

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1978

## The Role of Relaxation and Systematic Desensitization in the Efficacy of Assertiveness Training

Larry J. Carlson  
*Utah State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Carlson, Larry J., "The Role of Relaxation and Systematic Desensitization in the Efficacy of Assertiveness Training" (1978). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 5836.  
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/5836>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



THE ROLE OF RELAXATION AND SYSTEMATIC  
DESENSITIZATION IN THE EFFICACY  
OF ASSERTIVENESS TRAINING

by

Larry J. Carlson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

1978



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks and gratitude is extended to Dr. Michael B. Bertoch for his help and guidance throughout the preparation of this dissertation. A special thanks also is extended to committee member Keith T. Checketts for his assistance with regard to research and statistical methods. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. William R. Dobson, Dr. Elwin C. Nielsen, and Dr. Jay C. Skidmore, committee members.

Acknowledgement and thanks are expressed to Myrlynn Gladfelten for her cooperation and involvement as assertive training instructor for the research project. Special thanks is also extended to Larry Jarvis, Valerie Mead, Tom Atkin, Brian Smith, Lori Peterson, Dean Allen, Gary DeVries, and Rick Moody for their assistance as assistant instructors and/or in the assessment procedures of this research.

Finally, but not least, a special thanks and appreciation is extended to my wife, Kathy, and children for their patience and steadfast support.

LARRY J. CARLSON

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Assertiveness Training . . . . .	8
Relaxation . . . . .	20
Systematic Desensitization . . . . .	24
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	34
Purposes and Objectives. . . . .	34
Hypotheses . . . . .	35
Design, Population and Samplings . . . . .	36
Population and sampling . . . . .	37
Sources of Outcome Data (Instrumentation) . . . . .	38
Rathus Assertiveness Scale. . . . .	39
The Behavioral Performance Test . . . . .	40
Data Collection of Observed Behaviors . . . . .	42
Assessment personnel and procedures . . . . .	42
Apparatus for data collection . . . . .	45
Interrater reliability . . . . .	46

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
The Treatment Procedures . . . . .	46
Basic assertiveness training . . . . .	47
Assertiveness plus systematic desensitization . . . . .	47
Assertiveness training plus cue-controlled relaxation . . . . .	47
Assertiveness training extended . . . . .	48
Summary of Data to be Collected . . . . .	48
Rathus assertiveness scale . . . . .	48
Behavioral performance test . . . . .	49
Statistical Design . . . . .	49
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	51
College Self Expression Scale Comparisons . . . . .	51
Rathus Assertiveness Scale Comparisons . . . . .	52
Comparisons of Behavioral Performance Test Variables . . . . .	53
Interrater Reliability . . . . .	58
V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	59
Results and Implications of Analysis . . . . .	59
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	63
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	65
REFERENCES . . . . .	66
APPENDICES . . . . .	79
APPENDIX A. Rathus Assertiveness Scale . . . . .	80
APPENDIX B. The College Self-Expression Scale . . . . .	83

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
APPENDIX C. Scene Narrations . . . . .	88
APPENDIX D. Rating Instructions for Assertive Content . . . . .	95
APPENDIX E. Rating Scale for Eye Contact and Scene Length . . . . .	118
APPENDIX F. Rating Scale for Assertive Affect . . . . .	119
APPENDIX G. Rating Scale for Overall Assertiveness . . . . .	120
APPENDIX H. Outline of Basic Assertiveness Sessions. . . . .	121
APPENDIX I. Outline of Systematic Desensitization Procedure . . . . .	123
APPENDIX J. Cue-Controlled Relaxation Procedures . . . . .	126
VITA . . . . .	128

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for the College Self Expression Scale. . . . .	52
2.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for the Rathus Assertiveness Scale . . . . .	53
3.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for Variable I (Verbal Content) of the Behavioral Performance Test . . . . .	55
4.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for Variable II (Percent of Eye Contact) of the Behavioral Performance Test. . . . .	56
5.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for Variable III (Verbal Affect) of the Behavioral Performance Test . . . . .	57
6.	Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques for Variable IV (Overall Assertiveness) of the Behavioral Performance Test . . . . .	58

## ABSTRACT

The Role of Relaxation and Systematic  
Desensitization in the Efficacy  
of Assertiveness Training

by

Larry J. Carlson, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1978

Major Professor: Dr. Michael B. Bertoch  
Department: Psychology

The purpose of this study was to clarify the role of anxiety management techniques (cue-controlled relaxation, systematic desensitization) as components of an assertiveness training program.

Volunteers from Utah State University and the surrounding community were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups and a control group which were used in a pre-post change comparison design. Treatment groups consisted of: (1) cue-controlled relaxation plus assertiveness training, (2) systematic desensitization plus assertiveness training, and (3) assertiveness training extended. The control group was a delayed treatment control. All subjects were administered pre-tests with the following instruments: two self report inventories (the College Self-Expression Scale and the Rathus Assertiveness Scale) and a Behavioral Performance Test. The Behavioral Performance Test consisted of ten separate multiple stimulus role playing situations (five pre-test and five posttest) which were

videotaped and rated on four performance variables: (1) verbal content, (2) percent of eye contact, (3) assertive affect, and (4) overall assertiveness.

All treatment groups were exposed to four two-hour sessions of basic assertiveness training which consisted of shaping procedures (i.e. behavioral rehearsal, modeling, etc.). Treatment groups I and II were provided six additional hours of training in cue-controlled relaxation and systematic desensitization, respectively, while Group III was provided six additional hours of basic assertiveness instruction. Each of the treatment groups received equal amounts (14 hours) of training exposure over an eight-week period. At the conclusion of training, all subjects were posttested using the same measures used for pre-testing.

The results of the study indicated (1) that no one treatment approach can be considered superior or inferior to the other in its effectiveness in increasing assertive behavior, and (2) that all treatment groups showed significantly greater ability to increase assertiveness than was evidenced with the control group.

(128 Pages)

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Assertive training (Wolpe, 1958, 1969; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966) was developed as a technique of treatment primarily for those individuals who in many instances are unable to rationally express their rights and feelings (negative and positive) toward others. Based upon the above condition, Wolpe (1969) provides the following rationale for training in assertion. "Assertive training... is required for patients who in interpersonal contexts have unadaptive anxiety responses that prevent them from saying or doing what is reasonable and right" (p. 61).

Wolpe's (1958, 1969) theory basically suggests that a buildup of anxiety within the individual serves to inhibit interpersonal responsiveness. This theory contains an implicit assumption that the unassertive individual is essentially cognizant of what he should say and do, but that he is blocked from his full expression. This is often referred to as a performance deficit theory.

Others (Eisler, Hersen & Miller, 1973; Hersen et al., 1973; Laws & Serber, 1971; Lazarus, 1971) have postulated that an assertiveness training program must deal with other conditions than simply inhibiting anxieties. Based upon their research they contend that



there are a good number of clients who fail to evidence appropriate interaction in interpersonal settings because relevant verbal and non-verbal responses have never been learned. Laws and Serber (1971) argue that for these subjects training becomes a process of habilitation rather than rehabilitation of old behaviors or the facilitation of suppressed behaviors. This is often referred to as a learning deficit theory.

Although differences in theoretical orientation appear distinct, the differences in treatment programs developed by each theory appear to be quite similar (i.e., modeling, coaching, behavioral rehearsal, instructions with reinforcement). For example, behavior rehearsal as employed by the learning deficit theorists is primarily used to shape and reinforce new assertive behavior patterns. However, for the performance deficit theorists behavior rehearsal procedures provide in vivo desensitization of associated anxieties.

A number of recent studies have shown that a relationship does exist between low assertiveness and anxiety as well as social fear. Gay et al. (1975) found that a group of low assertive college students scored significantly higher than a comparable group of high assertive students on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Orenstein et al. (1975) findings support Gay et al. (1975) conclusions, but also found that assertiveness was even more strongly related to interpersonal fears, and not simply to any and all fears. Morgan (1974) found a significant relationship between expressed social fear and several measures of

assertiveness. Hollandsworth (1976) further verified Morgan's (1974) findings by obtaining even stronger coefficients when adding additional social fear items to those used by Morgan (1974).

It is suggested by Hollandsworth (1976) that these findings may have implications for the treatment of low assertive individuals typically suffering from anxiety or social fears, and that procedures which reduce anxiety might be expected to enhance the overall effectiveness of assertive training.

Most investigators acknowledge the importance of anxiety as a variable contributing to the maintenance of unassertive behavior. However, therapeutic techniques aimed directly at reducing anxiety and social fears (e.g., systematic desensitization and relaxation training) are rarely used. Instead, emphasis has continued to remain with the influences of operant conditioning (shaping and reinforcement) techniques as applied in behavioral rehearsal and modeling (Rathus, 1976; Eisler et al., 1973; Herson et al., 1973; Kazden, 1975; Galassi and Galassi, 1976; Eisler et al., 1974, Edelstein & Esiler, 1976; Winship & Kelley, 1976; and Serber, 1972). Several authors have reported clinical success with the use of such anxiety management techniques as systematic desensitization and relaxation in the treatment of the unassertive client (D'Zurilla, 1969; Geinsinger, 1969; Wolpe, 1970, 1973).

Further, others active in assertiveness training workshops have incorporated deep muscle relaxation and techniques of systematic

desensitization in their programs (Bower, 1972; Phelps & Austin, 1975). Unfortunately, none of the above sources provide systematic research data supporting the efficacy of this mode of treatment.

Until 1975 only two studies sought to compare through systematic evaluation the effects of anxiety reduction techniques with other assertive training procedures (Serber & Nelson, 1971; and Weinman et al., 1972). Serber and Nelson compared systematic desensitization and assertive training treatments with groups of hospitalized schizophrenics. They concluded that neither treatment could be considered effective, and that systematic desensitization appeared even less effective than assertive training in bringing about increased assertiveness. Weinman et al. compared socioenvironmental treatment, systematic desensitization, and relaxation training with groups of older and younger male schizophrenics. They found that for the older patients socioenvironmental treatment was more effective in producing assertive behavior than either of the other two treatments. They found no other differences among the three treatments.

Both of these studies provide little support for the efficacy of either relaxation or systematic desensitization in producing increased assertiveness. However, two factors should be considered in evaluation of these studies. First, both studies used hospitalized schizophrenic populations of which the effectiveness of systematic desensitization and relaxation procedures is still questioned; and second, both of these studies used the treatments in isolation rather than in combination with some other assertiveness training procedure.

To date the author is aware of only one study that has attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of combining assertive training and an anxiety management technique (Van Sickle, 1975). Van Sickle reported comparing four treatment groups: (1) assertive training, (2) anxiety management, (3) assertive training and anxiety management, and (4) delayed treatment control. Van Sickle concludes that all treatment groups were significantly improved above the control group, and that behavioral measures tended to indicate assertive training to be somewhat superior to anxiety management. One of the weaknesses of this study was the short three-week treatment duration. Typically, longer treatment durations are suggested for effectiveness of both relaxation and systematic desensitization procedures.

In spite of the neglect of researchers to evaluate the possible role of relaxation and systematic desensitization in the treatment of low assertive individuals, there is a growing number of studies which have supported the use of both these techniques in the treatment of various types of anxiety (i.e., test anxiety, flight phobias, snake phobias, speech anxiety) (Chang-Liang & Denney, 1976; Russel & Mathews, 1975; Reeves & Mealiea, 1975; Russell & Sipich, 1974; Deffenbacher, 1974).

Techniques such as modeling and role playing have somewhat reduced the amount of anxiety and social fears attached with asserting oneself (Wolpe, 1969, 1970). Another, perhaps more direct approach to reducing these anxieties, would be through the application of such

techniques as relaxation and systematic desensitization. With a combination of these techniques, the process of learning assertiveness is directly approached by the operant conditioning (shaping and reinforcing) techniques employed by modeling and role playing, while the process of weakening anxiety response habit is more directly attacked by relaxation and systematic desensitization approaches.

Presently, as suggested by Alberti and Emons( 1970), a great deal of assertive training is being provided in group settings. Concurrently, an increasing number of successful treatments of varying fears and anxieties using relaxation and systematic desensitization procedures have been reported employing the group treatment approach (Russell & Matthews, 1975; Allen, 1971; McManus, 1971; Freeling & Semberg, 1970).

Thus, the combining of these two group oriented procedures into a comprehensive assertive training program could be easily achieved. Further, the evaluation of such a combined treatment program concerning the question of obtaining greater efficacy in the treatment of low assertive individuals appears to be both practical as well as a pertinent research quest.

In conclusion, sufficient evidence exists indicating that low assertive individuals have greater amounts of anxiety and social fears. Also, present systematic research has almost exclusively concentrated upon the evaluation of techniques of assertive training which rely heavily upon operant conditioning principles, thus

neglecting the evaluation of combined anxiety and fear reducing techniques (relaxation and systematic desensitization) with other assertive training procedures.

The problem is, then, that there is a lack of systematic evaluation concerning the role that techniques, such as relaxation and systematic desensitization, play in the efficacy of an assertive training program.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It is the purpose of this chapter to review existing literature dealing with investigations of assertiveness training and to review relevant literature regarding the possible utility of two techniques (relaxation and systematic desensitization) in improving assertiveness treatment efficacy.

#### Assertiveness Training

One of the first to describe specific procedures directed at modification of the unassertive client was Salter (1949). Salter devised or outlined six "techniques for increasing excitation." They were, (1) "talk feeling--talk", (2) engage in "facial talk", (3) to "contradict and attack", (4) to "use the word I", (5) to "express agreement" when praised, and (6) to improvise or be spontaneous.

Following Salter's work, others began reporting positive results in the treatment of unassertive clients. These reports (Gittelman, 1965; Stevenson & Wolpe, 1960), which were single-case reports, provided primarily descriptive information concerning technique and procedures.

It was later that Lazarus (1966) undertook the first comparative study to determine the relative effect of assertive training (consisting primarily of behavioral rehearsal techniques). Although

Lazarus' measures were crude and the probability of experimenter bias was high, it was concluded that the behavioral rehearsal method was indeed superior to reflection-interpretation and advice oriented procedures in treatment of unassertive clients.

Hedquist and Weinhold (1970) evaluated Lazarus' (1966) procedure with Mainard's (1970) "social learning approach." After five weeks of therapy, these authors reported that both treatment groups were significantly more assertive than the control group, but that no difference between the two treatments were obtained. A six-week follow-up failed to show the treatment groups to be significantly better than the control.

Rathus (1972) compared an assertive training program with a discussion group and a no-treatment control. Using his own 30 items assertive scale, developed and subsequently validated by himself (Rathus, 1973), Rathus found that those receiving assertive training reported significantly greater pre-post response changes than the control group.

Lomont et al. (1969) used pre/post MMPI profiles to measure changes in psychiatric inpatients following assertive training or insight therapies. After six weeks of therapy, the assertion group evidenced a significantly greater total decrease on the clinical MMPI scales than did the insight group.

Galassi et al. (1974), using a behavioral and self report instruments for obtaining a measurement of assertiveness, found that subjects who received assertive training were rated as significantly



more assertive than subjects in control groups, and were also reported to have less anxiety. Behavioral performance measures that reached significance included percentage of eye contact, length of scene, and assertive content. A fourth behavioral measurement, latency of response, did not reach significance. Galassi et al. (1975) reported a one-year follow-up study of the original Galassi et al. (1974) population. Nine of 16 original control subjects, and 11 of 16 original experimental subjects were reassessed with two self report measures (the College Self Expression Scale and the Subjective Unit of Disturbance Scale) and a behavioral performance test. Results revealed significant differences between the experimental and control groups on both of the self report measures and on two of the four behavioral measures, indicating long-term effectiveness assertive training procedures.

A number of studies have concentrated upon variants of behavioral rehearsal techniques, and some form of performance feedback. McFall and Marston (1970) studied the effectiveness of behavior rehearsal with and without performance feedback. Also compared in this study was placebo insight therapy and a waiting list no-treatment control group. They used a behavioral role-playing test and the Wolpe-Lazarus assertive scale as measurement instruments. In short, the two behavior rehearsal procedures resulted in greater improvement than controls with the behavior rehearsal/performance feedback group being the most potent treatment.

McFall and Lillesand (1971) investigated overt versus covert behavioral rehearsal in the training of refusal of unreasonable requests. Using the Conflict Resolution Inventory and a behavioral assertiveness test for measurement, it was found that the combined behavioral rehearsal groups performed significantly more assertively than a control group, with the covert group showing the greatest amount of change.

Loggin and Rooney (1973) reported results contrasting that reported by McFall and Lillesand. Employing the performance measurement "behavioral assertiveness test" developed by McFall and Marston (1970) they found overt rehearsal to be significantly better than covert rehearsal. However, both overt and covert rehearsal groups were found to be significantly more assertive than control subjects. It should be noted here that the population used by Loggin and Rooney was hospitalized schizophrenics. Therefore, concern should be taken in generalization of these results to other sample populations.

Finally in a study by Melnick and Stocker (1977) the relative contribution of behavioral feedback to the behavioral rehearsal with feedback procedure was assessed. Three treatment conditions were compared: (1) behavioral rehearsal without knowledge of recording and without the provision of playback; (2) rehearsal with knowledge of recording and without the provision of playback; (3) rehearsal with knowledge of recording and with provisions of playback. It was also the intent of the authors to assess a second variable,

effect of knowledge of recording. Their research included pre- and post-assessment via the Conflict Resolution Inventory and Behavioral Assessment by audio taped recordings of simulated refusal situations. Analysis of Variance for both assessment instruments revealed no significant difference. This suggests that response feedback does not seem to add to the effectiveness of behavioral rehearsal. It was also observed that there was no effect due to knowledge of recording. Melnick and Stocker fail to provide definitive information as to the length of treatment conditions, indicating only that two sessions were given to each of the treatment conditions. Depending on how long each of these sessions lasted, a criticism might be directed toward limited treatment exposure as a factor in failure to obtain significant differences.

In general, it appears that researchers employing behavior rehearsal and performance feedback techniques in assertiveness training, have found them to be effective. However, there seems to be contradictory evidence as to the extent of benefit obtained by feedback alone (Melnick, 1973; Melnick & Stocker, 1977; McFall & Lillesand, 1971; McFall & Marston, 1970).

Another technique of assertiveness training which has attracted the attention of researchers is that of modeling. A number of empirical investigations have evaluated variants of modeling techniques. Friedman (1971) used as measurement instrumentation pre- post-change scores from a self report measure of assertiveness (Action Situation Inventory) and an observed eight-minute stressful interpersonal situation. He compared six groups: (1) modeling plus role-playing,

(2) modeling, (3) directed role-playing, (4) improvised role-playing, (5) assertive script, and (6) nonassertive script. He found the modeling plus directed role-playing group to be significantly more assertive than all other groups with the exception of improvised role-playing. All other groups were found to be significantly different from the nonassertive script group, but not from each other.

A study by Eisler, Hersen, and Miller (1973) revealed a possible relationship between modeling and rehearsal. They found that behavior rehearsal alone without instructions, modeling or coaching, was significantly less effective in increasing assertive behavior than combined modeling and behavior rehearsal. They used a behavioral performance based measurement of changes which showed superior performance of the modeling plus practice group on five behavioral categories: (1) longest duration of replies, (2) greatest number of requests for new behavior, (3) greatest affect, (4) louder speech, and (5) greater overall assertiveness.

Rathus (1973) investigated a procedure that included both modeling and practice. Based upon pre-/post measurement on his own assertion scale (Rathus, 1973a) the modeling-plus practice group was significantly more assertive than the modeling without practice group. This group also reported lower fear of social conflict.

McFall and Twentyman (1973) in a series of four experimental designs attempted to determine the contributions of interactions among behavioral rehearsal, modeling and coaching in assertiveness training by design manipulation over a series of four separate studies. They concluded that modeling seemed to only slightly, if any, affect

treatment when combined with either rehearsal alone or rehearsal and coaching. They also indicated that it was coaching and rehearsal that were primarily responsible for effective treatment results. It might be noted here that these experiments may have a weakness, if duration of treatment is a factor in the relative effectiveness of the techniques being assessed, since treatment only included two 45-minute sessions.

Young, Rimm, and Kennedy (1973) sought to evaluate the function of verbal reinforcement of modeled assertive behavior on subsequent imitation. They compared four groups, two treatment conditions (verbal reinforcement to the model and no verbal reinforcement to the model), and two control groups (no treatment and placebo therapy). The authors, based upon behavioral performance measures of assertiveness, concluded that the two modeling conditions produced significant improvements over that of controls, and that verbal reinforcement to an assertive model does not significantly improve treatment effects of modeling.

Kazdin (1974) designed a study assessing the effects of covert modeling and model reinforcement on assertive behavior. The study consisted of four groups: (1) covert modeling (imagination of assertive model performance), (2) covert modeling plus reinforcement (same as (1) plus imagined favorable consequences contingent on assertiveness), (3) no modeling (imagined scenes with no assertive model and no favorable consequences), and (4) delayed treatment controls. Kazdin concludes that covert modeling with and without imagined reinforcement to the model is effective in increasing assertive

behavior in low assertive individuals. Although significance was not reached between the two covert modeling groups, there were indications that the covert modeling plus reinforcement was the more effective procedure.

Later Kazdin (1976) designed a study which assessed the effects of covert modeling (imagined model), multiple models (single versus several models performing assertively), and model reinforcement (imagining favorable consequences following model behavior versus no consequences), on assertive behavior. The study included the following five groups: (1) single model-reinforcement, (2) single model-no reinforcement, (3) multiple models-reinforcement, (4) multiple model-no reinforcement, and (5) nonassertive-model control. Kazdin (1976), reports the following results: (1) covert modeling produced significant improvements in assertive behavior as indicated by both self report and behavioral assessments, (2) imagining several versus single models and model reinforcement further improved treatment effects, (3) imagining assertion-relevant scenes without an assertive model failed to produce consistent changes in assertion, and (4) the effects of the treatment generalized to novel situations (via role-playing) and were maintained for four months as assessed by follow-up self-report measures.

Although most studies in assertiveness training have been of the treatment control group type, Edelstein and Eisler (1976) designed a single subject modified multiple baseline study in which they

studied the effects of modeling and modeling with instructions and feedback on the Behavioral Components of social skills. Their subject was a male schizophrenic patient. The following dependent variables were assessed: duration of eye contact, number of head and hand gestures, and ratings of affect and overall assertiveness. Their study indicated that modeling alone increased affect, but not gestures or duration of eye contact, while modeling combined with instructions and feedback increased eye contact, gestures, and overall affect.

In general, it appears that modeling, even covert modeling, does have significant effects upon improved assertion (Kazdin, 1974; Kazdin, 1976; Young, Kimm and Kennedy, 1974; Edelstein and Eisler, 1976). However, studies including treatment groups that provided additional components of assertion training (e.g., behavioral rehearsal, coaching, instruction, practice), indicated that modeling combined with additional training procedures brought about increased efficacy in the training of assertion skills (Friedman, 1971; Eisler, Hersen & Miller, 1973; Rathus, 1973; McFall & Twentyman, 1973; Edelstein & Eisler, 1976).

Most of the literature concerning assertion has dealt primarily with the process of assertive training (e.g., modeling, role playing, behavioral rehearsal) or with particular characteristics of an assertive response (e.g., eye contact, affect, duration of reply, voice volume). All of these represent viable components of assertion. However, the various components of assertion contain differing

degrees of complexity (Rathus, 1972). For example, teaching assertive eye contact is much less complicated than is the teaching of an assertive verbal content response.

Due to the complexity of assertive verbal content training, several authors have suggested the formulation of more concrete models designed to facilitate the development of assertive verbal responses (Winship & Kelley, 1976; Gale & Carlsson, 1977; Albert & Emmons, 1974; Cooley, 1976). Although each trainer develops his own unique style or model for teaching the verbal content component of assertion, the author is aware of only three formal models presented in the literature (Winship & Kelley, 1976; Gale & Carlsson, 1977; and Cooley, 1976). One of these models reports research to substantiate the effectiveness of their model (Winship & Kelley, 1976).

Winship and Kelley presented a verbal response model which focused upon three components of an assertive statement, "(a) an empathy statement--the ability to see the situation through the other person's eyes, (b) a conflict statement--the individual's communicative rationale for his action, and (c) an action statement--what it is that the individual wants to happen." They further defined an assertive response as "the ability to make a three-part statement in which one expresses one's own rights while respecting the rights of others." Winship and Kelley's (1976) study investigated the effect of their verbal response model by comparing three groups of subjects: (1) assertive training group (trained via verbal response model), (2) attention control group (trained via generalized client



oriented supportive group therapy approach) and (3) no treatment control group. All groups were randomly assigned and posttested on a self report scale, responses to written situations, and on scores of a video tape role-playing situation. The results indicated that significant differences were obtained between the assertive training group and the attention control group, and between the assertive training group and the no-treatment control group.

Another content model was suggested by Cooley (1976) in which the author recommended the use of Gordon's (1970) "I message" formula. The "I message" formula is seen by Gordon as more influential in modifying unacceptable behavior. In using the formula the individual communicates the feelings he or she is presently experiencing (I message) rather than accusing (you message). The Cooley (1976) model includes two additional components also borrowed from Gordon (1971). They are: (1) a nonblameful description of another's behavior, and (2) the tangible effects of this behavior on me now or in the future.

A third content model is presented by Gale and Carlsson (1977). Their model includes three steps: (1) "the individual briefly shares the feelings generated by the offending behavior of another person", (2) "attention is paid to the feelings of the receiver of the assertive message and to maintaining a friendly relationship between the sender and the receiver", and (3) "the receiver is asked to make a specified change in his offending behavior." Gale and Carlsson argue that this model meets two requirements indicated by Ginott (1965):

(1) that communication be directed at preserving the self-respect of both parties, and (2) that communication of understanding precede any suggestions for behavioral change. They also argue that step (2) allowed the asserter to meet his own approval needs as well as lowering the receiver's resistance to change, and therefore promotes the reception of the following request for behavior change.

Although all three of the models presented here appear to incorporate many of the same communication strategies, they do purport certain qualities of uniqueness that should be considered. However, it is important to point out that none of these models have met the test of repeated significant gains over other techniques, and until this has been obtained, they remain only suggested models.

In summary, it appears that the experimental research clearly demonstrates that a number of assertive training techniques have been shown to increase assertive behavior in previously unassertive individuals. These techniques have varied from the extremely covert training techniques of Kazdin to the overt techniques of Galassi, Kostka, and Galassi, and have included research designs of the multiple treatment-control group type, to the single subject multiple baseline type.

Based upon this review, an increasing amount of evidence seems to be pointing to the superiority of treatment procedures that include techniques of behavioral rehearsal (coaching, role playing). However, others have found that combinations of behavioral rehearsal with

modeling and performance feedback serves to further enhance the efficacy of an assertiveness program. Such combining of various training elements appears to strengthen the effectiveness as well as promote the maintenance of treatment gains.

Finally, it appears that some of the new frontiers of assertion training will be directed towards the development of teaching models which will incorporate the process components of role playing, modeling, and behavioral rehearsal. These have been identified as effective training procedures when incorporated into assertive training models.

### Relaxation

With the publication of Jacobson's Progressive Relaxation in 1938, relaxation training was introduced as a therapeutic procedure directed at the reduction of various forms of tension and anxiety. However, not until Wolpe (1958) modified Jacobson's rather extensive training procedures into a less time consuming, but yet potent procedure, did relaxation as a therapeutic technique gain significant professional recognition.

Wolpe (1958) incorporated a modified relaxation technique into procedures for systematic desensitization. Since then, a number of studies have employed relaxation-control groups, which have shown relaxation alone to be ineffective in lowering fear and fear-related symptoms (Aponte & Aponte, 1971; Cooke, 1968, Davison, 1968; Rimm & Medeiros, 1970). In contrast, some of these studies have found significant fear reductions following training in relaxation (Denney,

1974; Freeling & Shemberg, 1970; Laxer & Walker, 1970; Spiegler, Liebert, McMaius, & Fernandez, 1969). It is suggested by Change-Liang and Denney (1976) that the apparent contradiction in the efficacy of relaxation training in the reduction of various anxieties and fears may be due to the emphasis or lack of emphasis placed upon the application of relaxation learned skills. In line with this view, Goldfied (1971) viewed relaxation as an active coping skill acquired during desensitization therapy. Goldfied further suggested that the emphasis be placed on providing explicit instructions to subjects in applying the relaxational skill during encounters with daily anxiety arousing situations.

Further support of effective use of relaxation through instructions geared toward application of the learned skill was obtained by Zeisset (1968). Zeisset compared an applied relaxation procedure with systematic desensitization, attention-control and no treatment control groups. It was concluded that both applied relaxation and desensitization procedures were equally effective and significantly more effective than controls in reducing interview anxiety.

In another study, Jacks (1972) compared systematic desensitization with a self-control procedure suggested by Goldfied (1971). The author had acrophobic subjects maintain imagery and "relax away" any anxiety that was experienced. Posttest results revealed no differences on actual performance, but the self-control group did report significant decreases in subjective anxiety during the performance situation.

Further support of relaxation as an effective coping skill was obtained by Goldfried and Trier (1974). These authors compared three treatment conditions: a standard relaxation group, a self control relaxation group, and a discussion group, in the treatment of public speaking anxiety. The primary distinguishing differences between the two relaxation conditions was that the standard relaxation group was told that the exercises would automatically reduce their anxiety levels, while the self control condition was told they were learning an "active coping skill." Although no significant differences were obtained, the results were consistently in favor of the self control condition and overall ratings of satisfaction from a follow-up assessment indicated greater satisfaction among the self-control group.

Following in a similar direction to that of Goldfried and Trier, Chang-Liang and Denney (1976) further assessed the effectiveness of applied relaxation with test-anxious subjects. The authors used four treatment procedures: applied relaxation, systematic desensitization, relaxation only, and no treatment (control). Assessment was directed at reducing test anxiety and generalization to other fears. The results indicated the superiority of applied relaxation over relaxation only and no treatment (control), on four of six measures, while superiority over systematic desensitization was limited to one of six performance measures. It was found that systematic desensitization was not superior on any of the measures compared to the other treatment groups.

A variation of applied relaxation, that may in fact improve its effectiveness, is cue-controlled relaxation. This variation used by Cautela (1966) and Russell and Sipich (1973) typically involves two steps, training in deep muscle relaxation, and repeatedly associating the relaxed state with an internal or external cue. It is supported by Brady (1973) that this repeated pairing functions as a conditioned stimulus and elicits or facilitates relaxation.

Brady (1973), using this procedure, treated a variety of anxiety related disorders (e.g., stuttering, phobic anxiety, obsessive thoughts, and insomnia). Brady used the externally generated cue of rhythmic beats of a metronome (60 H<sub>2</sub>) as a conditioned stimulus, which was reported to serve to elicit relaxation.

The literature using internally generated cues such as (calm) or (relax) indicate that the procedure has been used effectively in reducing test anxiety in both individual (Russell & Sipich, 1973) and group settings (Russell, Miller, & June, 1974). Further, Russell, Miller and June (1975) found this technique to be as effective as desensitization in reducing self report indices of test anxiety.

Russell and Matthews (1975) report using the technique in the successful treatment of intense phobic reactions (snake phobia). The authors used cue-controlled relaxation and in vivo desensitization of the snake phobia. Others (Reeves and Mealiea, 1975) used biofeedback-assisted cue-controlled relaxation for the successful treatment of flight phobias in three individually treated subjects. The authors

further indicate that inasmuch as frontalis EMG is a reliable index of depth of relaxation, that the cue-control technique appears to promote deeper levels of relaxation than non cue-controlled procedures.

In conclusion, it appears that an increasing amount of evidence supports the effectiveness of applied or cue-controlled relaxation, in both clinical and comparable studies where anxiety and fear related conditions are being treated.

Such positive indications give further support for a proposed hypothesis suggesting increased efficacy of assertiveness training programs which incorporate within that program applied relaxation training. The relative ease with which groups of individuals can be trained in applied relaxation provides additional support in terms of the practicality of such a combinational assertiveness treatment program.

#### Systematic Desensitization

Systematic desensitization is one of the most widely used methods of behavior therapy. It was developed by Joseph Wolpe in the early 1950's as a method for deconditioning anxiety responses. Wolpe et al. (1973), in discussing the role and effectiveness of systematic desensitization said:

Systematic desensitization is indicated for phobias, obsessions, compulsions, and anxiety reactions that maintained by anxiety-reducing defense mechanisms. ...More than 100 outcome

studies indicate that systematic desensitization produces significantly better results than a variety of comparison therapies (p. 961).

In a review of 75 outcome studies of systematic desensitization, Paul (1969) concluded that for nearly 1,000 different clients treated by over 90 therapists, findings indicated an overwhelmingly positive success ratio. At the conclusion of his review of the systematic desensitization literature, Paul stated:

For the first time in the history of psychological treatments a specific therapeutic package reliably produced measureable benefits for clients across a broad range of distressing problems in which anxiety was of fundamental importance (p. 150).

The clinical effectiveness of systematic desensitization has been discussed in some detail by Wolpe (1958, 1969) and Rachman (1965). Success rates in the clinical setting have been considered within the area of 75 percent, indicating that in a clinical setting it remains an effective tool (Rachman, 1967).

A number of comparative studies evaluating the effectiveness of systematic desensitization in the treatment of various anxiety and phobic conditions have been made (Wolpe et al., 1973). Areas of major investigation include test anxiety, speech anxiety, and phobias such as snake and airplane phobia. Allen (1972) reviewed a majority



of the comparative studies on systematic desensitization and test anxiety reduction between 1966 and 1972. He concluded among other things that, based upon self-report anxiety measures, systematic desensitization appeared to be effective in reducing test anxiety. He also found academic performance to be improved when combinations of systematic desensitization and study counseling techniques were used.

As with the treatment of test anxiety, systematic desensitization has been investigated in the treatment of various phobias. Again, comparative studies of the effectiveness of systematic desensitization in the treatment of phobias indicate that such treatment is effective (Rachman, 1967). A number of authors investigating the efficacy of systematic desensitization in treating phobias report significant improvement over other treatment procedures (Cooke, 1966; Marks & Gelder, 1965, Rachman, 1965; Kimura, Kennedy & Rhodes, 1972).

Although desensitization is considered by many to be a relatively efficient technique, it may require more time to effectively alleviate the problem symptoms than many practitioners are willing to spend, due to overburdened appointment schedules. In this view, the past decade has witnessed the increased use of group counseling, partially as a result of demand on the professional counselor's time (Gazda, 1971). There has also been a growing body of research evidence indicating that systematic desensitization can be effectively employed in group settings.

Group desensitization has been found effective in treating various anxieties and phobias, some of which include: fear of spiders, (Marshall, Strawbridge & Keltner, 1972; Robinson & Suinn, 1969), fear of snakes (Fishman & Nawas, 1971; Shannon & Wolff, 1967), fear of childbirth (Kondas & Scetnidia, 1972), fear of physical contact with opposite sex (Dua, 1972), interpersonal performance anxiety (Calef & MacLean, 1970). Group desensitization has also been used to reduce test anxiety in elementary and secondary school students (Mann, 1972; Suinn, 1970) as well as college students (Aponte & Aponte, 1971; McManus, 1971; Suinn & Hall, 1970).

In general, researchers who have attempted to evaluate the use of systematic desensitization in groups have kept fairly close to the model initially presented by Wolpe (1958). Wolpe's (1958) procedure as originally developed, consisted of three distinct phases. The first phase consisted of relaxation training. This was followed by or concurrently carried out with, the construction of an anxiety hierarchy (a graduated scale of aversive stimuli that elicit the anxiety reaction), while the third phase consists of desensitization proper. Recent research, however, has included some variations in the procedures used to obtain results in the various phases of the complete process. Following is a review of some of these variations.

Procedures for most studies in the relaxation phase incorporate a modified version of the Jacobson (1938) method of relaxation or they have cited Wolpe (1958) or Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) as their

source for training techniques. This procedure typically involves deep muscle relaxation through the process of tightening and relaxing various muscle groups under the direction of a trainer. The procedure usually begins with the upper extremities and progresses to the feet. However, recent studies have suggested that the instructions for training in relaxation can be administered to groups by means of a taped recording with no apparent loss of effectiveness (Freeling & Shernberg, 1970; Hall & Hinkle, 1972; Mann, 1972; Suinn & Hall, 1970). Others, (Kondas, 1967; Kondas & Scetnidia, 1972), have used Schultz's (1935) autogenic training method with groups, as a relaxation training procedure prior to desensitization proper. Several other studies have reported success of relaxation training by having subjects passively observe a videotape of people who are receiving training in relaxation (Hall & Hinkle, 1972; Mann, 1972).

The second phase, construction of an anxiety hierarchy, is a crucial determinant of the success of the desensitization process (Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966).

In the studies reviewed, this phase of the desensitization process was dealt with in one of two basic ways: by developing individualized hierarchies for each member of the group or by developing a universal hierarchy for the entire group.

In studies where the individualized hierarchies were developed (Katahn et al., 1966; Lazarus, 1961; McMannus, 1971), each member of

the group developed his or her own personal hierarchy in conjunction with the trainer. Then during the desensitization process only the numbers were identified by the trainer.

In the development of universal type hierarchies, at least three different methods have been used. Some researchers developed or used standardized, pre-constructed hierarchies (Dua, 1972; Fishman & Naws, 1971; Mann, 1972). Others provided each member with questionnaires or lists of potential items of which they were asked to rate (Aponte & Aponte, 1971; Freeling & Shemberg, 1970; Osterhouse, 1972). The trainer took this information and then constructed the universal hierarchy. A third method was one in which a general consensus was arrived at through group discussion (Cohen, 1969, Donner & Guernsey, 1969).

Another factor that seems to vary somewhat is the number of items developed for any given anxiety hierarchy. These have varied from two (Suinn, 1970) to 36 (Mitchell, 1971). Most, however, fell within the range from 10 to 20 items. Marguis and Morgan (1968) suggested that for individual desensitization between 10 and 20 items is usually preferred. Although Marguis and Morgan (1968) suggested this for individual desensitization, there is nothing in the research reviewed here that would indicate that this rule of thumb would not hold equally well for group desensitization.

In assessing anxiety hierarchies, Paul (1969) identified them to consist primarily of thematic, spatial-temporal, or a combination of

the two. A thematic hierarchy consists of some central theme "based upon stimulus classes which are associated through spatial or temporal contiguity, through similarity of physical attributes, through function, or through internal responses (p. 68)." On the other hand, the spatial-temporal hierarchies tend to focus on the anxiety stimulus situation or event with which the items on the hierarchy represent an approach value with regard to time and space.

During the third phase of the systematic desensitization procedure, desensitization proper, the client imagines scenes developed from his personal anxiety hierarchy while remaining relaxed. This process involves a number of different variables, among them being, duration of item presentation, length of interval between scenes, number of sessions, and the number of times a scene is to be presented before progressing to the next scene.

Most studies reviewed remained close to Wolpe and Lazarus' (1966) guidelines of 5 to 10 seconds for the duration of the item presentation and 15 to 35 seconds between items. However, the number of sessions varied from two (Suinn, 1970) to 20 (Laxer and Walker, 1970). Although there is apparent disagreement as to just how many sessions are required, the author is aware of no studies that have directly attempted to evaluate this question when using group desensitization.

One of the crucial variables in the desensitization process is the number of times a scene is presented before progressing down the

hierarchy list. This is particularly important in group desensitization. The decision of when to move on is typically determined by subjective impressions of the client; i.e., only after the client can visualize the preceding item without experiencing anxiety. When group desensitization is being done each of the clients have their own unique reactions to differing scenes from their hierarchy. This has presented some problems for the group desensitization technique. In the studies reviewed three different systems were employed.

One "procedure" advanced the group to the next hierarchy item only after every member of the group could visualize a given item void of anxiety (Lazarus, 1961; Mann & Rosenthal, 1969). A different version of this procedure was used by Taylor (1971), in which when an individual signalled continual anxiety, the rest of the group relaxed while the therapist worked with that person individually.

A second procedure used an automated approach (Fishman and Nawas, 1971; O'Neil and Howell, 1969; Rachman, 1965). In this approach the subjects were asked to visualize each item on the hierarchy a predetermined number of times. At that point the entire group would move on to the next item regardless of individual anxiety states.

A third procedure provided for individualized progression (Cohen, 1969). With this method the trainer neither referred to

the scene or to the item number but merely indicated the timing of scene visualization and relaxation periods. Each subject was asked to stop thinking about a scene if it produced anxiety and to move on to the next scene only after an item could be visualized twice without eliciting anxiety.

As indicated by this review, systematic desensitization is a fairly complex procedure in which numerous variations and modifications have been applied by various researchers. In fact, the varying procedures used by researchers presents a problem in the evaluation of systematic desensitization as a treatment, by adding additional variables to studies, thus making it difficult to replicate and generalize the results.

Until future research establishes the optimal combinations of procedural variations, those who wish to conduct systematic desensitization in groups, should become familiar with these variations and develop a system of group desensitization that takes into consideration the mainstream of these procedures.

In conclusion, it seems quite clear from research and reviews of the literature concerning systematic desensitization, that as a clinical therapy procedure, it is effective in the treatment of a broad range of distressing problems of which anxiety plays fundamental importance. This has been evidenced from the evaluation of numerous studies in clinical settings as well as a substantial number of comparative studies. Further, the extension of systematic desensitization procedures into group treatment procedures has also

revealed that this procedure is effective as a group therapy treatment. However, research is yet to establish the optimal combinations of procedural variations and until it does, individual variations will no doubt be the trend.



## CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY

Purposes and Objectives

Based upon this author's review of the literature, several pertinent arguments have been presented. First, two theoretical positions have been proposed to account for unassertiveness. One of these is a performance deficit, which implies that unassertiveness is the result of built-up anxiety within the individual serving to inhibit interpersonal responsiveness and blocking assertive expression. The other, being a learning deficit, which implies that unassertiveness is the result of never having learned relevant verbal and nonverbal responses considered necessary in assertive behavior. Although these two theoretical positions appear to be distinctly different, practical techniques espoused by each of these positions to treat the unassertive individual are characteristically the same.

A second argument being presented dealt with the growing amounts of research which supports the contention that low as compared to high assertive individuals experience greater amounts of anxiety and social fear. This research further suggests that the reduction of these fears would be expected to enhance the effectiveness of an assertive training program.

Third, a contention is presented suggesting that although neither the performance or learning deficit theoretical models reject the need for anxiety reduction in an assertiveness treatment program, the particular techniques being espoused and evaluated, i.e., role playing, guided behavioral rehearsal, and modeling, are geared more directly toward teaching appropriate assertive behaviors than anxiety management.

The final argument presented by the literature is that in spite of the current successful treatment of anxiety and phobic related conditions by use of systematic desensitization and relaxation procedures, few (only two according to this author's awareness) have attempted to evaluate the possible relevance that these procedures coupled with the more popular shaping techniques play in the increased efficacy of an assertive training program.

The problem this study purports to address is the lack of empirical data concerning the efficacy of combining relaxation and systematic desensitization procedures in the treatment of unassertive individuals. The purpose of this study is to clarify the role of these techniques (relaxation and systematic desensitization) as a component of assertive training regimens by evaluating the therapeutic effects of three different treatments of equal eight-week duration: assertive training and cue controlled relaxation; assertive training and systematic desensitization; and assertive training extended.

### Hypotheses

The treatment regimens evaluated in this study consisted of the

following: Group I, cue-controlled relaxation plus assertiveness training; Group II, systematic desensitization plus assertiveness training; and Group III, assertiveness training extended. A control group, Group IV, delayed treatment control, will also be compared with the treatment regimens.

Stated in the null form the following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the mean change scores among the three treatment regimens (Groups I, II, and III) and between each treatment group and the control group (Group IV) on the College Self Expression Scale.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean change scores among the three treatment groups (Groups I, II, and III) and between each treatment group and the control group (Group IV) on the Rathus Assertiveness Scale.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean change scores among the three treatment groups (Groups I, II, and III) and between each treatment group and the control group (Group IV) on the four Behavioral Performance Test variables; verbal content, percent of eye contact, verbal affect, and overall assertiveness.

#### Design, Population and Sampling

Design. The design of this study is a pre-post change comparison. The treatment groups consisted of: (I) cue-controlled relaxation plus assertiveness training, (II) systematic desensitization plus assertiveness

training, (III) assertiveness training extended (six additional hours beyond the assertiveness training provided Groups I and II are provided Group III. However, each group received an equal amount of total training exposure). The control group, Group IV, was a delayed treatment control.

Population and sampling. The population was drawn from both community members and college students in and around the Logan, Utah area. Subjects who participated in the study were obtained from a group of individuals who responded to community and university advertising efforts. Approximately 60 individuals (50 females, 10 males) ranging in age from 40 to 19, indicated a desire to participate in the free assertiveness training course. All volunteers were aware of the research orientation of the training course, and that a limited number of subjects would be selected for inclusion in the course. Once a sufficient number of volunteers had been obtained, random assignments were made to both control and treatment groups. Those assigned to treatment were then randomly assigned to one of three treatments. Those assigned to the control group were then contacted and asked to participate as a delayed treatment control. With the assurance of getting first choice in an assertiveness training course to be offered the following quarter, 14 individuals were approached and 12 of them agreed to participate.

Following random assignment, each group consisted of 12 subjects. However, during the course of the study the following attrition

resulted: Groups I, II and III, one subject each; Group IV, two subjects. There was no attempt to evaluate the interaction of sex by this study. It should be noted, however, that of the 48 subjects who volunteered and were randomly selected for participation in this research, only nine were males.

#### Sources of Outcome Data (Instrumentation)

The subjects of all four groups were administered pre- and posttests of the following instruments: the College Self Expression Scale, the Rathus Assertiveness Scale, and the Behavioral Performance Test. The rationale behind the use of two types of assessment instruments (behavioral observation and self report inventories) is supported by previous research reviewed in the literature (Galassi, et al. 1975; Edelstein & Eisler, 1976; Kazdin, 1975). Because of the inherent limitations of each of these assessment instruments, a more valid assessment of change in assertiveness is obtained by combining the two measurements. The rationale for using two self report inventories (College Self Expression Scale and Rathus Assertiveness Scale) was not for the purpose of increasing assessment validity, but to evaluate the comparability (not reported in the literature) of these two similar instruments in ability to reveal change in assertiveness.

College Self Expression Scale. The CSES consists of a 50-item self report inventory which was designed to assess assertiveness. The inventory is designed to assess or measure three separate dimensions of assertiveness by use of a five-point Likert scale with

21 positively worded items and 29 negatively worded items. The three dimensions consist of positive assertiveness, negative assertiveness, and self-denial. Individuals being administered the scale are asked to judge the frequency with which he or she engages in a variety of assertive acts. The resultant scores range from 0 to 200, depending on the individuals self reported assertiveness.

The test-retest reliability over a two-week time period is reported from .89 to .90 (Galassi et al., 1974). Moderate construct and concurrent validation was reported when correlated with the Gough adjective check list and assertiveness ratings obtained by supervisors and counselors of the validation group subjects (Galassi & Galassi, 1973; Galassi et al., 1974). Normative data from a variety of college settings has also been collected (Galassi et al., 1974). Galassi et al. (1976) provided additional validation of the scale by assessing the ability of the CSES to differentiate low scorers from combined moderate and high scorers based upon behavioral performance measures. The authors found a significant difference on the combined dependent variables (assertive content, percentage of eye contact, subjective unit of disturbance scale, and response latency) between the low group and the average performance of the moderate and high assertive groups.

Rathus Assertiveness Scale. The RAS is a 30-item schedule for measuring assertiveness. The items are presented as statements which the individual is asked to respond to as being characteristic

or uncharacteristic of them. The form employs a six-point scale, which ranges from +3 (very characteristic of me) to a -3 (very uncharacteristic of me) with no zero point. Approximately half the items must be disagreed with in order to indicate assertiveness, with total scores ranging from +90 to -90 (Rathus, 1973). The schedule has been reported to have moderate to high test-retest reliability over a two-month period, yielding  $r$  of .78. Split-half reliability is reported at .77 (Rathus, 1973a). Satisfactory validity was established by comparing the RAS scores to two external measures of assertiveness: impressions respondents make of other people and how they would behave in specific situations in which assertive outgoing behavior could be used with profit (Rathus, 1973a).

The Behavioral Performance Test. The use of behavior performance tests in the assessment of assertiveness has been reported by a number of investigators (Arkowitz, Lichtenstein, McGovern, & Hines, 1975; McFall & Lillesand, 1971; Serber, 1972; Longin and Rooney, 1973; McFall and Marston, 1970; Eisler, Hersen, & Miller, 1973; Hersen, Eisler, Miller, Johnson, & Pinkston, 1973; Weinman, Gelbart, Wallace & Post, 1972; and Rathus, 1972). These assessments generally take the form of role playing interactions that are recorded by audio or video tape, later to be rated on pertinent behavioral variables.

The literature has varied considerably with regard to procedures for a behavioral performance test. Role playing formats have ranged from pre-taped confederate stimulus statements (Arkowitz et al.,

1975; Longin & Rooney, 1973; McFall & Marston, 1970; and McFall & Lillesand, 1971) to live confederate interactions (Eisler, Hersen, & Miller, 1973; Rathus, 1972; Friedman, 1971; Galassi, Galassi, & Litz, 1974; and Galassi, Kostka, & Galassi, 1975). Likewise, variations in the behavioral performance variables being rated has occurred. For example, Hersen, Eisler and Miller (1973) assessed the behavioral variables of (1) duration of looking, (2) duration of reply, (3) latency of response, (4) loudness of speech, (5) compliance content, (6) content requesting new behavior, (7) assertive effect, and (8) overall assertiveness. Others (Galassi et al., 1976) assessed variables of (1) assertive content, (2) percent of eye contact, (3) SUD ratings upon completion of role playing, and (4) response latency. While Serber (1972), who was concerned exclusively with nonverbal components of assertive training, suggests the variables of: (1) loudness of voice, (2) fluency of spoken words, (3) eye contact, (4) facial expression, (5) body expression, and (6) distance from confederate.

Based upon the author's review of performance based assessment procedures, it was decided to use a format used by Galassi, Galassi, and Litz (1974) and Galassi, Kostka, and Galassi (1975), in which multiple stimulus statements by a live confederate are presented in ten separate role playing situations. Five of these scenes were used for pretest measurement, while the other five comparable scenes were used in the posttest assessment. The following



behavioral performance variables were rated: (1) verbal assertive content, (2) percent of eye contact, (3) assertive affect, and (4) overall assertiveness.

#### Data Collection of Observed Behaviors

The behavioral performance test requires the direct observation of each subject's response to multiple stimulus statements provided by a live confederate in five structured pre- and five structured posttest role playing situations. The methods by which these data were obtained and observed will be discussed below under the following subheading: assessment personnel and procedures; apparatus for data collection and interrater reliability.

Assessment personnel and procedures. Personnel included in the assessment phase of this research were as follows: Two confederate role players (one male, one female) who interacted with the subjects in role playing; one individual who acted as narrator, providing content stimuli for each of the role playing situations; one individual who operated the videotape equipment and was responsible for recording procedures; and two raters, who later viewed the videotaped role playing sessions and rated them on the four behavioral performance variables.

The two confederate role players (one male, one female) were graduate students in the Professional-Scientific Psychology program at Utah State University. Each of the confederate role players had had previous experience in role playing activities. Each was given

copies of the structured role playing scenes (see Appendix C), and asked to memorize the structured multiple stimulus statements for each of the scenes. Additionally, a training session was conducted where emphasis was directed toward consistent response patterns that were to be maintained throughout the testing session. Further, neither of the confederate role players were aware of the group designation for any of the subjects.

Procedures and apparatus for videotaping of the role playing situations consisted of the following. The subject was taken to one of the counseling suites in the USU psychology counseling labs. The room is equipped with three strategically placed video cameras which allow for closeup and wide lens videotaping. The subject was then introduced to the confederate role player and given a brief explanation of procedures to follow. The explanation consisted of the following: (1) A narrative describing the situation and conditions of the role playing situation will be read to you. (2) Upon completion of the narration, you will begin role playing the situation as directed by the narration. (3) The confederate role player will be responding to you in order to make the role playing situation as life-like as possible. (4) At the completion of the first scene you will be given a few moments to compose yourself, after which the second, third, fourth, and fifth scene narrations and role playings will follow in much the same manner. (5) If, upon completion of any narration you still have questions, please indicate by raising your hand and the narration will be re-read.

While the confederate and subject remained in the suite, the individual acting as narrator and the videotape operator were in an adjoining room which allowed for one-way observation of the video suite. Two-way communication between the role players and the personnel in the adjoining room allowed the narrator to read the narration of each scene, as well as answer any questions that might arise. Upon completion of the narrative, the videotape operator would begin recording of each of the role played scenes. One half of the screen included a closeup picture of the subject, while the second half of the screen provided a wide angle picture which included both the confederate and the subject.

Recordings were made of each subject as he or she responded to the multiple stimulus statements of the confederate for each of the five pretest scenes, as well as to the comparable five posttest scenes. The multiple stimulus statements and accompanying narrations of the ten role playing scenes used in this study were adapted without deviation from those used by Galassi, Kostka, and Galassi (1975). (See Appendix C).

Once pre- and post- videotapings of each subject had been recorded, behavioral performance ratings of the following variables were obtained: (1) verbal assertive content, (2) percent of eye contact, (3) assertive affect, and (4) overall assertiveness. Criteria for rating each of the four variables were provided for each of the two raters (see Appendices D, E, F, and G), and later a training session

was conducted where random segments of pre-recorded scenes were rated by each of the raters until acceptable correlations were obtained (at least .90).

Once acceptable correlations had been obtained, the following procedures for rating the tapes were employed. The rater would review the tapes on three separate occasions. During the first viewing the rater would rate variable (1) assertive verbal content, during the second viewing variable (2) percent of eye contact would be rated, and finally a third viewing was made in which ratings were made on variable (3) assertive affect and variable (4) overall assertiveness.

Apparatus for data collection. The following is a list of the apparatus used in the assessment of the behavioral performance test. One counseling suite equipped with one-way mirrors adjoining the video equipment room, three stationary but adjustable high sensitivity cameras, a dynamic lavalier microphone, and an extension speaker.

Two of the three cameras were used, both cameras were Concord Communications Systems Model MTC-21 high sensitivity cameras. One of the cameras was equipped with a Concord television zoom 20-55 mm 1:2.8 lens, while the other was equipped with a Izukar mini-TV lens 16 mm 1:1.6.

The room was equipped with a multi-directional Sony Model 560 dynamic lavalier microphone, and a model 166-A extension speaker,

V-M Corporation, which was used to provide two-way communication between recording personnel and role players.

Video equipment consisted of a television control panel with multiple camera selection and mode selection split image control, installed by micro studio Concord Communications systems, a JVC "VCP" recorder model CR-6100u and a Sony Triniton color TV receiver model KV-1910.

Interrater reliability. Reliability was calculated using the following procedure. Prior to rating of the tapes, each rater observed randomly selected role playing scenes, rating them as directed by rating and scoring procedures (see Appendices D, E, F, and G), until inter-observer agreement of at least .90 was obtained and maintained for two separate training sessions.

Upon achievement of pre-training criteria for inter-observer reliability, each of the raters proceeded to rate the tapes following the procedure indicated above (see subsection, "Assessment personnel and procedures"). After each of the two raters had completed their ratings, interrater reliability checks were made by randomly selecting scenes throughout the pre- and posttest observations and computing ( $r$ ) for each of the four variables. Randomly selected scenes used for computing ( $r$ ) totaled 20% of the total scenes rated.

### The Treatment Procedures

Descriptions of the treatment procedures used are provided below in outline form. A brief description of the content of the basic

assertiveness training sessions, of which all three treatment groups received, will be presented first. The following are descriptions of procedures unique to each of the following treatment groups: Group I (assertiveness training plus systematic desensitization), Group II (assertiveness training plus-cue-controlled relaxation), and Group III (assertiveness training extended).

Basic assertiveness training. All three treatment groups received the following four, two-hour sessions, totaling eight hours of instruction in assertiveness training. Training for these sessions was conducted by a female staff member of the USU counseling center, and two doctoral level psychology students. (See Appendix H for the outline of the content of these sessions.)

Assertiveness plus systematic desensitization. As previously explained, this group received the basic four session assertiveness training package. Subjects assigned to this treatment group were broken up into two groups of six each. In conjunction with the basic assertiveness training, these subjects received eight 45-minute sessions totaling six hours of instruction in a procedure called systematic desensitization. (For an outline of this procedure see Appendix I.)

Assertiveness training plus cue-controlled relaxation. As previously mentioned, this group received the basic four sessions of assertiveness training. Also, as were Group I subjects, they were divided into two groups of six subjects each. In conjunction

with the basic assertiveness training, the subjects of this group received eight 45-minute sessions, totaling six hours of instruction, in a procedure called conditioned or cue-controlled relaxation. (This procedure is outlined in Appendix J.)

Assertiveness training extended. As previously mentioned, this group received the basic four sessions of assertiveness training. However, this group was also provided six additional hours of training in assertiveness skills. Although this group was provided additional training, they were not provided any new or different information about developing assertiveness skills. They did, however, receive additional exposure to many of the exercises and techniques provided in the basic four sessions of assertiveness training. Direct supervision was provided by two doctoral level students in psychology, with the goal of developing proper assertive behavior through modeling, role playing, and shaping procedures.

#### Summary of Data to be Collected

The data to be collected from the above instruments consisted of the following:

Rathus assertiveness scale. Each subject was administered on a pre- and post-basis the (RAS) and received an individual score within the range of 0 to 200, depending on the individual's self reported assertiveness. Gain scores derived from pre- and posttest scores were computed and these scores were used to test hypotheses number 2 and 4 (referenced above).

Behavioral performance test. Each subject was administered pre- and post-behavioral performance tests. Each received ratings of four separate performance variables: (1) assertive content, (2) percent of eye contact, (3) assertive effect, and (4) overall assertiveness. Gain scores derived from pre- and posttest ratings were computed and these scores were used to test hypotheses number 3 and 4 (referenced above).

### Statistical Design

In order to test the three proposed hypotheses, the following statistical analysis were used:

In order to test hypotheses (1) pre-post change scores on the (CSES) were computed for each individual and planned comparisons using one way analysis of variance techniques were computed to test for significance among the treatment groups, and between each treatment group and the control group.

In order to test hypotheses (2), pre-post change scores on the (RAS) were computed for each individual and planned comparisons using one way analysis of variance techniques were computed to test for significance among the treatment groups, and between the combined treatment groups and the control group.

In order to test hypotheses (3), pre-post change scores on the four Behavioral Performance Test variables, verbal content, percent of eye contact, verbal affect, and overall assertiveness, were computed



for each individual. With this data planned comparisons, using one way analysis of variance techniques, were computed to test for significance among the treatment groups, and between the treatment groups and the control group.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The outcome analysis reported here will be treated in the same sequence as presented in hypotheses form in Chapter III. Planned comparisons using analysis of variance techniques were used to test the hypotheses that there is no difference in the mean change scores among the three treatment groups and between the combined treatment groups and the control group on (I) College Self Expression Scale (hypotheses one), (II) Rathus Assertiveness Scale (hypotheses two), and (III) the four Behavioral Performance Test variables: verbal content, percent of eye contact, verbal affect and overall assertiveness (hypotheses three). The three treatment groups consist of the following: Group I, cue-controlled relaxation plus assertiveness training; group II, systematic desensitization plus assertiveness training; group III, assertiveness training extended. The control group, group IV, was a delayed treatment control. Following presentation of the above outcome data interrater reliability correlations for ratings on the four Behavioral Performance variables will be provided.

#### College Self Expression Scale comparisons

Change scores between pre and post test administrations of the College Self Expression Scale, were compared using planned comparison techniques. F values were computed for "among treatment groups" (groups I, II and III) and "between the combined treatment groups and the control group". There was no significant difference among treatment groups. However, the combined treatment

groups obtained significantly higher change scores than did the control group. See Table 1 for summarization of above analysis.

Table 1  
Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
for the College Self Expression Scale

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	766.17	1.68
Treatment groups vs. control	1	6305.34	13.8*
Error	39	457.26	

  

Mean change scores				
Groups	Cue-controlled	Systematic	Assertiveness	Delayed
	Relaxation	Desensitization	Extended	Control
	25.73	32.10	42.27	4.50

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.

#### Rathus Assertiveness Scale comparisons

Change scores between pre and post test administrations of the Rathus Assertiveness Scale, were compared using planned comparison techniques. F values were computed for "among treatment groups" and for "between combined treatment groups and the control group". There was no significant difference among treatment groups. The combined treatment groups, did however, obtain significantly higher change scores than did the control group. See Table 2 below for summarization of above analysis.

Table 2  
Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
for the Rathus Assertiveness Scale

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	297.30	0.95
Treatment groups vs. control	1	6127.94	19.58*
Error	39	313.02	

  

Groups	Mean change scores			
	Cue-controlled Relaxation (n=11)	Systematic Desensitization (n=11)	Assertiveness Extended (n=11)	Delayed Control (n=10)
	27.82	32.27	38.18	4.50

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.

#### Comparisons of Behavioral Performance Test variables

Change scores between pre and post ratings of the four Behavioral Performance Test variables, verbal content, percent of eye contact, verbal affect and overall assertiveness, were compared using planned comparison techniques. F values were then computed for "among treatment groups" and for "between combined treatment groups and the control group", on each of the four variables.

On three of the four behavioral performance variables (verbal content, verbal affect and overall assertiveness) no significant

difference existed among the treatment groups. However, on the percent of eye contact variable there was a significant difference among the treatment groups. Significance was beyond the .01 level. Analysis of between combined treatment groups and the control groups obtained significantly higher change scores than did the control group. Again, the level of significance was beyond the .01 level. See Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 for summarization of the above analysis.

In order to further identify where the differences existed among the four groups on the behavioral performance variable, percent of eye contact, a Scheffe tests for comparison of groups with unequal n's was computed. Results of the Scheffe tests showed that no significant difference existed between the control group and the cue-controlled relaxation group. However, significant differences did exist between the control group and the systematic desensitization group, as well as the control group and the assertiveness extended group, with these two groups having significantly higher change scores than the control group. It was also shown that a significant difference existed between the cue-controlled relaxation group and the systematic desensitization group, with the latter obtaining significantly higher change scores. See Table 4 mean change scores.

Table 3  
 Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
 for Variable I (Verbal Content) of the  
 Behavioral Performance Test

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	.06	.34
Treatment groups vs. control	1	7.68	22.29*
Error	39	.35	

  

Groups	Mean change scores			
	Cue-controlled Relaxation	Systematic Desensitization	Assertiveness Extended	Delayed Control
	1.22	1.32	1.18	.24

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.

Table 4  
 Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
 for Variable II (Percent of Eye Contact)  
 of the Behavioral Performance Test

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	863.71	4.88*
Treatment groups vs. control	1	2056.93	11.61*
Error	39	177.18	

  

Groups	Mean change scores			
	Cue-controlled Relaxation (n=11)	Systematic Desensitization (n=11)	Assertiveness Extended (n=11)	Delayed Control (n=10)
	10.25	27.77	21.30	3.40

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.

Table 5  
 Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
 for Variable III (Verbal Affect) of the  
 Behavioral Performance Test

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	.01	.04
Treatment groups vs. control	1	7.53	20.37*
Error	39	.37	

  

Mean change scores				
Groups	Cue-controlled	Systematic	Assertiveness	Delayed
	Relaxation	Desensitization	Extended	Control
	(n=11)	(n=11)	(n=11)	(n=10)
	1.24	1.21	1.28	.25

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.



Table 6  
 Planned Comparisons Using Analysis of Variance Techniques  
 for Variable IV (Overall Assertiveness) of the  
 Behavioral Performance Test

Source of variation	df	Mean squares	F-value
Among treatment groups	2	.13	.29
Treatment groups vs. control	1	9.08	20.48*
Error	39	.44	

  

Groups	Mean change scores			
	Cue-controlled Relaxation (n=11)	Systematic Desensitization (n=11)	Assertiveness Extended (n=11)	Delayed Control (n=10)
	1.40	1.31	1.50	.31

\*Significant beyond the .01 level.

#### Interrater reliability

Interrater reliability checks were made by randomly selecting scenes throughout the pre- and post-test observations and computing (r) for each of the four behavioral performance variables. Randomly selected scenes used for computing (r) totaled 20% of the total scenes rated. (r) for each of the four behavioral performance variables were as follows: verbal content, .90; percent of eye contact, .97; verbal affect, .83; overall assertiveness, .87.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

The findings of this study will be presented within the following structure and discussed with respect to these major areas of concern: (1) results and implications of outcome analysis, (2) limitations of the study, (3) recommendations for further research.

#### Results and Implications of Analysis

One of the objectives of this study was to assess the efficacy of combining cue-controlled relaxation or systematic desensitization procedures with the more typical shaping procedures (i.e. behavioral rehearsal, modeling, etc.) in the treatment of unassertive behaviors. Characteristically, such direct approaches to anxiety management are not incorporated into assertive training programs. Yet there has been considerable evidence (Orenstein et al., 1975; Gay et al., 1975; Hollandsworth, 1976) suggesting that anxiety, particularly of an interpersonal nature, is a characteristic observed with high frequency among the unassertive.

A summarization of the research findings indicated the following: (1) comparisons among treatment groups failed to reveal any differences on subjective report variables (the College Self Expression Scale, Rathus Assertiveness Scale), and three of four Behavioral Performance Test variables (verbal content, verbal affect, and overall assertiveness). (2) The observed differences that existed among the treatment groups

on the performance variable (percent of eye contact), identified by use of Scheffe Tests for comparison of groups with unequal n's, showed that a difference existed between Group I (cue-controlled relaxation) and Group II (systematic desensitization) with the latter obtaining significantly higher change scores. (3) Comparison of treatment groups versus the control group, showed that the treatment groups were in all cases observed to have significantly higher change scores on all variables, except the performance variable (percent of eye contact), in which case, Group I (cue-controlled relaxation) alone failed to obtain significantly higher change scores.

The failure of Group I (cue-controlled relaxation) to obtain pre-post-change scores equal to those of Group II (systematic desensitization) on eye contact tends to suggest a weakness in that approach. The extent of this weakness is also evident in the research results showing no significant differences in the change scores obtained by Group I (cue-controlled relaxation) and the Control Group, in which no training in assertion was provided.

An explanation of this finding is not readily obvious, particularly when the other behavioral performance variables showed no such weakness. Possible explanations are presented which the author feels may have influenced this finding. Eye contact, although often cited as highly important in assertive expression, is a rather specific behavior. Mannerisms, such as poor eye contact, may have initially

developed and persisted because of interpersonal anxiety. However, once maintained by habit strength it seems unlikely that diminished anxiety alone would promote change. Therefore, although anxiety levels may have diminished, mannerisms would likely persist unless sufficient emphasis was placed there to break down habits no longer maintained by anxiety. The cue-controlled relaxation group had less direct exposure to shaping procedures emphasizing good eye contact, as was provided Group III (assertiveness extended). They also lacked the specific exposure obtained by Group II (systematic desensitization), where subjects included imagery screens which highlighted good eye contact in their hierarchies for desensitization. The limited exposure to shaping procedures or specific emphasis on appropriate eye contact might possibly account for Group I's (cue-controlled relaxation) failure to obtain higher change scores on this variable.

Despite perplexities presented by low level gains made by Group I (cue-controlled relaxation) on the performance variable percent of eye contact, the remaining data seems more consistent. In brief, they indicate (1) that no one treatment approach can be considered superior or inferior to the other in its effectiveness at increasing assertive behavior, and (2) that all treatment groups are indeed superior in ability to increase assertiveness than was evidenced with the control group.

In general then, this study has shown that a program consisting of eight instruction hours of overt shaping procedures (i.e. behavioral

rehearsal, modeling, etc.), plus six instruction hours of anxiety management techniques (i.e. systematic desensitization, cue-controlled relaxation) is equally as efficient as fourteen hours of instruction implementing overt shaping procedures alone. This indicates that the three approaches can be considered equally effective, although it is questionable in regards to the cue-controlled relaxation group versus the systematic desensitization group in the course of eye contact behavior.

It should be noted that there were no significant differences found between combined shaping plus anxiety management procedures and shaping procedures alone on any of the dependent variables. In actuality, these findings may lend support to the efficacy of the combined approach, especially when considering the advantages this approach would offer. When using the combined approach it would mean the trainee is taught to develop two skills instead of one. Although the combined skills tend to complement each other in the learning of new assertive response patterns, anxiety management techniques have special treatment benefits of their own. These are evidenced by the frequency of anxiety management techniques in the treatment of phobias, tension headaches, hypertension, insomnia, etc.

Earlier, this author reviewed literature which presented two theoretical positions purporting to account for unassertiveness. The first of these was referred to as the "performance deficit" and emphasizes that unassertiveness is the result of built-up anxiety

within the individual serving to inhibit interpersonal responsiveness and thus blocking assertive expression. The second, referred to as the "learning deficit" emphasizes that unassertiveness is the result of never having learned relevant verbal and nonverbal responses considered necessary in assertive behavior. The results of this study would have direct relevancy for these two competing theories provided the following assumptions were accepted: (1) that a "performance deficit" theory of unassertiveness would be more positively impacted by a treatment regimen stressing "anxiety management" (i.e. relaxation training and systematic desensitization); and a "learning deficit" theory of unassertiveness would be more positively impacted by a treatment regimen stressing "shaping procedures" (i.e. behavioral rehearsal, modeling, etc.). The results of this study would neither support nor refute either theoretical position.

#### Limitations of the Study

1. Since the sample population was drawn from volunteers, the results of this study can only be generalized to a like population of volunteers.

2. All subjects were obtained from within the Logan, Utah, area, thus representing a geographic area limitation and again reducing the generalizability of the results to the general population. Also, there was no attempt to control for age or sex, other than random sampling.

3. Situational testing (role playing), although having many

advantages in terms of control and reliability of assessment, is itself, artificial. Therefore, it may not give an accurate indication of how the individual would behave in a natural situation. Appropriate assertive behaviors being shaped during training may or may not generalize to everyday use in the natural environment. Also, Spencer (1978) would argue that the type of role playing conducted as part of the behavior performance test failed to control for internal validity, since no attempt to monitor the subjects role adaptation was made.

4. The use of self report inventories (College Self-Expression Scale, Rathus Assertiveness Scale) as measures of assessing change are only as accurate as the individual's self-perception are accurate, and to the degree that the person is willing to express themselves honestly. Often, such self report inventories are subject to responses determined by a general "set" (i.e., favorable light, socially desirable) treatment exposure taught appropriate assertive attitudes, feelings, and overt behaviors. These same elements are assessed by the self report inventories. Such exposures (improved knowledge of assertiveness) could possibly account for pre-posttest changes on these scales, particularly if the subject wanted to appear as a "good student."

5. The use of loosely structured self report in assessing the amount of assigned practice completed by subjects, has questionable validity, and is considered a limitation of this study.

### Recommendations for Further Research

It is recommended that:

1. Future research in the area of assertiveness training be conducted with populations considered clinical, rather than populations of university students. This recommendation was stimulated by observation of rather impressive assertion gains by a number of near clinical subjects in what seemed to be a response to the anxiety management approach.

2. Research efforts be directed toward assessing the affects of differing treatment approaches upon personality types. This may then aid in the selection of treatments likely to provide greatest improvement on an individual basis.

3. Efforts be directed toward the development of assessment procedures which will provide both valid and reliable means of evaluating generalization (transfer of classroom learned skills into the natural environment) of assertiveness skills. Once we have available valid assessment of assertiveness skill generalization, trainers of assertiveness would be more likely to build into their training procedure and program aspects which improve generalization of assertive behavior.



## REFERENCES

- Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. Your perfect right. San Luis Obispo: Impact, 1974.
- Allen, G. J. Effectiveness of study counseling and desensitization in alleviating test anxiety in college students. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 282-289.
- Allen, G. J. The behavioral treatment of test anxiety: Recent research and future trends. Behavior Therapy, 1972, 3, 253-262.
- Aponte, J. F., & Aponte, C. E. Group preprogrammed systematic desensitization without the simultaneous presentation of aversive scenes with relaxation training. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 337-346.
- Arkowitz, H., Lichtenstein, E., McGovern, K., & Hines, P. The behavioral assessment of social competence in males. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 3-13.
- Bernstein, D. A., & Borkovec, T. D. Progressive relaxation training: A manual for the helping professions. Research Press, Champaign, Illinois, 1973.
- Bower, S. A. A self analysis of threatening situations: A beginning for assertiveness training. Paper presented at the APGA Convention, San Diego, California, February 1972.
- Brady, J. P. Metronome-conditioned relaxation: A new behavioral procedure. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1973, 122, 729-730.

- Calet, R. A., & MacLean, G. D. A comparison of reciprocal inhibition and reactive inhibition therapies in the treatment of speech anxiety. Behavior Therapy, 1970, 1(1), 51-58.
- Cautela, J. A behavior therapy approach to persuasive anxiety. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 99-111.
- Chang-Liang, R., & Denney, D. R. Applied relaxation as training in self-control. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 183-189.
- Cohen, R. The effects of group interaction and progressive hierarchy presentation on desensitization of test anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 15-26.
- Cooke, G. The efficacy of two desensitization procedures: An analogue study. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 17-24.
- Cooke, G. Evaluation of the efficacy of components of reciprocal inhibition psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 464-467.
- Cooley, M. A model for assertive statements. Assert: The newsletter of assertive behavior, 1976, 1(6).
- Davison, G. C. Systematic desensitization as a counterconditioning process. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 91-99.
- Deffenbacher, J. L. Group desensitization for heterogenous phobias. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1974, 5, 305.
- Denney, D. R. Active, passive and vicarious desensitization. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 369-375.

- Donner, L., & Guerney, B. G. Automated group desensitization for test anxiety. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 1-14.
- Dua, P. S. Group desensitization of a phobia with three massing procedures. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 125-129.
- D'Zurilla, T. J. Reducing heterosexual anxiety. In J. D. Krumboltz, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969, 442-454.
- Edelstein, B. A. & Eisler, R. M. Effects of modeling and modeling with instructions and feedback on the behavioral components of social skills. Behavior Therapy, 1976, 7, 382-389.
- Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., & Miller, P. M. Effects of modeling on components of assertive behavior. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1973, 4, 1-6.
- Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., & Miller, P. M. Shaping components of assertive behavior with instructions and feedback. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1974, 89, 1344-1347.
- Fishman, S. T., & Nawas, M. M. Standardized desensitization method in group treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 520-523.
- Freeling, N. W., & Shemberg, K. M. The alleviation of test anxiety by systematic desensitization. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1970, 8, 293-299,
- Friedman, P. H. The effects of modeling and role playing on assertive behavior. In R. D. Rubin, H. Fensterheim, A. Lazarus, & C. Franks (Eds.), Advances in Behavior Therapy. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

- Galassi, J. P., Galassi, M. D., & Litz, M. C. Assertive training in groups using video feedback. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 390-394.
- Galassi, J. P., & Galassi, M. D. Alienation in college student: A comparison of counseling seekers and nonseekers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 44-49.
- Galassi, J. P., Kostka, M. P., & Galassi, M. D. Assertive training: A one year follow-up. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 451-452.
- Galassi, M. D. & Galassi, J. P. The effects of role playing variations on the assessment of assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1976, 7, 343-347.
- Gale, E. N., & Carlsson, S. G. The ABC model of assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8, 510-511.
- Gay, M. L., Hollandsworth, J. H., & Galassi, J. P. An assertiveness inventory for adults. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 340-344.
- Gazda, G. M. Group Counseling: A Developmental Approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- Geinsinger, D. L. Controlling sexual and interpersonal anxieties. In J. D. Krumboltz, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), Behavioral Counseling: Cases and techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969, 454-469.
- Ginott, H. G. Between parent and child. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

- Gittelman, M. Behavior rehearsal as a technique in child treatment. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 1965, 6, 251-255.
- Goldfried, M. R. Systematic desensitization as training in self-control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 228-234.
- Goldfried, M. R., & Trier, C. S. Effectiveness of relaxation as an active coping skill. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1974, 83, 348-355.
- Gordon, T. P.E.T.: Parent effectiveness training. New York: Wyden, 1970.
- Gordon, T. The basic modules of the instructor outline for effectiveness training courses. Pasadena, California: Effectiveness Training Associates, 1971.
- Hall, R. A., & Hinkle, J. E. Vicarious desensitization of test anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1972, 10, 407-410.
- Hedquist, F. J., & Weinhold, B. K. Behavioral group counseling with socially anxious and unassertive college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 237-242.
- Hersen, M., Eisler, R. M., Miller, P. M., Johnson, M. B., & Pinkston, S. G. Effects of practice instructions and modeling on components of assertive behavior. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 443-451.
- Hollandsworth, J., Jr. Further investigation of the relationship between expressed social fear and assertiveness. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1976, 14, 85-87.

- Jacks, R. N. Systematic desensitization versus a self-control technique for reduction of acrophobia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.
- Jacobson, E. Progressive relaxation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Katahn, M., Strenger, S., & Cherry, N. Group counseling and behavior therapy with test-anxious college students. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 544-549.
- Kazdin, A. E. Effects of covert modeling and reinforcement on assertive behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1974, 83, 240-252.
- Kazdin, A. E. Covert modeling imagery assessment, and assertive behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 716-724.
- Kazdin, A. E. Effects of covert modeling, multiple models and model reinforcement on assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1976, 7, 211-222.
- Kimura, H. K., Kennedy, T. D., & Rhodes, L. E. Recurring assessment of changes in phobic behavior during the course of systematic desensitization. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1972, 10, 279-282.
- Kondas, O. Reduction of examination anxiety and "stage fright" by group desensitization and relaxation. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1967, 5, 275-281.
- Kondas, O., & Scetnidia, B. Systematic desensitization as a method of preparation for childbirth. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3(1), 51-54.

- Laws, D. R., & Serber, M. Measurement and evaluation of assertive training with sexual offenders. Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Laxer, R. M., & Walker, K. Counterconditioning versus relaxation in the desensitization of test anxiety. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 431-436.
- Lazarus, A. A. Group therapy of phobic disorders by systematic desensitization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 504-510.
- Lazarus, A. A. Behavior rehearsal versus non-directive therapy versus advice in affecting behavior change. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.
- Lazarus, A. A. Behavior therapy and beyond. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Lazarus, A. On assertive behavior: A brief note. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 697-699.
- Lomont, J. R., Gilner, F. H., & Skinner, K. K. Group assertion training and group insight therapies. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 463-470.
- Longin, H. E., & Rooney, W. M. Assertion training as a programmatic intervention for hospitalized mental patients. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 459-460.

- Mann, J. Vicarious desensitization of test anxiety through observation of videotaped treatment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 1-7.
- Mann, J., & Rosenthal, T. L. Vicarious and direct counterconditioning of test anxiety through individual and group desensitization. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 359-367.
- Marks, I., & Gelder, M. A controlled retrospective study of behavior therapy in phobic patients. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 111, 561-573.
- Marquis, J. N., & Morgan, W. G. A guidebook for systematic desensitization. Palo Alto, Calif.: Veterans Administration Hospital, 1968.
- Marshall, W. L., S-rawbridge, H., & Keltner, A. The role of mental relaxation in experimental desensitization. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1972, 10, 355-366.
- McFall, R. M., & Lillesand, D. B. Behavior rehearsal with modeling and coaching in assertion training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 313-323.
- McFall, R. M., & Marston, A. R. An experimental investigation of behavior rehearsal in assertive training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 295-303.
- McFall, R. M., & Twentyman, C. T. Four experiments on the relative contributions of rehearsal, modeling, and coaching to assertion training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 81, 199-218.
- McManus, M. Group desensitization of test anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 51-56.



- Melnick, J. A. Comparison of replication techniques in the modification of minimal dating behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 81, 51-59.
- Melnick, J., & Stocker, R. B. An experimental analysis of the behavioral rehearsal with feedback technique in assertiveness training. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8, 222-228.
- Mitchell, K. R. Effect of neuroticism in intratreatment responsibility to group desensitization of test anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 371-374.
- Morgan, W. G. The relationship between expressed social fears and assertiveness and its treatment implications. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1974, 12, 255-257.
- O'Neil, D. G., & Howell, R. J. Three modes of hierarchy presentation in systematic desensitization therapy. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 289-294.
- Orenstein, H., Orenstein, E., & Garr, J. E. Assertiveness and anxiety: A correlational study. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 203-207.
- Osterhouse, R. A. Desensitization and study-skills training as treatment for two types of test-anxious students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 301-307.
- Paul, G. L. Outcome of systematic desensitization. In Behavior Therapy Appraisal and Status. Franks, C. M. (Edited) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969, 63-59.

- Paul, G. L., & Shannon, D. T. Treatment of anxiety through systematic desensitization in therapy groups. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 124-135.
- Phelps, S., & Austin, N. The assertive woman. San Luis Obispo, Calif.: Impact, 1975.
- Rachman, S. Studies in desensitization - I: The separate effects of relaxation and desensitization. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1965, 3, 245-252.
- Rachman, S. Systematic desensitization. Psychological Bulletin, 1967, 67, 93-103.
- Rathus, S. A. An experimental investigation of assertive training in a group setting. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 81-86.
- Rathus, S. A. Instigation of assertive behavior through videotape-mediated assertive models and directed practice. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 57-65.
- Rathus, S. A. A 30 item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 1973, 4, 398-406.
- Rathus, S. A. Assertion training in the secondary school and the college. Adolescence, 1973, 8, 257-264.
- Reeves, J. L., & Mealiea, W. L. Biofeedback-assisted cue-controlled relaxation for the treatment of flight phobics. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 105-109.
- Rimm, D., & Medeiros, D. The role of muscle relaxation in the participant modeling. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1970, 8, 127-132.

- Robinson, C., & Suinn, R. M. Group desensitization of a phobia in massed sessions. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1969, 7, 319-321.
- Russell, R. K., & Matthews, C. O. Cue-controlled relaxation in in-vivo desensitization of snake phobia. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 49-51.
- Russell, R. K., Miller, D. E., & June, L. N. A comparison between group systematic desensitization and cue-controlled relaxation in the treatment of test anxiety. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 172-177.
- Russell, R. K., Miller, D. E., & June, L. N. Group cue-controlled relaxation in the treatment of test anxiety. Behavior Therapy, 1974, 5, 572-573.
- Russell, R. K., & Sipich, J. F. Treatment of test anxiety by cue-controlled relaxation. Behavior Therapy, 1974, 5, 673-676.
- Salter, A. Conditioned reflex therapy. New York: Capricorn, 1949.
- Schultz, J. H. Uebungsheft fur das autogene training (a practice manual of autogenous training). Leipzig: Thieme, 1935.
- Serber, M. Teaching nonverbal components of assertive training. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 179-183.
- Serber, M., & Nelson, P. The ineffectiveness of systematic desensitization and assertive training in hospitalized schizophrenics. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1971, 2, 107-109.

- Shannon, D. T., & Wolff, M. E. The effects of modeling in reduction of snake phobia by systematic desensitization. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1967.
- Spiegler, M. D., Liebert, R. M., McMains, M. J., & Fernandex, L. E. Experimental development of modeling treatment to extinguish persistent avoidant behavior. In R. D. Ribin & C. M. Franks (Eds.), Advances in Behavior Therapy. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Stevenson, I., & Wolpe, J. Recovery from sexual deviations through overcoming non-sexual neurotic responses. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1960, 116, 737-742.
- Suinn, R. M., & Hall, R. Marathon desensitization groups: An innovative technique. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1970, 8, 97-98.
- Suinn, R. M. Short term desensitization therapy. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1970, 8, 383-384.
- Taylor, D. W. A comparison of group desensitization with two control procedures in the treatment of test anxiety. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1971, 9, 281-284.
- VanSickle, D. J. Anxiety and assertive training: A program evaluation and therapy outcome study. Dissertation, University of Utah, 1975.
- Weinman, B., Gelbart, P., Wallace, M., & Post, M. Inducing assertive behavior in chronic schizophrenics: A comparison of socioenvironmental, desensitization, and relaxation therapies. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 246-252.

- Winship, B. J., & Kelley, J. D. A verbal response model of assertiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 215-220.
- Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969.
- Wolpe, J. The instigation of assertive behavior: Transcripts from two cases. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1970, 1, 145-151.
- Wolpe, J. Supervision transcript: V. mainly about assertive training. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1973, 4, 141-148.
- Wolpe, J., Brady, J. P., Serber, M., Agras, W. S., & Liberman, R. P. The current status of systematic desensitization. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1973, 130, 961-965.
- Wolpe, J., & Lazarus, A. A. Behavior therapy techniques: A guide to the treatment of neuroses. New York: Pergamon Press, 1966.
- Young, E. R., Rimm, D. C., & Kennedy, T. D. An experimental investigation of modeling and verbal reinforcement in the modification of assertive behavior. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 317-319.
- Zeisset, R. M. Desensitization and relaxation in the modification of psychiatric patients interview behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 18-24.

APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

## Rathus Assertiveness Scale

Directions: Indicate how characteristic or descriptive each of the following statements is of you by using the code given below.

- +3 very characteristic of me, extremely descriptive
- +2 rather characteristic of me, quite descriptive
- +1 somewhat characteristic of me, slightly descriptive
- 1 somewhat uncharacteristic of me, slightly nondescriptive
- 2 rather uncharacteristic of me, quite nondescriptive
- 3 very uncharacteristic of me, extremely nondescriptive

- \_\_\_ 1. Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am.
- \_\_\_ 2. I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of "shyness."
- \_\_\_ 3. When the food served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction, I complain about it to the waiter or waitress.
- \_\_\_ 4. I am careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured.
- \_\_\_ 5. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise which is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time in saying "no."
- \_\_\_ 6. When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why.
- \_\_\_ 7. There are times when I look for a good, vigorous argument.
- \_\_\_ 8. I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position.
- \_\_\_ 9. To be honest, people often take advantage of me.
- \_\_\_ 10. I enjoy starting conversations with new acquaintances and strangers.
- \_\_\_ 11. I often don't know what to say to attractive persons of the opposite sex.

- \_\_\_ 12. I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institutions.
- \_\_\_ 13. I would rather apply for a job or for admission to a college by writing letters than by going through with personal interviews.
- \_\_\_ 14. I find it embarrassing to return merchandise.
- \_\_\_ 15. If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would smother my feelings rather than express my annoyance.
- \_\_\_ 16. I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid.
- \_\_\_ 17. During an argument I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over.
- \_\_\_ 18. If a famed and respected lecturer makes a statement which I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view as well.
- \_\_\_ 19. I avoid arguing over prices with clerks and salesmen.
- \_\_\_ 20. When I have done something important or worthwhile, I manage to let others know about it.
- \_\_\_ 21. I am open and frank about my feelings.
- \_\_\_ 22. If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him (her) as soon as possible to "have a talk" about it.
- \_\_\_ 23. I often have a hard time saying "No."
- \_\_\_ 24. I tend to bottle up my emotions rather than make a scene.
- \_\_\_ 25. I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere.
- \_\_\_ 26. When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don't know what to say.



- \_\_\_27. If a couple near me in a theatre or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to be quiet or to take their conversation elsewhere.
- \_\_\_28. Anyone attempting to push ahead of me in a line is in for a good battle.
- \_\_\_29. I am quick to express an opinion.
- \_\_\_30. There are times when I just can't say anything.

## APPENDIX B

## The College Self-Expression Scale

The following inventory is designed to provide information about the way in which you express yourself. Please answer the questions by providing the appropriate number from 0-4 (Almost Always or Always, 0; Usually, 1; Sometimes, 2; Seldom, 3; Never or Rarely, 4) in the space provided. Your answer should reflect how you generally express yourself in the situation.

- \_\_\_ 1. Do you ignore it when someone pushes in front of you in line?
- \_\_\_ 2. When you decide that you no longer wish to date someone, do you have marked difficulty telling the person of your decision?
- \_\_\_ 3. Would you exchange a purchase you discover to be faulty?
- \_\_\_ 4. If you decided to change your major to a field which your parents will not approve, would you have difficulty telling them?
- \_\_\_ 5. Are you inclined to be over-apologetic?
- \_\_\_ 6. If you were studying and if your roommate were making too much noise, would you ask him to stop?
- \_\_\_ 7. Is it difficult for you to compliment and praise others?
- \_\_\_ 8. If you are angry at your parents, can you tell them?
- \_\_\_ 9. Do you insist that your roommate does his fair share of the cleaning?
- \_\_\_ 10. If you find yourself becoming fond of someone you are dating, would you have difficulty expressing these feelings to that person?

- \_\_\_ 11. If a friend who has borrowed \$5.00 from you seems to have forgotten about it, would you remind this person?
- \_\_\_ 12. Are you overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings?
- \_\_\_ 13. If you have a close friend whom your parents dislike and constantly criticize, would you inform your parents that you disagree with them and tell them of your friend's assets?
- \_\_\_ 14. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favor for you?
- \_\_\_ 15. If food which is not to your satisfaction is served in a restaurant, would you complain about it to the waiter?
- \_\_\_ 16. If your roommate, without your permission, eats food that he knows you have been saving, can you express your displeasure to him?
- \_\_\_ 17. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show you some merchandise which is not quite suitable, do you have difficulty in saying no?
- \_\_\_ 18. Do you keep your opinions to yourself?
- \_\_\_ 19. If friends visit when you want to study, do you ask them to return at a more convenient time?
- \_\_\_ 20. Are you able to express love and affection to people for whom you care?
- \_\_\_ 21. If you were in a small seminar and the professor made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it?

- \_\_\_22. If a person of the opposite sex whom you have been wanting to meet smiles or directs attention to you at a party, would you take the initiative in beginning a conversation?
- \_\_\_23. If someone you respect expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, would you venture to state your own point of view?
- \_\_\_24. Do you go out of your way to avoid trouble with other people?
- \_\_\_25. If a friend is wearing a new outfit which you like, do you tell that person so?
- \_\_\_26. If after leaving a store you realize that you have been "short-changed," do you go back & request the correct amount?
- \_\_\_27. If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?
- \_\_\_28. If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance?
- \_\_\_29. If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?
- \_\_\_30. Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified?
- \_\_\_31. If a friend does an errand for you, do you tell that person how much you appreciate it?
- \_\_\_32. When a person is blatantly unfair, do you fail to say something about it to him?
- \_\_\_33. Do you avoid social contacts for fear of doing or saying the wrong thing?

- \_\_\_34. If a friend betrays your confidence, would you hesitate to express annoyance to that person?
- \_\_\_35. When a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you, do you call his attention to the matter?
- \_\_\_36. If you are particularly happy about someone's good fortune, can you express this to that person?
- \_\_\_37. Would you be hesitant about asking a good friend to lend you a few dollars?
- \_\_\_38. If a person teases you to the point that it is no longer fun, do you have difficulty expressing your displeasure?
- \_\_\_39. If you arrive late for a meeting, would you rather stand than go to a front seat which could only be secured with a fair degree of conspicuousness?
- \_\_\_40. If your date calls on Saturday night 15 minutes before you are supposed to meet and says that she (he) has to study for an important exam and cannot make it, would you express your annoyance?
- \_\_\_41. If someone keeps kicking the back of your chair in a movie, would you ask him to stop?
- \_\_\_42. If someone interrupts you in the middle of an important conversation, do you request that the person wait until you have finished?
- \_\_\_43. Do you freely volunteer information or opinions in class discussions?
- \_\_\_44. Are you reluctant to speak to an attractive acquaintance of the opposite sex?

- \_\_\_45. If you lived in an apartment and the landlord failed to make certain necessary repairs after promising to do so, would you insist on it?
- \_\_\_46. If your parents want you home by a certain time which you feel is much too early and unreasonable, do you attempt to discuss or negotiate this with them?
- \_\_\_47. Do you find it difficult to stand up for your rights?
- \_\_\_48. If a friend unjustifiably criticizes you, do you express your resentment there and then?
- \_\_\_49. Do you express your feelings to others?
- \_\_\_50. Do you avoid asking questions in class for fear of feeling self-conscious?

APPENDIX C  
Scene Narrations

I-1 Mooching Scene:

Narr.: Picture yourself just getting out of class on any weekday morning. Hmm. You're a little hungry so you get a candy bar and milk from the machines. While you're eating you see your mooching friend (same sex) coming over again. The one who already owes you about five dollars from borrowing "just a dime" or "just fifty cents". Although you have enough money including change in your pocket, you're very tired of lending him money. Oh, here he comes now.

Moocher: Hi, how are you doing?

Moocher: Hey, I don't have any money and I'm hungry. How about loaning me 40¢ so I can get a snack from the machine.

Moocher: I'll pay you back.

Moocher: What are friends for -- Gee -- I sure am disappointed in you.

Moocher: You don't trust me -- that's great.

Moocher: I'd lend it to you if you asked me.

Moocher: A lousy 40¢, that's all -- how about a quarter then.

Moocher: You're really a cheap sort of guy. How can you be that way?

Moocher: See ya around.

\*Galassi, J. P. & Galassi, M. D.

\*All scene narrations (Appendix D) as well as all rating instructions for verbal content (Appendix E) have been developed by Galassi, J. P. & Galassi, M. D. and used here without deviation.

## II-1

## Studying Scene

Narr.: It's in the evening. About half an hour ago you were sitting at your desk in your room trying to study for an important exam tomorrow when one of your friends (same sex) dropped by to visit. Now, a half hour later she is still firmly entrenched in your room and although she knows you have an important exam to study for she doesn't seem at all anxious to go. In fact, she has been talking and laughing and playing music for so long that it's beginning to look as if she may never leave. Now you're beginning to feel somewhat panicked. You feel you must get back to your studying but your friend is making no move to leave. Well, there's only one thing to do! If you want to get her to leave, you'll have to tell her to go. Ah! There's a lull in the conversation -- this is your chance.

(Both are seated)

(DON'T SPEAK UNTIL STUDENT INITIATES A LINE)

Friend: Ah! Come on, you don't have to study all night.

Friend: You always do well. There's plenty of time to study later.

Friend: I just want to listen to this one album.

Friend: You've studied enough!

Friend: If you're not careful you'll overstudy and get all tensed up and blow it. You really need to relax.

Friend: How about just going down to the Lair with me for a few minutes then?

Friend: Oh, well if you want to be that way -- study -- see ya tomorrow. Well, anyway good luck on the exam.

## II-2

## Parents Want to Visit This Weekend

Narr.: You just received a note from your parents saying they are planning to visit you this weekend. You have already made plans to go with a friend to his home in Pennsylvania. All the plans are made and you are really looking forward to the weekend. You call your house to tell your parents of your previous plans for the weekend. Your mother answers the phone and you have just said hello to her.



Mother: Oh, hi \_\_\_\_\_. We're really looking forward to seeing you this weekend.

Mother: Well, we have been thinking about this for awhile and have made all the arrangements.

Mother: We're not sending you to college to go running off to Pennsylvania every weekend.

Mother: Your father won't be too pleased if you're not there when we come. He's even taking a day off from work.

Mother: I'm terribly disappointed in you. You should be happy that we're so interested in you that we come to visit you.

Mother: We expect to see you Friday.

Mother: Bye now.

II-3            Need a Friend to go to the Cleaners Scene

Narr.: It's 4:30 and you have a very important dinner engagement. You have just enough time to get showered and dressed and get to where you're going when you suddenly remember that the dress/suit you have planned to wear tonight is at the cleaners. You have absolutely nothing else that is appropriate for the occasion. You do not have time to go to the cleaners which is a 15 minute walk away and also get ready. You realize that you will have to ask someone to run this errand for you. Here comes your friend (same sex) \_\_\_\_\_ now.

Friend: Hi \_\_\_\_\_. How are you doing? .....Fine.....

Friend: I'm kind of busy myself. Why don't you ask someone else?

Friend: You must have something else to wear.

Friend: You're so clothes conscious all of a sudden!

Friend: Why don't you look through your closet again. I'm sure you'll find something.

Friend: That should only take me half an hour at the most. Where's the slip for it? I'll be back soon.

Friend: I had to go through drop and add for myself yesterday and it took about a half hour. That's too much time.

Friend: (Sarcastically) First I have to get your advisor's signature and then go to the Registrar's Office. Sure there isn't anything else that you want me to do?

Friend: You could have taken care of it instead of eating lunch.

Friend: All right, I'll do it but I expect the same in return. Who's your advisor anyway?

#### I-4 Change Your Grade Scene

Narr.:<sup>1</sup> You've taken an objective final exam - 50 multiple choice items. You picked up the exam and see you've gotten a 78 on the test, a C for the course. However, you noticed that two answers that Dr. Crego has marked wrong on your exam are marked correctly on your friend's exam. If you get these two marked correctly, you'd get an 82, a B instead of a C for the course. You decide to go speak to Dr. Crego, your professor. You are standing in front of the door to his office with your exam in your hand. You knock on the door.

Professor: Yes. Come in. What is it \_\_\_\_\_? (Wait for problem).

Professor: I marked these tests very carefully and double checked them so it's doubtful I've made a mistake.

Professor: You may have read your friend's exam incorrectly.

Professor: I don't make a habit of changing grades.

Professor: (Take Exam) You're right. I have made a mistake but it's only four points.

Professor: Well that grade has already been recorded with the registrar, so it's a little difficult to change it.

Professor: O.K. I see your point. I'll write a letter to the registrar and change your grade. Thank you for calling it to my attention.

---

<sup>1</sup>Before narration begins, give student a blank sheet of paper. Tell him it is a prop and will be explained in the scene description.

I-2

## Mother Wants You Home Scene

Narr.: Your mother has just called you on the phone and tells you that she wants you to come home this weekend since Aunt Sally will be visiting from out of town. You have already made very important plans for the weekend which you are not going to break. Your mother has just finished speaking and is waiting for you to speak. This is your chance.

(DON'T SPEAK UNTIL STUDENT INITIATES A LINE)

Parent: I expect you to be here this weekend.

Parent: There are plenty of other weekends for parties and social events.

Parent: Look, I pay a lot of the bills and I want you home.

Parent: Your Aunt has done a lot of things for us, the least you can do is be here. She'll be terribly hurt if you're not here.

Parent: What shall I say. My child is too busy for us now.

Parent: I hope when I call tomorrow night you will have altered your plans. Good night for now.

I-3

## Drop and Add Scene

Narr.: It's lunch time and you have classes for the rest of the afternoon, all of which require attendance. You know your friend (same sex) with whom you are eating lunch is free for the rest of the afternoon. It is the last day to drop and add courses. Thus, you would like your friend to take care of the drop and add slip for you. You still need to get your advisor's signature on the slip and he won't be back in his office until after lunch and then you need the slip taken to the registrar's office. You look at your watch and see it is 10 to 1. You must leave for class in a few minutes. You must speak now.

(DON'T SAY ANYTHING UNTIL STUDENT INITIATES A LINE)

Friend: Hey, sorry but I'm busy this afternoon.

Friend: You can cut a few classes, can't you?

## II-4

## Rescheduling Your Exam Scene

Narr.: You had a conflict between tests in two classes on the same day. One is from 2 to 4 and the other from 4 to 6. The professor in one class has made special arrangements with you to take the exam two days earlier. However, it's a week before the exam and your professor, Dr. Crego, mentions at the beginning of class that the special arrangement is off. You feel this is unfair of him to change the arrangement now. You decide to go to his office after class to talk to him about this. You knock at his door. Dr. Crego replies.

Professor: Come in. What is it \_\_\_\_\_?

Professor: I think it is best that everyone takes the exam at the same time. I really do.

Professor: When I said you could alter the schedule I was busy thinking of other things. You'll have to do the best you can.

Professor: Do you think it's fair to the others for me to make a special case just for you?

Professor: It's terribly inconvenient for me to be around two days before the exam. I'm quite busy.

Professor: Well, how about the day before the exam. I might be able to manage it then.

Professor: O.K. See you then.

## II-5

## Dating Scene

Narr.: You've been dating for two months and want to tell her how much you like her. You're sitting in a quiet lounge and are getting ready to let her know how you feel about her. There's a quiet moment, it's your chance to speak.

(Female Confederate)

(DON'T SPEAK UNTIL STUDENT INITIATES A LINE)

Friend: Oh come on.

Friend: Oh, you don't really mean that.

Friend: Please, you're embarrassing me.

Friend: Oh, I don't fall for those kinds of lines.

Friend: I didn't expect you to say something like that.

Friend: You really mean what you say. Don't you? You know,  
I like you too.

NOTE! This scene is the same for both pre- and post-testing.

## APPENDIX D

## Rating Instructions for Assertive Content

## Mooching Scene:

You will score a total of seven possible statements. These will begin with the student's response to the confederate's pitch of borrowing 40¢ and end with the student's response to the confederate's statements about being a "cheap sort of guy." (See attached sheet.)

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statements in which the student refuses to lend money.)
  - a. I don't want to lend you money.  
I can't lend you any more money.  
I'm not going to lend you any money.  
I'd rather not lend you any money.  
Me, I don't think so.
  - b. Any of the above plus a fact.  
I don't want to lend you any plus:  
You already owe me \$5.  
You haven't paid me back.  
Nickles and dimes add up.  
You always borrow money from me.  
I would have/might have if you paid me back.  
I'm tired of lending you money.
3. Qualified assertiveness
  - a. Any of 4a above plus excuses. (Has to at least say I won't or I can't.)  
  
I can't lend it to you. I don't have it.  
I don't think I can lend it to you. I don't have any change.  
(underline = excuse)
  - b. Factual statements without excuses. (As a declarative statement.)  
  
You already owe me five dollars.  
You should pay me back.  
You always borrow money.  
I need my money.
  - \*\*c. After the quarter request, score the following as a 3.  
No or I'm sorry if the student hasn't previously given a four response.

2. Implied assertiveness (Implied that he can't lend you money, he doesn't have any, or gives excuses or apologies.)

- a. I don't have any change.  
I would if I had it.  
Why don't you try Joe.  
I already spent my money.  
You can have some of my food.  
How much money do you owe me?  
I spend all my money.
- b. Facts plus excuses are scored 2.  
You should pay it back, I have a lot of expenses.  
You already owe me \$5.00. Besides, I don't have any money right now.  
You already owe me money. Here, you can have some of my food.

1. Irrelevant responses or incomplete response (e.g., Yes, but...)

Score 1 if the response is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response.

0. No response

Score 0 for the whole scene (regardless of scores previously obtained) if student lends the confederate any amount of money.

Once a student has made a 3 or 4 level response, the subsequent responses should be maintained at that level unless he

- (1) makes excuses in succeeding responses.
- (2) makes an irrelevant response.
- (3) makes no response or gives in.

If the student attains a 3 or 4 level response and then makes excuses in the succeeding response, drop the level of the succeeding response by one point, e.g., a 4 becomes a 3,  
a 3 becomes a 2.

Always refer to the student's highest response and drop it from there. Thus, a student makes a 4 response. His next response consists of an excuse. It should be scored a 3. His next response also consists of one or more excuses. It remains a 3 also. (You don't drop it to 2.)

An irrelevant response should always receive a score of 1. No response is always 0.

Never drop a response below a two unless it is either irrelevant or non-existent.

## Score the Following Examples

<u>SCORE</u>	
2	A. Don't you owe me some money already?
3	Look, I'm tired of lending you money.
3	You never pay me back.
3	I would trust you if you would pay me back.
2	No, but you can have some of my food.
3	You should pay me back.
4	I'm sorry you feel that way but I'm not going to lend you any money.
<u>20</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>

4	B. Not today.
3	I don't have any on me.
4	Sorry.
3	Look, I have a lot of bills to pay.
2	I never ask you.
0	O.K. - here's the quarter but be sure to pay it back.
<u>0</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>

2	C. I don't know.
3	Well, you haven't paid me back yet.
3	They are not for lending money all the time.
3	I'm afraid that's the way it is.
3	But I didn't ask you.
4	Not 40¢, not a quarter, not a penny.
4	I need my money.
<u>22</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>



Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Mother Wants You Home Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's opening statement and end with the student's response to the confederate's statement "my child is too busy for us now."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student says he is not coming home.)
  - a. I'm not coming home this weekend.  
I won't be there.  
I won't be home.  
I can't come home.
  - b. Any of the above plus any of the following facts:  
I have a big party/special weekend.  
I have already made plans for the weekend.  
I'm not going to break any plans.  
I can see her another time.  
If Aunt Sally had wanted to see me she should have made plans with me.
3. Qualified assertiveness (Refuses in a round about way.)
  - a. Any of the above plus excuses or apologies.  
e.g., I can't come home but I would like to be there.  
I'm sorry I can't be there. It's just impossible.
  - b. Any fact or facts.
  - c. I don't think I can make it.
2. Implied assertiveness (Never says I can't or won't or just gives excuses or apologies.)
  - a. She'll understand.  
Can't I come another time?  
I can come home next weekend.  
I have a lot of studying to do.                      apologies  
I have to be here.  
Aunt Sally bugs me anyway.  
You should be called earlier.  
I can't break them.
  - b. Fact plus excuses.
  - c. Questions are excuses.

1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response.

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student agrees to change plans or comes home.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring previous scenes will be used here.

## Score the Following Examples

SCORE	A.
3	I already have plans this weekend.
2	You should have told me earlier.
2	Can't I see her another time?
2	But I don't even like Aunt Sally.
2	I just don't think that it will be possible.
3	I don't know.
14 TOTAL	
	B.
2	I already have plans for this weekend. I think next weekend would be a better time for me to come home.
2	Couldn't we make it next weekend?
3	But this weekend is special.
3	I know you do, but I already have other plans.
3	Well, I'm sorry about that.
3	That's all right.
16 TOTAL	

	C.
4	Mom, I called to tell you I can't come home this weekend.
3	I have a lot of studying to do, exams and all.
4	I'm not coming home.
3	Well, maybe next weekend.
3	She will not, she could care less. She always argues with me.
0	No, I'll be there, but not until Saturday night.
<hr/>	
0	TOTAL
<hr/>	

Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Drop and Add Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's initial statement and end with his response to "you could have taken care of it instead of eating lunch."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student asks the friend to drop the course.)
  - a. Would you take care of this drop and add slip for me?  
I'd like you to do a favor for me and take care of dropping a course.
  - b. Any of the above plus the following facts:  
You have classes all afternoon. They require attendance.  
Your friend has nothing to do.  
Last day to drop and add.  
You need your advisor's signature and he won't be back until after lunch.  
The slip has to be taken to the registrar's office.  
It's 10 of 1. Class is in a few minutes.
3. Qualified assertiveness
  - a. 4a or 4b plus excuses.
  - b. I'd like you to do a favor for me (above).
  - c. Do you think you might be able to drop a course for me?  
I was wondering if you might drop a course for me.
  - \*\*d. If they begin with either would you do a favor for me or I'd like you to do a favor for me followed by 4a or 4b, score a 3. (with pause)

2. Implied assertiveness (Never asks the person directly to drop the course.)

- a. Just facts are scored 2 if not yet at a higher rating.
- b. 3b plus excuses.
- c. Just excuses, apologies, or begging (e.g., exaggerated please).
- d. Would you do a favor for me.  
Do you think you might be able to do a favor for me?  
I was wondering if you might run an errand for me?  
You don't think you could do it?

1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response, or an irrelevant question. E.g., What do you have to do?  
Well ....

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student doesn't get the confederate to drop the course for him or if the student alters his plans.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring previous scenes will be used here. In addition, excessive begging (exaggerated please) will be dropped 1 from a previous 3 or 4 level.

Score the Following Examples

SCORE	A.
4	Could you help me cut this afternoon and drop a course for me?
1	What do you have to do?
3	No, they all require attendance; and besides if I don't attend, I won't do very well.

3	I'm sure it won't take that much time today.
1	You could go and return this library book for me while you're at it.
3	But, I need to eat lunch.
<hr/>	
15	TOTAL

	B.
2	Would you do a favor for me? I have classes all afternoon and I need to drop a course and today is the last day.
2	What should I do? Today is the last day, and I can't cut class.
2	No.
2	Please just this one time.
2	No, that's all.
2	Please do it for me.
<hr/>	
12	TOTAL

	C.
2	I have to drop a course and today is the last day.
4	Would you do it for me? I can't cut my afternoon classes.
4	No, they require attendance.
4	This is important to me.
4	No, just that.
4	That's true.
<hr/>	
22	TOTAL

Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Change of Grade Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's response to "what is it?" and end with the student's response to "...it's a little difficult to change it."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student asks the professor to check over the exam or change the grade.)
- a. I'd like you to check over my exam.  
 Would you check my exam?  
 Would you look at my exam, I think there has been a mistake in grading it.  
 Would you change the grade on this exam since there has been a mistake in grading it?  
 Could you look at my exam?

- b. 4a plus facts.  
 You got a 78 instead of an 82.  
 Two answers marked wrong on your paper have been  
 marked right on your friend's paper.  
 The 4 points would give you a B instead of a C for  
 the course.  
 I need the B or I need the four points.

3. Qualified assertiveness

- a. I was wondering if you could check over my exam?  
 Do you think you might look at my exam?  
 Do you think you could change my grade?
- b. 4a or 4b plus excuses, apologies, begging.
- c. You made a mistake in grading my exam or I think you made  
 a mistake in grading my exam. (without excuses)  
 I think you graded these incorrectly.  
 I earned a B and I should (or ought to) get it.

2. Implied assertiveness (Never really asks professor to look at the  
 exam or to change the grade.)

- a. Is there any chance you might have made a mistake in grading  
 my exam?  
 What are the correct answers?
- b. Just facts, e.g., I think there was a mistake in grading  
 my exam.  
 I think a couple of these were graded wrong.
- c. Just excuses.
- d. 3a or 3c plus excuses, apologies, begging.

1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or to the  
 confederate's preceding comment or if it is an incomplete response or  
 an irrelevant question.

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student agrees to forget about the four  
 points.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring the previous scenes will be used here. In addition, excessive begging (exaggerated please) will be dropped 1 from a previous 3 or 4 level.

Score the Following Examples

<u>SCORE</u>	A.
3	Dr. Crego, I'm sorry to bother you but I think there has been a mistake made in scoring my test.
3	But two answers were marked wrong on mine but marked right on my friend's exam.
3	No.
2	Don't you think it's only fair if I earned the points?
2	Don't you feel you have to change it?
4	Well, I'd like you to change it.
<u>17 TOTAL</u>	
	B.
4	Would you check over my exam? I believe you've made a mistake.
4	I'd like you to check it.
4	I doubt it.
3	The four points are important, I need to get a 3.3 to keep my scholarship.
3	Please change it for me.
4	I'm sure you could change it.
<u>22 TOTAL</u>	
	C.
2	Do you think you might have made a mistake in grading my test?
3	Well, I think you did make a mistake.
4	No, would you check it over please?
4	I realize that.
4	Yes, but that's the difference between a C and a B.
3	I'm sorry to put you through an inconvenience but I did earn those four points.
<u>20 TOTAL</u>	

Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Dating Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's initial statement and end with the response to "I didn't expect you to say something like that."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student says he likes/loves the confederate.)
  - a. I like you.  
I love you.
  - b. 4a plus facts:  
We've been dating for two months.  
Any statements about the relationship with the confederate.
  - c. 4a plus 2c.
3. Qualified assertiveness
  - a. I want to tell you (how much) I like you. (no excuses)  
I guess you know I like you. (no excuses)
  - b. I think you're great. (no excuses)  
I think you're a wonderful person. (no excuses)
  - c. 4a or 4b plus excuses, apologies, qualifications.  
Don't get embarrassed but I like you.  
I hope you don't think I'm childish, but I like you.  
I've dated a lot of girls but...  
Well, if you don't believe me, I don't know. But  
I like you.
2. Implied assertiveness (Expresses feelings in an indirect way.)
  - a. I enjoy being with you.  
I had a wonderful time.  
We always have a good time together.  
I'm attracted to you.
  - b. 3a or 3b plus excuses.
  - c. Questions - Do you know how much I like you?
1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response, or an irrelevant question.



- a. How do you feel about me?  
Do you like me?
- b. Just facts or excuses without any statements about the person or the relationship.

If a 1a response occurs with a 3 response, drop response 1 point.  
If a 1b response occurs with a 4 or 3 response, drop response 1 point.

0. No response

Score 0 for the response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student says nothing or if the student never gets a 2, 3, or 4.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring previous scenes will be used here.

Score the Following Examples

SCORE	
2	A. Do you know how much I like you?
2	No, I mean it.
2	Yes I do.
2	You shouldn't feel embarrassed, that's how I feel.
2	Well, if that's the way you feel, I don't know.
2	Well, I mean it.
12 TOTAL	
2	B. I really enjoy being with you. The party was great!
2	Come on what.
2	Sure I do.
3	Why, because I want to tell you I like you.
4	Line's, I like you.
3	Then I won't say it anymore.
16 TOTAL	

	C.
1	We've been dating for two months. I've never dated anyone that long.
1	Well, we've had 12 dates.
1	Sure I do.
1	Oh well.
1	Lines - what do you mean?
1	Oh, I give up. Take me home.
<hr/>	
	0 TOTAL

### Rating Instructions for Assertive Content in the Study Scene

You will score a total of seven possible statements by the students. These will begin with the student's opening line and end with the student's response to the following line by the confederate-- "How about just going down to the Lair with me for a few minutes then?" (See attached sheet)

Each student statement will receive a score from 0 to 4.

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement which directly tells the person that he has to leave.)

Score the following statements 4:

- a. You'll have to go now; or you'll have to leave; or I want you to leave .
- b. Any statement such as the above plus any factual statement.  
You have to leave plus:  
I have a(n) (difficult, important, final) exam.  
I have to study.  
You've been here a long time.  
or consult attached sheet.
- c. I'm sorry (figure of speech) but you'll have to go now.

3. Qualified assertiveness

- a. Any statement which asks a person to leave in a round about way. E.g., You could come back tomorrow.  
Why don't you come back tomorrow? (without excuses)  
Couldn't you come back tomorrow?  
Please come back tomorrow, I have to study.
- b. Any statements which directly asks the person to leave but includes some apology or excuse.

E.g., You'll have to leave now, I'm going to study.  
 "I know it's really not polite but I'm afraid  
 it's necessary."  
 Would you please leave, if I don't study for this  
 exam "I'll probably get an F in the course."  
 You'll have to leave. "You wouldn't want me to  
 flunk this exam would you?"

## 2. Implied assertiveness

Statements which never really ask the person but which imply that he  
 should leave - but never says leave or go.

- a. You know this is a really important test.  
 I sure have a lot of studying to do tonight.  
 Why don't you visit Jane?  
 Why don't you go to the movies?  
 Why don't you take the album to your room?  
 I don't mean to be unfriendly, but I have a lot of studying  
 to do.  
 It's been great talking to you. We should do this again  
 sometime.
- b. Just a fact.
- c. Just an excuse.

## 1. Irrelevant responses or incomplete response (e.g., Yes, but ...)

Score 1 if the response is unrelated to the entire sequence or to  
 the confederate's proceeding comment.

E.g., Do you have a car?  
 What are you doing this weekend?

## 0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate  
 line.

## 0. For the scene

Score 0 for the whole scene (regardless of scores the student might  
 have received) if:

- a. Student says nothing for entire scene, or
- b. Student gives in and allows confederate to remain in room  
 or leaves the room himself and goes to the Lair with  
 confederate.

Once a student has made a 3 or 4 level response, the subsequent responses should be scored on their level unless he:

- (1) makes excuses in succeeding responses.
- (2) makes an irrelevant response.
- (3) makes no response or gives in.

If the student attains a 3 or 4 level response and then makes excuses in the succeeding response, drop the level of the succeeding response by one point - e.g., a 4 becomes a 3,  
a 3 becomes a 2.

Always refer back to the student's highest response and drop it from there. Thus, a student makes a 4 response. His next response consists of an excuse. It should be scored a 3. His next response also consists of one or more excuses. It remains a 3 also. (You don't drop it to a 2.)

An irrelevant response should always receive a score of 1. No response is always 0.

Never drop a response below a two unless it is either irrelevant or non-existent.

#### Score the Following Examples

SCORE	A.
2	I really have a lot of studying to do.
2	No, I really have to study.
4	You'll have to leave now, I really must study.
3	Please don't make me feel guilty. You have to go.
4	This is a very important test.
4	I do have to study.
4	Why don't you come back tomorrow?
23 TOTAL	
	B.
2	Don't you think you ought to go see Ray. I have a lot of work.
2	I really have to study. This is an important test.
2	No, I have to study now.
2	Couldn't you take it with you?
2	No, this is an important test.
2	Well, I'll take a shower and then I'll relax.
2	Why don't you go to the Lair. I have to study.
14 TOTAL	

- C.
- 4      Would you mind leaving, I have an important test  
tomorrow.
- 3      Well, this test will determine whether I pass the  
course or not.
- 4      No, this is really important.
- 3      Do you want me to flunk the test?
- 0      ---
- 4      That won't happen.
- 0      Well, maybe for just a few minutes, then you'll have  
to leave.

---

0 TOTAL

---

Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Parents Want to Visit Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's response to the confederate's opening line and end with the student's response to the confederate's statement "We expect to see you Friday."

4.    Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student says he is going away to Pennsylvania.)
- a.    I'm not going to be here. I'm going to Pennsylvania.  
Don't come. I won't be here.  
I'm going away this weekend.
- b.    Any of the above plus any of the following facts:  
I already have plans for the weekend.  
I have plans with a friend.  
Your note came too late.  
I am looking forward to the plans I have.  
I want to go to Pennsylvania.
3.    Qualified assertiveness
- a.    Any of the above plus excuses or apologies.  
I'm not going to be here. It's a shame you didn't tell me  
about your plans earlier.
- b.    Any fact or facts without excuses.  
I don't think I'll be here.  
I was going to Pennsylvania.  
I have to go to Pennsylvania.

2. Implied assertiveness (Never says he is not going to be there.)

## a. apologies or excuses

e.g., Couldn't you come next week?

I have a lot of tests to study for this week.

This is a bad weekend.

I really want to see you.

This is the first time I'm going there.

## b. Facts plus excuses or apologies

e.g., I'm busy this weekend. Why don't you come next weekend?1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response.

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student agrees to change plans.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that was used in scoring previous scenes will be used here.

## Score the Following Examples

<u>SCORE</u>	A.
3	Mother, I already have plans for this weekend.
3	I would like to go to Pennsylvania.
2	This will be the first time.
3	Well, I have my own life to lead.
3	I am happy about it, but I'm going to Pennsylvania.
3	Sorry.
<u>17</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>

	B.
4	Well, I'm not going to be here.
3	That's a shame we won't be able to get together.
4	Yes, I realize that.
4	I know.
3	But it would be unfair to break my plans at this time.
0	OK, I'll be here.
<u>0</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>

- C.
- 3 Well, I was going to go to Pennsylvania this weekend.  
 3 You're note came too late.  
 3 I'm afraid I've already made plans.  
 4 Tell him to take off another weekend. I'm going  
 to Pennsylvania.  
 3 But I need to get away.  
 4 I don't think I'll be here.

---

20 TOTAL

### Rating Instructions for Assertive Content in the Cleaners Scene

You will score a total of five possible statements. These will begin with the student's initial statement and end with his response to "why don't you look through your closet again, I'm sure you'll find something."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student asks the friend to go to the cleaners.)
- a. Would you mind picking something up for me at the cleaners?  
I'd like you to run an errand for me and pick up a suit at the cleaners.
- b. Any of the above plus any of the following facts:  
 You have a very important engagement.  
 You don't have enough time to get showered and dressed and also go to the cleaners.  
 Your suit is at the cleaners.  
 You have nothing else to wear.  
 The cleaners is a 15 minute walk away.
3. Qualified assertiveness
- a. 4a or 4b plus excuses.
- b. I'd like you to do a favor for me. (alone)  
I'd like you to do an errand for me. (alone)
- \*\*c. If they begin with either would you do a favor for me or I'd like you to do a favor for me followed by a pause and then followed by 4a or 4b, score a 3.
- d. Do you think you might be able to go to the cleaners?  
I was wondering if you might go to the cleaners?
- e. Will you do it for me? (If it is undefined.)

2. Implied assertiveness (Never directly asks the person to go to the cleaners.)

a. Just facts are scored 2 if not yet at a higher rating.

b. 3b plus excuses.

c. Just excuses, apologies or begging.

Excuse: Yes, I've always been that way - I'm clothes conscious.

Ask, "Who to ask."

d. Would you run an errand for me?

Would you do a favor for me?

I need someone to go to the cleaners for me.

Are you busy?

Do you think you might be able to do a favor for me?

I was wondering if you might run an errand for me?

1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or the confederate's preceding comment or if it is an incomplete response, or an irrelevant question.

What do you have to do?

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student doesn't get the confederate to go to the cleaners.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring previous scenes will be used here. In addition, excessive begging (exaggerated please) should be dropped 1 from a previous 3 or 4 level.



## Score the Following Examples

<u>SCORE</u>	
2	A.
2	Would you mind doing a favor for me?
2	Well, I have an important dinner engagement and I don't have time to get ready and also pick up my suit.
2	No, I don't.
3	I don't think I'm clothes conscious. Look, do you think you could pick up the suit for me?
4	No, I've already looked twice. How about going to the cleaners for me? It won't take long.
<u>13 TOTAL</u>	

	B.
2	I have a problem, I have an important dinner engagement and my suit is at the cleaners and I don't have time to pick it up. I need someone to pick it up for me.
2	Who would you suggest?
2	No, this is my only suit.
2	This is the only thing that is appropriate for the occasion.
2	Please do it for me.
<u>10 TOTAL</u>	

	C.
4	Would you pick up a suit at the cleaners for me. I have an important dinner engagement tonight and I forgot it was there.
3	Who would you suggest?
3	No, I don't. You have to help me out this one time.
4	It's not that. I just need that suit.
0	Well, all right. Maybe I can find something but I doubt it.
<u>0 TOTAL</u>	

Rating Instructions for Assertive Content  
in the Rescheduling Exam Scene

You will score a total of six possible statements. These will begin with the student's initial statement and end with his response to "how about the day before the exam..."

4. Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statement in which the student indicates that he wants the previous arrangement.)
- a. I want to take the exam as we arranged.  
I think I'm entitled to take the exam as we arranged.  
I want to take it two days before as we planned.
  - b. 4a plus facts.  
Conflict between two exams on same day.  
Made special arrangement to take exam two days early.  
Week before exam and professor calls off the special arrangements.
3. Qualified assertiveness (Student asks to arrange an alternate day or time convenient for himself and/or expresses fact that he feels the professor is unfair for changing the arrangements.)
- a. Can we make it for another day? (without excuses)
  - b. I think it's unfair for you to change the time at this late date.
  - c. Any 4 with excuses, apologies, begging.
  - d. I'm wondering if followed by 4a.
2. Implied assertiveness (Never really says he wants to take the exam two days early.)
- a. Can you tell my why you called off the special arrangements?
  - b. Don't you think it's unfair to change at this late date?  
Don't you think I should be allowed to take it when we had planned?  
Isn't there anything you could do? or There must be something you can do.
  - c. Any fact.
  - d. 3a or 3b with excuses.
  - e. Just excuses, apologies, begging.
1. Irrelevant or incomplete response

Score 1 if comment is unrelated to the entire sequence or to the confederate's preceding comment, or if it is an incomplete response or an irrelevant question.

0. No response

Score 0 for a response if the student says nothing to the confederate's line.

0. For the scene

Score 0 for the scene if the student agrees to take the exam the same time the other students take it.

\*For last response - If they agree to do it the day before, drop 1 from the high.

Don't drop below a 2 unless student gives irrelevant response or no response.

\*\*Scoring responses subsequent to a 3 or 4 response

The same rules about maintaining or dropping a response that were used in scoring previous scenes will be used here. In addition, excessive begging (exaggerated please) will be dropped 1 from a previous 3 or 4 level.

## Score the Following Examples

SCORE	
2	A. Dr. Crego, you said that the special arrangement for me to take the exam early is off. I would like to know why you changed your mind.
2	But it's not possible. I have a conflict between two exams.
2	That will probably mean that I'll flunk it.
2	They won't mind.
2	Do you think it's fair to me that you have changed your mind at the last minute.
2	Well, O.K.
12 TOTAL	

2	B. You said our special arrangement is off and I've already made my plans.
4	Well, I think it's only fair to let me take the exam on the day that we agreed on.
3	Then I probably won't do very well.
4	You could just leave it with your secretary for me.
3	Isn't there something you can do?
4	No that's no convenient.

C.

3 You changed our special arrangement and I would like  
to see if there would be another day that I could  
take the exam.

3 Isn't there some other day which would be convenient  
to both of us.

2 There must be something you can do.

2 Yes, I think they would understand.

2 Well, I guess I'll just have to flunk it then.

2 O.K. That is a help.

---

14 TOTAL

## APPENDIX E

## Rating Scale For Eye Contact and Scene Length

The amount of time a student maintained eye contact with the confederate was measured for each scene. Stop watches were used to record this variable. (Amount of time eye contact was maintained was converted later into a percentage of eye contact for each scene.)

The length of each scene was also recorded. Stop watches were used for this task. If a student went over two minutes in any scene, the tape was stopped at the two minute point.

## APPENDIX F

## Rating Scale for Assertive Affect

The following aspects were considered in assessment of the performance variable (Assertive Affect):

<u>Voice Rate</u>	<u>Voice Force</u>	<u>Voice Pitch</u>	<u>Articulation Quality</u>
Too slow	Adequate	High	Over precise
Too fast	Weak	Low	Slurred
Too many pauses	Unvaried	Monotone	Strained
Too even	Loudness	Narrow range	Flat
	Varied	High overtones	Lifeless

Each subject was rated on a scale from 1 to 5 on each of the four aspects of Assertive Affect (voice rate, voice force, voice pitch, and articulation quality). These scores were then added together and divided by four to get the rating score for this performance variable.

## APPENDIX G

## Rating Scale for Overall Assertiveness

The following considerations were taken into account in the rating of the performance variable (overall assertiveness):

1. Projection of confidence, competence, and self-assuredness.
2. Consistency between verbal content and nonverbal components and appropriate expression to the situation.
3. Voice qualities free from speech disturbances that represent nervousness and anxiety.
4. Ratings on other performance variables added together and divided by three.

Each of these areas were rated on a one to five point scale. The resulting ratings were then divided by four, providing the score for the performance variable (overall assertiveness).

## APPENDIX H

## Outline of Basic Assertiveness Sessions

Session One:

1. Exercise in reaching out to learn another person's name and to shake hands with them.
2. Lecture, disclosing the part male-female roles played in assertiveness orientation and behavior.
3. Lecture, learning to discriminate what assertiveness is and is not; to distinguish among assertive, nonassertive, and aggressive behaviors.
4. Use of the non-verbal communication of eye contact in being assertive.
5. Assignment, read first and second chapters of Your Perfect Right (Alberti & Emmons, 1974).

Session Two:

1. Discussion on experiences of using eye contact since the previous session.
2. Exercises in self-disclosing and practice in developing listening skills.
3. Four behaviors: assertive, nonassertive, aggressive, and passive-aggressive, role played by trainers and discussed.
4. Discussion on congruence of verbal and non-verbal behaviors.
5. More on non-verbal (body messages) and their role in assertive behavior.



6. Development of an assertive-behavior hierarchy--how to develop your own.
7. Assignments, develop your own assertiveness hierarchy. Read chapters 3 and 4 in text.

#### Session Three:

1. Exercises in giving and receiving compliments.
2. The use of "I" messages and "you" messages in being assertive.
3. Practice exercises in the use of "I" statements.
4. From personal hierarchies, each subject role plays a first step (not too threatening) situation while in groups of four.
5. Shaping of assertiveness skills through coaching, modeling, and reinforcement as subjects role playing being assertive.
6. Continued practice and shaping on assertiveness behaviors (groups of four).
7. Read chapters 5, 6, and 7 in Your Perfect Right.

#### Session Four:

1. Introduction and model of "broken record" technique.
2. Introduction and modeling of "fogging" and "negative assertion" techniques.
3. Lecture on three steps to assertive responding.
4. Exercises in use of the preceding techniques.
5. Continued role playing (practice) in use of above concepts and techniques (getting it all together).

## APPENDIX I

## Outline of Systematic Desensitization Procedure

Session One:

1. A brief discussion of the rationale behind the use of systematic desensitization.
2. Presentation of progressive relaxation procedures including muscle tensing and relaxing of the basic 16 muscle groups:  
(1) dominant hand and forearm, (2) dominant biceps, (3) non-dominant hand and forearm, (4) nondominant biceps, (5) forehead, (6) upper cheeks and nose, (7) lower cheeks and jaws, (8) neck and throat, (9) chest, shoulders, and upper back, (10) abdominal or stomach region, (11) dominant thigh, (12) dominant calf, (13) dominant foot, (14) nondominant thigh, (15) nondominant calf, (16) nondominant foot. Subjects of this group received two sessions dealing with this relaxation procedure using the basic 16 muscle groups as suggested by Bernstein and Borkovec (1973).  
Note: Subjects were provided cassette tapes of the relaxation procedure and were given the assignment of practicing between four to six times per week over a two-week period. Methods for determining the extent of relaxation practice relied on self report at the beginning of each session.
3. Session 3 consisted of a continuation of progressive relaxation procedures but a shortened procedure involving seven basic muscle

groups was introduced: (1) muscles of the dominant hand and arm, (2) muscles of the nondominant hand and arm, (3) the facial muscle group, (4) the neck and throat, (5) chest, shoulders, upper back and abdomen, (6) muscles of the dominant thigh, calf and foot, (7) muscles of the nondominant thigh, calf and foot. Also included in the third session were procedures for the development of a personal assertiveness hierarchy for use in the desensitization procedures to follow. Again, cassette tapes of the relaxation procedures for the seven muscle groups were provided. The subjects were assigned to practice the procedure four to six times per week. Procedures being used were adapted from Bernstein and Borkovec (1973).

4. Session 4 introduced desensitization proper. Individual hierarchies of each subject were printed in large letters on separate 5"x8" cards. Desensitization proper proceeded in the following manner: In the initial desensitization session, the first four scenes of each subject's 12-scene hierarchy was placed before him on an adjustable stand that allowed the subject to read the hierarchy cards from the lying down position. The cards describing the hierarchy scenes were ordered from left to right, according to their anxiety-arousing capacity. The desensitization process began with a 15-minute relaxation session, using the seven basic muscle group procedure. When all subjects were fully relaxed, they were instructed to open their eyes and read the first scene

on the adjustable stand and then close their eyes and visualize that scene. If a subject experienced significant anxiety during visualization, he was instructed to discontinue visualization of that scene and to relax until instructions for revisualization began. Each scene was presented for a standard 20 seconds, and then terminated by the instructor. Approximately 30 seconds between scenes, visualizations were devoted to relaxation. Each subject moved to his next scene in the hierarchy only after he had visualized a given scene twice in succession without anxiety. If a subject completed his four scenes before the session was finished, he was instructed to go back over the scenes completed in that session. To insure that the session didn't end with some subjects feeling anxious, the instructor had each subject return to his last successfully completed scene, which was presented three times. This scene then became the first scene for the next session. In this manner, each subject moved progressively at his own pace through his individualized hierarchy.

5. Sessions 5, 6, 7 and 8 consisted of continued desensitization proper. Since individuals progressed at their own rate, some had completed the 12 hierarchy scenes prior to completion of the eighth session. These individuals were instructed to add other appropriate scenes to make use of the available desensitization instruction process.

## APPENDIX J

## Cue-Controlled Relaxation Procedures

Session One:

1. A brief discussion of the rationale behind the use of cue-controlled relaxation was presented. Presentation and training in progressive relaxation procedures, using the basic 16 muscle groups procedure (see Appendix I). Tape recordings of this procedure were given to each subject with instructions to practice the procedure from four to six times per week. Methods for determining the extent of relaxation practice relied upon self report at the beginning of each session.

Session Two:

2. Introduction of the seven muscle groups procedure (see Appendix I) was presented, with instructions to continue use of pre-recorded tape of "16 muscle groups" until at least nine successful practice sessions had been completed.

Session Three:

3. Presentation of cue-word conditioning was introduced. Procedure for conditioning the cue-word "relax" followed, without deviation, those guidelines suggested by Bernstein and Borkovec (1973).

Session Four:

4. Continuation of cue-word conditioning using "seven muscle groups" procedure, and cue-word conditioning procedure.

Session Five:

5. Same as Session 4, with additional presentation of ways to apply the conditioned cue-word in situations relevant to development of assertiveness behavior.

Sessions Six and Seven:

6. Same as Session 5, with an additional assignment which consisted of experimenting on a daily basis with the use of the cue-controlled conditioning technique in everyday environmental situations relative to assertive behavior.

Session Eight:

7. Same as Sessions 6 and 7, with additional time spent in group discussion of experienced applications of the cue-controlled technique and/or problems which any of the subjects might have experienced in application efforts.

## VITA

Larry J. Carlson

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: The Role of Relaxation and Systematic Desensitization  
in the Efficacy of Assertiveness Training

Major Field: Psychology

## Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Heber, Utah, June 4, 1946, son of  
Jack I. and Vera Carlson; married Kathleen Page August  
27, 1971; children--Gregory, Amy, and Michael.

Education: Attended elementary school in Heber, Utah, graduated  
from Wasatch High in 1964, received the Bachelor of  
Science degree from Utah State University, Logan, Utah,  
with a major in psychology in 1970; 1976 completed the  
requirements for the Master of Science degree at Utah  
State University, with a major in psychology; 1978  
completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy  
degree at Utah State University, with a major in Psychology.

Professional Experience: 1973-75, Personnel psychologist  
Armed Forces examining and entrance station, Manchester,  
New Hampshire; 1975-76, teaching assistant at Utah State  
University; Coordinator of services to handicapped children  
for Northern Utah Head Start/Home Start, 1976-77; Psychology  
intern at Walla Walla, Washington VA Hospital 1977-1978;  
Psychology intern at Mid-Columbia Mental Health Center  
at Richland, Washington 1978.