do nothing, but worry a lot about your health?
 - B. take a few aspirins and go to bed?
 - C. usually see your doctor?
31. Someone you know well, is always nagging you to behave in a particular manner. Do you:
- A. shut out his/her voice?
 - B. try to obey, feeling angry inside about the control he/she has over you?
 - C. fight back by raising your voice and/or criticize his/her behavior?
32. When you take an examination do you usually:
- A. feel a little tense but very alert?
 - B. get upset and forget what you had studied?
 - C. feel indifferent and do what you know and leave out what you do not know?

33. You are invited for dinner to a friend's house. The hostess has unknowingly prepared a meal in which the main course is food that you do not like to eat. Do you:
- A. tell the hostess of your dislike?
 - B. pretend that it is delicious?
 - C. not eat that food?
34. The week before you had agreed to go out with a friend to a movie. Now however, you have a headache and would really prefer not to go out. Do you:
- A. tell your friend that you have a headache and will not go out?
 - B. tell your friend you have a headache but go out anyway?
 - C. go out and pretend that everything is all right?
35. You receive a bill for an account you paid two weeks ago, but you did not keep your receipt. Do you:
- A. phone and complain to the store?
 - B. get upset at how big companies try to cheat their customers?
 - C. forget about it, because you will wait for the store to discover their mistake?
36. Your friend tells you how much he liked the favor you did for him. Would you:
- A. thank him and let him know you are happy that he liked it?
 - B. get embarrassed and not say anything?
 - C. nod your head to show him you heard?
37. You have an idea of how you can do your job more easily. Do you:
- A. do your work the same as always, feeling bad that no one will ever like your ideas?
 - B. go and do it your way?
 - C. ask your teacher/supervisor for permission to try the new way?
38. You had an appliance repaired, but when you got it home, it was not working properly. Would you:
- A. do nothing, but get upset at how they cheated you from your money?
 - B. contact the repair shop, explain the problem, and accept any reason they might give?
 - C. contact the repair shop, and have them fix it at no further expense?

39. You promised to pay your account by a certain date, but find that you do not have enough money. Do you:
- A. wait, but get upset because they will not forget about your debt?
 - B. borrow the money from a friend?
 - C. contact the people you owe money to and make new arrangements?
40. You have hurt your friend by something you did. Do you:
- A. send him/her a gift and hope that they will understand?
 - B. get upset and do nothing?
 - C. tell him/her that you are sorry, and that you will try to fix things up?

APPENDIX C

TABLE 9

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM
ON INITIAL FORMS OF THE GREEN FOX SCALE

ITEM NO.	MEAN	S.D.	ITEM NO.	MEAN	S.D.
1	2.49	.52	21	1.97	.79
2	2.77	.56	22	2.87	.45
3	2.37	.54	23	2.23	.68
4	2.55	.76	24	2.33	.75
5	2.01	.88	25	2.17	.96
6	2.07	.66	26	2.24	.68
7	2.97	.23	27	2.48	.57
8	2.89	.41	28	2.17	.69
9	2.29	.96	29	1.88	.99
10	2.31	.58	30	2.34	.66
11	2.90	.37	31	2.15	.78
12	2.25	.76	32	2.13	.85
13	1.77	.95	33	1.56	.75
14	2.23	.58	34	2.30	.82
15	2.16	.71	35	2.67	.53
16	2.29	.60	36	2.89	.39
17	2.70	.55	37	2.30	.55
18	2.11	.64	38	2.90	.31
19	2.33	.63	39	2.87	.41
20	2.77	.58	40	2.97	.23

A P P E N D I X D

THE GREEN FOX SCALE

Directions: Following are questions about how you would act in certain situations. Look at each question and place a check mark (✓) in the space of the item on the answer sheet that most closely describes how you would behave. Your answer must show how you would actually behave and not how you think you would like to react in such a circumstance. There are no right or wrong answers to this scale.

Example: While at work/school your boss/teacher stops at your place to watch you work. Do you:

- A. stop working and get very upset because it bothers you to have someone watch you working?
- B. chat with your boss/teacher while you do your work?
- C. do your work the same as always?

Alright, now decide which one of the three ideas best describes how you would really act. Indicate your response by a check mark in the appropriate space. Remember do not check what you think you would like to do, mark what you would most likely do in each case.

1. At your job, you are overdue for a raise. Would you:
 - A. ask your boss for a raise?
 - B. say nothing, feeling upset that your boss does not come forward offering you a raise?
 - C. give subtle hints about wanting a raise?

2. Upon receiving disrespectful service from the salesperson at a department store, do you:
 - A. ask to speak to his/her manager in order to complain?
 - B. ignore the salesperson and make your purchase anyway?
 - C. quickly leave that department?

3. While at a party, you notice how attractively the hostess has prepared the food. Do you:
 - A. not show your appreciation because you would feel embarrassed?
 - B. tell her how nice the food looks?
 - C. eat a lot of food, in this way showing your appreciation?

4. This time you have really made an effort on a project and feel very pleased with the result. Your boss/teacher comes and criticizes one little part of your work. Would you:
 - A. object, directing his/her attention to the rest of the work?
 - B. get upset by the criticism, but say nothing to your boss/teacher?
 - C. be indifferent to his/her comments?

5. You are in a theatre, watching a show. Two people in front of you are talking loud enough to distract you from following the program. Do you:
 - A. start talking yourself, hoping they will take the hint?
 - B. ask them to stop talking?
 - C. say nothing, and put up with it?

6. Your friend embarrassed you in public. Would you:
 - A. try to embarrass him/her?
 - B. try not to let him/her know that you are upset?
 - C. let him/her know of your embarrassment?

7. You have been wrongly charged with a traffic violation. Would you:
 - A. pay the fine but feel very unhappy and bitter about your bad luck?
 - B. hire a lawyer and fight the injustice?
 - C. pay the fine because it will be less trouble in the long run?

8. While standing in a line-up to get into a theatre, a person pushes in ahead of you. Do you:
- A. get upset about it, but do nothing?
 - B. grumble about it to a friend, but nothing else?
 - C. tell the person to step to the back of the line?
9. You have agreed to meet your friend at a certain place. He/she is a half hour late. Do you:
- A. wait for an explanation and accept any reasonable excuse?
 - B. say nothing but are upset because you feel so taken for granted?
 - C. express your annoyance?
10. A relative asks you for some help but you are busy with another project. Would you:
- A. let the relative know that you are busy but help him/her anyway?
 - B. let the relative know that you are busy?
 - C. drop everything and help your relative because you do not want him/her to get mad?
11. You are at an art gallery opening and an artist friend indicates enthusiasm about a painting that you do not really like. Would you:
- A. disagree with him/her and tell why?
 - B. say nothing?
 - C. agree with the artist so that he/she will not force you to defend your opinion?
12. You are trying to further your education by going to school. Your teacher gives you a written assignment. Do you:
- A. write the way you want?
 - B. try to get the work done?
 - C. try to write for what the teacher wants, but get upset about it?
13. Your friend wishes to borrow one of your books after you have decided not to loan them out anymore. Would you:
- A. let him/her take the book but indicate that you have no wish to part with it?
 - B. say nothing, but get very upset inside?
 - C. refuse to part with the book?
14. Your evening meal is interrupted by a door-to-door salesman who "just wants a moment of your time to show his new product". Do you:
- A. have him/her come back in an hour even though you are not really interested in the product?
 - B. tell him/her that you are not interested and return to your meal?
 - C. listen politely, getting very upset at the thought of a cold meal?

15. A person with whom you work closely has an annoying personal habit. Would you:
- A. say nothing because you feel that it is none of your business?
 - B. tell him/her what bothers you?
 - C. suffer with it even though the habit really bothers you?
16. Your friend borrows an electric appliance from you. After he/she returns it, you try to use it, but it will not start. Would you:
- A. do nothing, but get upset at how your friends mistreat you?
 - B. try to fix the appliance yourself?
 - C. let your friend know that it will not work and ask him/her to repair it.
17. With members of the opposite sex, would you usually:
- A. enjoy talking about yourself, your interests and your work?
 - B. feel nervous talking about yourself and avoid every chance to do so?
 - C. feel indifferent in talking about yourself, your interests, and your work?
18. You feel that your help is taken for granted by someone you like very much. Would you:
- A. continue to help but grumble loud enough to be heard by that person?
 - B. make your feelings known?
 - C. say nothing and do what is expected of you, feeling upset that you are taken for granted?
19. You walk into a room full of strangers. Do you:
- A. look for someone you know?
 - B. get upset because you are the centre of attention?
 - C. make an effort to meet some of these new people?
20. You have given your co-worker/classmate twenty-five cents in order that he/she might buy you a beverage for ten cents. Upon returning he/she brings you your beverage but does not give you the change. Do you:
- A. ask for your change?
 - B. say nothing but feel badly about people's dishonesty?
 - C. drink your beverage, and continue with your work?
21. Someone whom you like has hurt your feelings. Do you:
- A. try to hurt them back?
 - B. remain silent in order not to show that you have been hurt?
 - C. let that person know how they affected you?

22. When you are feeling ill, do you:
- A. do nothing but worry a lot about your health?
 - B. take a few aspirins and go to bed?
 - C. usually see your doctor?
23. When you take an examination do you usually:
- A. feel a little tense but very alert?
 - B. get upset and forget what you had studied?
 - C. feel indifferent and do what you know and leave out what you do not know?
24. You are invited for dinner to a friend's house. The hostess has unknowingly prepared a meal in which the main course is food that you do not like to eat. Do you:
- A. pretend that it is delicious?
 - B. tell the hostess of your dislike?
 - C. not eat that food?
25. The week before you had agreed to go out with a friend to a movie. Now however, you have a headache and would really prefer not to go out. Do you:
- A. tell your friend that you have a headache and will not go out?
 - B. tell your friend you have a headache but go out anyway?
 - C. go out and pretend that everything is all right?
26. Your friend tells you how much he liked the favor you did for him. Would you:
- A. thank him and let him know you are happy that he liked it?
 - B. get embarrassed and not say anything?
 - C. nod your head to show him you heard?
27. You have an idea of how you can do your job more easily. Do you:
- A. do your work the same as always, feeling bad that no one will ever like your ideas?
 - B. go and do it your way?
 - C. ask your teacher/supervisor for permission to try the new way?
28. While eating dinner with company, you make a bad mistake. Would you:
- A. apologize over and over again, getting more and more upset each time?
 - B. apologize and continue with the meal?
 - C. continue with the meal?

APPENDIX E

TABLE 10

ITEM TOTAL CORRELATIONS FOR THE FINAL
28-ITEM VERSION OF THE GREEN FOX SCALE (N=85)

ITEM NO.	ITEM- TOTAL r.	ITEM NO.	ITEM- TOTAL r.
1	.356	15	.363
2	.227	16	.387
3	.066	17	.103
4	.449	18	.607
5	.498	19	.214
6	.293	20	.355
7	.335	21	.507
8	.310	22	.336
9	.304	23	.251
10	.211	24	.398
11	.332	25	.163
12	.131	26	.327
13	.404	27	.195
14	.311	28	.036

A P P E N D I X F

SCORING THE GREEN FOX SCALE

Scoring of the Green Fox Scale follows the assignment of weights as listed below. The most assertive responses are weighted as 3, neutral responses are weighted as 2, and passive non-assertive responses are weighted as 1. The scores for each item are then summed and expressed as a total score.

KEY

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> | 15. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 1</u> |
| 2. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 1</u> | 16. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 3</u> |
| 3. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 2</u> | 17. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 4. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> | 18. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 1</u> |
| 5. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 1</u> | 19. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 3</u> |
| 6. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 3</u> | 20. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 7. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 2</u> | 21. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 3</u> |
| 8. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 3</u> | 22. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 3</u> |
| 9. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 3</u> | 23. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 10. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 1</u> | 24. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 11. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 1</u> | 25. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 1</u> |
| 12. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 1</u> | 26. <u>A 3</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 13. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 1</u> <u>C 3</u> | 27. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 2</u> |
| 14. <u>A 2</u> <u>B 3</u> <u>C 1</u> | 28. <u>A 1</u> <u>B 2</u> <u>C 3</u> |

Total possible score for the Green Fox Scale is 84. At present, no norms are available for the Green Fox Scale.

A P P E N D I X G

THE GREEN FOX SCALE

CONFIDENTIAL DATA SHEET

1. NAME _____
2. AGE _____
3. SEX _____
4. OCCUPATION _____
5. NUMBER OF OLDER BROTHERS AND SISTERS _____
6. NUMBER OF YOUNGER BROTHERS AND SISTERS _____

Place a check mark (✓) in the appropriate space

Example: A ___ B ___ C ___

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 15. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 2. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 16. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 3. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 17. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 4. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 18. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 5. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 19. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 6. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 20. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 7. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 21. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 8. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 22. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 9. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 23. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 10. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 24. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 11. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 25. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 12. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 26. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 13. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 27. A ___ B ___ C ___ |
| 14. A ___ B ___ C ___ | 28. A ___ B ___ C ___ |

A P P E N D I X H

ASSERTION RATING DEVICE

HIGH ASSERTERS

Are those individuals who speak right out, and say what they think. These students generally express all feelings other than nervousness or anxiety. They generally show more aggressive behavior by taking initiative, asking questions, and showing some leadership.

LOW ASSERTERS

Are those individuals who find it extremely difficult to speak out and say what they think. If they do communicate, it is generally as a result of having to respond to direct questioning. If, or when they communicate feelings, it is generally restricted to showing anxiety and or tension. Low asserters seldom behave aggressively by taking initiative, asking questions or showing leadership.

DIRECTION

Circle the Number that most suitably describes how assertive each individual student is. For example:

NAME	RATING SCALE						
	LOW						HIGH
JONES, Tom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SMITH, John	1	2	3	4	5	6	7