0-315-05588-X

53482

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | *THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE*

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Valerie Elisabeth Whiffen

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Sex Roles and Assertiveness

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* Simon Fraser University

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/*GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1981

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Dr. Meredith Kimball

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication, ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Dec 17/81 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ*

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* [redacted]

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

SEX ROLES AND ASSERTIVENESS

by

Valerie Elisabeth Whiffen

B.A.(Hons), University of Guelph, 1977

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Psychology

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

December 1981

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

Sex Roles and Assertiveness

Author:

(Signature)

VALERIE WHIFFEN

(Name)

DEC 17/1981

(Date)

APPROVAL

Name: Valerie Elisabeth Whiffen

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of thesis: Sex Roles and Assertiveness

Examining Committee:

Chairperson: Dr. Dennis Krebs

Dr. Meredith Kimball
Senior Supervisor

Dr. William Krane

Dr. Julie Brickman
External Examiner
Clinical and Consulting
Psychologist

Date Approved: Dec 14, 1981

ABSTRACT

The widespread promotion of assertiveness training for women is predicated on the assumption that women are generally less assertive than men. Previous research has failed to establish sex differences in global assertiveness. However, situation-specific differences have emerged which suggest a relationship between assertiveness and stereotyped expectations of sex appropriate behavior. Sex role orientation, as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire, was hypothesized to be a better predictor of assertiveness than gender. This hypothesis was supported by data collected from 40 male and 40 female university students. Androgynous and masculine subjects, regardless of gender, were more assertive than feminine and undifferentiated subjects on the Adult Self-Expression Scale, and more assertive than feminine subjects on a projective measure of assertiveness. When self-concept, as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, was controlled for, the relationship between sex role orientation and assertiveness disappeared for the ASES but not for the projective measure. This discrepancy was attributed to the greater specificity in the situations included in the projective measure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. Meredith Kimball for her patient assistance in editing this manuscript. I would also like to thank Drs. Bill Krane and Ray Koopman for their statistical advice, and Joan Foster who always has time to explain the mysterious ways of the computer. A special thank you to my many friends, especially Marlene and Malcolm, for their patience and support during the somewhat trying experience of completing this research. Finally I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Ben Gottlieb, of the University of Guelph, for his kindness and encouragement many years ago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

I. Introduction

1.1 Assertiveness: Definition and Issues

The concept of assertiveness was originally derived from Wolpe's (1958) work on reciprocal inhibition. Wolpe proposed that neurotic anxiety could be inhibited by the emission of self-expressive excitatory responses. One of the anxiety-inhibiting responses he identified was assertiveness, a general term describing "more or less aggressive" (Wolpe, 1969, p.61) interpersonally potent behaviour. As he worked in a therapeutic context, Wolpe perceived assertiveness as typically involving the expression of anger and resentment, an emphasis which has been adopted in popular literature on the subject (eg Creative Aggression Bach & Goldberg, 1974). In general, however, assertiveness was seen to involve "all socially acceptable expressions of rights and feelings" (Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966, p.39), including those conveying positive affect.

This early conceptualization has been widely criticized for its vagueness (McFall & Marston, 1970; Rich & Schroeder, 1976), and attempts have been made to formulate a definition with greater specificity. The establishment of criteria for "socially

acceptable expressions" has proven especially problematic. Theorists in the tradition of Alberti and Emmons (1974) have focussed on the issue of rights, defining assertiveness as the ability "...to express (one's) rights without destroying the rights of others" (p.2). They distinguished assertion from aggression, arguing that the latter risks negative social consequences such as the escalation of hostilities. They also speculated that the aggressive individual may experience anxiety and guilt about his/her aggressiveness, resulting in a negative self-image. In general, these theorists conceived assertiveness as a social skill which functions not only to reduce anxiety but to enhance interpersonal communication in both "neurotic" and normal populations. Thus they emphasized the importance of positive as well as oppositional expressions, maintaining that deficits in either respect could prove deleterious.

In general it is Wolpe's orientation which has provided the framework for most empirical work on assertiveness. One unfortunate consequence of this emphasis has been a systematic disregard for the distinction between assertiveness and aggression. DeGiovanni and Epstein (1978) found substantial confusion between the concepts among the most frequently employed measures of assertiveness; to date no measure has been developed which clarifies this issue. However, guidelines for discriminating assertive from aggressive responses have been proposed. It is generally agreed that aggression involves

attempts to dominate or humiliate another person. Thus Hollandsworth (1977), for instance, suggested that threats and/or the use of explicit punishment to gain compliance constitute aggression. He observed that the object of the aggression may be deprived of existing or anticipated resources, or subjected to social punishment in the form of negative evaluations, ostracism or name-calling. His definition of assertiveness, however, is essentially negative as it is demarcated from aggression only by the absence of abusive concomitants.

Other theorists have attempted a more positive differentiation by incorporating the concept of obligation. Rakos (1979) argued that in addition to avoiding negative evaluations of the other, the assertive response must recognize the rights of the other person. Similarly, Jakubowski (1977) maintained that an assertive response is comprised of an acknowledgement of the other's feelings or perspective followed by a statement of the assertor's feelings. She reasoned that explicit statements of rights and responsibilities function both to inhibit aggressive tendencies and to dispel such perceptions on the part of others. Thus, a response which does not include some recognition of the other is not necessarily aggressive, but risks that perception and is subsequently less than ideally assertive.

A second, more subtle, distinction between the two general approaches concerns the extent to which assertiveness is perceived to be a situation-specific behaviour. Theorists in the Wolpe tradition tacitly admit, of course, that some individuals are capable of assertive responding across a wider range of situations than others. In their empirical work, however, and consistent with their broader theoretical orientation, these researchers have emphasized the importance of situational determinants. Specifically, they maintain that the capacity for assertiveness will vary as a function of the type of behaviour required and salient characteristics of both the context and the human object of the assertion.

Rich and Schroeder (1976) reasoned that if assertiveness were a relatively unitary response style, factor analyses of responses to assertiveness inventories should yield a strong general factor. They cited two such studies, which produced 13 and 11 factors respectively, as evidence to support the situation-specificity hypothesis. In contrast, Kipper and Jaffe (1978) found only four factors: (i) willingness to take risks, (ii) expression of emotions, (iii) taking action (i.e. setting limits) and (iv) adopting a self-punitive attitude.

A more direct test of this hypothesis was undertaken by Eisler, Hersen, Miller and Blanchard (1975). The authors presented 60 male psychiatric patients with 32 role play situations, varying the affective content of the desired

assertion (positive versus negative) as well as the sex and familiarity (intimate versus stranger) of the person toward whom the assertion was directed. All three variables were found to significantly influence overall ratings of assertiveness. Subjects were judged to be more assertive in the expression of positive rather than negative assertions. Compliance and spontaneous positive expression were more likely with male partners, compared with more requests for behaviour change with female partners. Finally, higher ratings were assigned to interactions with strangers compared to those with intimates. Thus, overall, assertiveness was most frequently observed with females and strangers, and in situations requiring positive assertions. Subsequent research has supported the importance of the gender variable in other populations, but contradicts the direction of the relationship. Stebbins, Kelly, Tolor and Power (1977) and Higgins, Alonso and Pendleton (1979) observed more same than opposite-sex assertiveness among college students; Heimberg, Goldberg, Desmarais and Blue (1979), however, found no sex-of-antagonist differences among young male offenders. Replication of the findings with regard to affective content and familiarity has yet to be attempted.

Other evidence suggests that despite some fluctuation across situations relatively stable personality characteristics may be equally important as predictors of assertiveness. Nesbitt (1979), for instance, found the best single predictor of role

played assertiveness to be subjects' evaluations of their overall level of assertiveness. Schwartz and Gottman (1976) explored the role of cognitive variables in discriminating globally high from low assertors. They asked self-rated high, moderate and low assertives to construct a written assertive refusal to an unreasonable request, which they then compared with role played refusals. The groups did not differ in their knowledge about the content of an appropriately assertive response; yet behavioural differences emerged during the role play. Self-rated low assertives also reported making more negative than positive self-statements during the role play, suggesting that they were inhibiting their attempts to respond assertively. In a replication Alden and Cappe (1981) were able to eliminate the behavioural differences by instructing subjects to behave as assertively as possible. However, low assertors were more likely to endorse Ellis' irrational beliefs, and rated themselves as more anxious and less effective during the role play than high assertors. These authors concluded that low assertors have high standards for themselves and, consequently, are overly critical of their performance.

Bruch's (1981) replication and extension of Schwartz and Gottman (1976) did not produce results entirely consistent with the other studies. He found high, moderate and low assertors to differ both behaviourally and in their knowledge of an appropriate response. However, he also found moderate and low

assertors to report making equivalent numbers of positive and negative self-statements during role play, suggesting that these groups undermine their performance by setting up cognitive conflicts. Also of interest is his finding that high assertors demonstrated greater cognitive complexity than other groups. He identified two aspects of cognitive complexity as most relevant to assertiveness: flexibility and inner-directedness. Bruch reasoned that the ability to examine situations from a variety of perspectives, in combination with an ultimate reliance on internal standards, allows cognitively complex individuals to formulate a response which recognizes both their own and others' rights in a situation.

Finally, Bruch found this pattern of differences to exist only in situations requiring the expression of negative assertion. Between group comparisons of assertiveness in situations which required the expression of positive affect failed to yield significant differences. The theoretical importance of this finding is unclear as the self-report measure employed is comprised solely of situations requiring negative assertion. This does support, however, the contention that deficits in one dimension need not generalize to the other.

Other research suggests relationships between nonassertiveness and low self-concept (Tolor, Kelly & Stebbins, 1976) and a general anxiety about communication (Pearson, 1979). Thus, nonassertiveness seems less the result of specific skill

deficits than of a cognitive style characterized by negativism, anxiety and inflexible social problem-solving strategies. It might be expected that relatively threatening or high risk situations, such as those involving negative assertion or a cross-sex antagonist, will function to exacerbate these tendencies.

1.2 The Measurement of Assertiveness

A variety of self-report inventories have been developed to measure assertiveness. In empirical work the most frequently employed tend to be the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Rathus, 1973), the Conflict Resolution Inventory (McFall & Lillesand, 1971), the College Self-Expression Scale (Galassi, DeLeo, Galassi & Bastien, 1974) and the Adult Self-Expression Scale (Gay, Hollandsworth & Galassi, 1975). All four are reported to have satisfactory test-retest reliability and content validity. Each was developed, however, from a slightly different theoretical orientation, which is reflected in the items included. With the exception of the RAS, item selection was consistent with a situation-specificity model. Rathus, however, developed what is essentially an attitude inventory; a typical item is "There are times when I just can't say anything". Thus this inventory provides a good estimate of global assertiveness, but does not permit the identification of situation-specific deficits. Conversely, the CRI consists of negative assertion

items only and does not provide an estimate of global assertiveness. Only the CSES and the ASES were intended to measure both global and situation-specific assertiveness. Both questionnaires contain positive as well as negative assertion items and a range of antagonists, from strangers and authority figures to friends and lovers. Items consist of a description of a situation followed by a specified response, half of which are assertive. Respondents indicate on a Likert format scale the probability of their engaging in the specified response. Assertive responses are positively scored and simple addition yields a global score.

Relative to the other measures available, the versatility of the CSES and the ASES is advantageous. DeGiovanni and Epstein (1978) observed, however, that all four measures fail to satisfactorily distinguish assertion from aggression. Their examination of validity studies demonstrated only moderate to poor discriminant validity. The presence of substantive correlations between self-report measures of assertion and aggression is, however, hardly surprising as these measures constitute little more than a frequency count of noncompliance. That this noncompliance can be accomplished aggressively is self-evident.

Behavioural indices were formulated in response to theoretical arguments that assertiveness, like other interpersonal behaviours, has a critical nonverbal component

(Serber, 1972). Indeed there is some intuitive appeal to the notion that verbally assertive content may be defused by smiling or by the uncertainty conveyed in a tremulous voice. Eisler, Miller and Hersen (1973) developed the Behavioral Assertion Test, a series of standardized role play situations. Responses are scored both for verbal content and for nonverbal behaviours which are presumed to covary with assertive responding. The validity of these nonverbal concomitants has yet to be firmly established. However, three have demonstrated some stability: loudness of speech (Eisler et al., 1973; 1975); strength of affect (Eisler et al., 1973; 1975; Heimberg et al., 1979), and duration of response (Eisler et al., 1975; Heimberg et al., 1979). Assertive subjects are reported to receive higher ratings than nonassertives on all three components. Thus assertives are judged to speak more loudly, with greater affect and for longer periods of time than nonassertives.

The most apparent difficulty with this measure is the authors' failure to include a category for aggressive responding in the scoring system. That this has resulted in some confusion of assertion with aggression may be inferred from the nonverbal differences between high and low assertives. It has also been suggested that the demand characteristics inherent in the role play format distort subject performance. Higgins et al. (1979) observed higher levels of assertiveness among subjects who were given standard role play instructions than among subjects who

were presented with an identical situation involving a confederate. They also reported only a nonsignificant tendency for self-rated low assertives to give more passive/compliant role played responses than high assertives.

Neither self-report nor role play measures correspond strongly with behaviour in situations involving a confederate. Cummins, Holombo and Holte (1977) reported a significant but unimpressive correlation of +.25 between self-reported assertiveness scores and behaviour with a confederate. Nor is the relationship between the two types of measurement entirely consistent. The best results were reported by Bourque and Ladouceur (1979) who derived role play situations from selected self-report items; however, they achieved only a moderate correlation of +.50.

1.3 Sex Differences in Assertiveness

The value of assertiveness training for women has been widely promoted (e.g., The New Assertive Woman. Bloom, Coburn and Pearlman, 1975). Jakubowski (1977) argued that women frequently seek professional help for disorders which derive from their sense of powerlessness. Assertiveness training, she claimed, provides concrete skills through which women can increase their sense of power and more effectively achieve interpersonal goals. An integral aspect of training, however, involves the resolution of psychological resistance to behaving

assertively. Women are socialized to be selfless, to subsume their opinions and needs to the needs of important others: parents, lovers and children. Expressions of anger or direct statements of need, particularly in opposition to the needs of others, are perceived as selfish and hence unfeminine. The consideration of others is such a consistent response for some women that they are frequently unaware of their own needs and feelings; the emergence of these feelings is likely to be associated with strong feelings of guilt. Thus assertiveness, as distinct from aggression, is argued to provide a balance between the conflicting needs to demonstrate consideration for others and for self-expression.

Implicit in this rationale is the assumption that nonassertiveness is a critical component of female socialization. If this assumption is accurate women in general should demonstrate deficits in assertiveness relative to men. Yet Hollandsworth and Wall (1977), in a review of the assertiveness literature, reported that only in 4 of 14 samples was significantly more male than female assertiveness observed. Similarly, among five studies not cited in the authors' review, three reported no sex difference (Cummins et al., 1977; Hollandsworth & Wall, 1977; Tolor et al., 1976) and three found females to report more assertiveness than males (Orlofsky &

Windle, 1978; Stebbins et al., 1977; Tolor et al., 1976)[1]. Behavioural explorations have not clarified this issue: two studies (Cummins et al., 1977; Stebbins et al., 1977) which incorporated an unobtrusive behavioural measure, in the form of a mildly obnoxious confederate, found no sex differences. Yet Smye and Wine (1980) observed more female than male assertiveness across a variety of role play situations. Bourque and Ladouceur (1979) compared responses to role play situations representative of four general categories of assertiveness: expressing positive feelings, refusing unreasonable requests, standing up for legitimate rights and expressing negative feelings. Overall, females achieved higher assertiveness scores than males. Specifically, however, males were more assertive in standing up for their rights, while females were better able to express positive feelings and to refuse unreasonable requests.

There is other evidence to support a situation-specificity approach to sex differences. Two studies (Gambrill & Richey, 1975; Hollandsworth & Wall, 1977) compared responses to individual self-report inventory items. Both reported stable differences in employment situations and in asking for dates, with males reporting more assertiveness than females. Hollandsworth and Wall also found males more likely than females to ask a friend to repay a loan and to speak up in group

---

[1]Tolor et al. (1976) found differences on one measure but not another.

discussions. In the same study females reported greater assertiveness in expressing anger to their parents and positive regard for others. Gambrill and Richey found females to report more often that they would refuse a date or ask if they had offended someone.

Many of these differences are predictable in the sense that they conform to societal expectations of sex-appropriate behaviour, for instance the expression of positive regard for females and work-related assertiveness for males. Sex difference hypotheses are, in fact, frequently predicated on the assumption that gender is associated with stereotyped behaviour. Yet it appears more sensible to argue that stereotypic behaviour is mitigated by an individual's identification with his/her sex appropriate role. The failure to establish consistent sex differences in global assertiveness may not belie the theoretical logic of the hypothesis, but rather reflect the fact that the proportion of sex-typed college students is estimated to be less than forty percent (Bem, 1977; Spence and Helmreich, 1978).

1.4 Sex Roles: Research and Issues

Until recently masculinity and femininity were perceived as polar opposites such that the presence of one precluded the presence of the other. In general, femininity was associated with the expressive and masculinity with the instrumental or

active domain. While it was acknowledged that the two realms are complementary in society, they were presumed to be antagonistic within the individual (Parsons & Bales, 1955). This assumption reflected societal attitudes toward the sexes which are manifested in the conformity of many men and women to the instrumental and expressive stereotypes. Growing recognition that the stereotypes are more prescriptive than descriptive has inevitably resulted in the challenging of bipolar definitions of masculinity and femininity (e.g. Constantinople, 1973).

Bem (1974) developed a measure of sex role orientation which eschews the structural assumption of an inverse relationship between masculinity and femininity. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) is comprised of two orthogonal subscales measuring masculinity (M) and femininity (F). Conceptually, an individual who scores high on his/her sex appropriate scale and low on the sex inappropriate scale is considered sex-typed; when the reverse is true the individual is cross sex-typed. Two additional classifications are made possible by the structure of the BSRI: androgyny, which is defined as the possession of high levels of both masculinity and femininity, and "undifferentiated" to describe those individuals whose scores are low on both scales. Bem argued that the empirical dichotomization of masculinity and femininity has obscured the potential for rigidity inherent in sex-typing. She reasoned that the individual who is committed to either a masculine or

feminine orientation will be behaviourally constrained in situations requiring sex inappropriate responses. The androgyne, she proposed, may be more flexible, that is capable of responding in either a masculine or feminine manner dependent on the contingencies of a given situation.

To substantiate this hypothesis Bem conducted a series of experiments comparing behavioural flexibility in situations involving sex-typed responses. In a standard conformity study (Bem, 1975) androgynous and masculine subjects, regardless of gender, were found to conform less than feminine subjects on false consensus trials. This configuration was highly significant for males, but originally just shy of significance for females. However, when Bem responded to methodological criticisms[2] by reclassifying some subjects and reanalysing her data (Bem, 1977), the result for females was significant at conventional levels. Also reported (Bem, 1975) were the results of a study in which subjects were asked to play with a kitten, then given the choice of engaging in optional play. Feminine and androgynous males reported more enjoyment of the activity and engaged in more spontaneous interaction than masculine males. The pattern for females conformed less well to predictions, however. Androgynous females were most responsive to the kitten in both forced and spontaneous play: significantly more responsive than feminine subjects. In addition, masculine women

---

[2] See Section 1.5 for a discussion of these criticisms.

engaged in more spontaneous play than feminine women.

Two post hoc explanations of these results were proposed. Hypothesizing that the feminine women were afraid of the animal, Bem, Martyna and Watson (1976) repeated the study with a human infant. As predicted masculine subjects of both sexes were less nurturant with the baby than both feminine and androgynous subjects. Alternatively, it was proposed that nurturance might best be elicited from feminine women in passive situations. To test this hypothesis subjects were placed in a listening role with a same-sex confederate who confessed to feelings of loneliness. Again the pattern of results conformed to her predictions. As both manipulations were successful in eliciting nurturance from feminine women, the explanatory power of either hypothesis is impossible to evaluate. All four studies, however, support Bem's contention that androgynes demonstrate more behavioural flexibility than do sex-typed subjects in sex inappropriate situations.

Attempts to extend this hypothesis to non-behavioural flexibility have been less successful. Orlofsky and Windle (1978) operationally defined expressive responses to selected TAT cards as "feminine", and self-reported global assertiveness as "masculine". As predicted sex-typed and cross sex-typed subjects achieved high scores only on the measures congruent with their sex role orientation. The overall pattern of results, however, was only as predicted for the sex inappropriate "task".

That is, androgynous and feminine males gave more expressive responses to the TAT cards than did masculine and undifferentiated males, but females' expressiveness did not vary as a function of sex role. Similarly, androgynous and masculine females were more assertive than feminine and undifferentiated females; yet masculine males were more assertive than androgynous males who were again more assertive than feminine males. These results suggest that the evolution of androgyny involves the cultivation of cross sex-typed characteristics, and the concurrent suppression of appropriate sex-typed responding. If this conclusion is warranted it might be expected that androgyny has different implications and consequences for males and females, and that the two groups are not strictly comparable.

This suggestion seems to be supported by Wiggins and Holzmuller (1978) who further extended the androgynous flexibility hypothesis. The authors asked subjects to rate themselves on 1710 trait-descriptive adjectives as well as the BSRI. They reasoned that androgynes' responses would generate relatively flat profiles as they should not rigidly emphasize any one set of interpersonal traits to the exclusion of others. This hypothesis was confirmed for androgynous males, who described themselves as introverted, cold, calm, unemotional, passive and undramatic. It was completely disconfirmed for androgynous females, however, who perceived themselves as

extraverted, warm, excitable, emotional, aggressive and vivacious. The latter group's profile was also as "rigid" as that of stereotyped females, but in the opposite direction (r= -.96). As the authors subsequently failed to replicate all of these findings (Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1981), conclusive statements cannot be made. The self-perceived differences between male and female androgynes are striking enough, however, to warrant some caution in assuming their comparability.

Further extensions of Bem's original hypothesis have equated flexibility with psychological adjustment. The issue of self-esteem is one which has enjoyed some popularity. While Spence and her colleagues (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) contended that androgynes have the highest self-esteem, followed in order by masculine, feminine and undifferentiated individuals, Bem (1977) and Orlofsky (1977) maintained that androgynous and masculine individuals possess equivalently high levels of self-esteem. There is general agreement that masculinity is more strongly correlated with self-esteem than femininity. Spence and Helmreich (1978) estimated correlations of +.72 for males and +.7 for females; in contrast, the correlations between self-esteem and femininity are reported to be +.23 and +.22 for males and females, respectively. Thus high self-esteem is primarily related to high masculinity, with or without concomitant high femininity.

Silvern and Ryan (1979) established a similar relationship between masculinity and global adjustment, as measured by the Self-Goal-Other Discrepancy Scale. They found higher levels of adjustment for both masculine and androgynous subjects relative to feminine and undifferentiated subjects. They concluded, however, that the effect was due to high levels of masculinity rather than to androgyny per se. The correlation between femininity scores and adjustment was statistically significant but considerably weaker than the correlation between masculinity and adjustment. Orlofsky (1977) reached the same conclusion when he examined the relationship between sex roles and ego identity. He found identity achievement to be associated with a masculine orientation for both sexes and with androgyny for females only. Androgyny in males was not related to any specific stage of ego identity.

Jones, Chernovetz and Hansson (1978) compared sex role groups across five areas of psychological functioning, including personality and adjustment, intellectual competence and sexual maturity. In addition, subjects were asked to indicate which BSRI items they most wanted to change. Again, striking differences emerged between the sexes within sex role groups. Androgynous and masculine women were both more politically aware and more creative than feminine women; these dimensions formed part of the operational definition of intellectual competence. Masculine women were also judged to have achieved greater sexual

maturity than androgynous and feminine women, as they perceived themselves as more popular and admitted to earlier and more frequent heterosexual activity. Finally, feminine women were more likely to desire increases in masculinity than the other groups. The findings for males are a departure from current conceptions of androgyny. Androgynous males were evaluated to be less politically aware than masculine males and less creative than feminine males. In addition, masculine men were more extraverted, showed greater sexual maturity and were quicker to solve anagrams (another component of intellectual competence) than both androgynous and feminine men. Finally, both androgynes and feminines were more likely than masculines to desire increased masculinity. The authors inferred two conclusions from these results: they proposed that the development of androgyny is more beneficial to females than to males, and that it is the masculine component of androgyny which is critical as evidenced by the higher overall level of functioning demonstrated by masculine-typed subjects.

As research has moved away from Bem's original hypothesis of behavioural flexibility to more psychodynamic conceptions of flexibility, the reputed superiority of an androgynous style has been seriously challenged. To some extent this conflict reflects the difference between behaviour and the value associated with that behaviour. Bem observed that androgynes are capable of behaving in ways that have been stereotyped as either masculine

or feminine, while sex-typed subjects are most proficient when the behaviour required is sex appropriate. To extrapolate that this flexibility will be positively valued and reinforced is to demonstrate a naive understanding of the extent to which social reinforcement is contingent upon gender appropriate behaviour. Research subsequent to Bem's does not refute the behavioural aspect of her hypothesis, but demonstrates that this flexibility is not entirely meritorious, especially in men.

Both intuition and empirical research support the notion that masculinity is more socially desirable than femininity. While masculine subjects equalled or exceeded androgynes in all but behavioural flexibility, feminine subjects demonstrated deficits across a variety of dimensions, including self-esteem and global adjustment. The extent to which masculinity is synonymous with "normality" is, in fact, best illustrated by some of the measures selected in the preceding research. Orlofsky (1977) included committment to an occupational goal in his definition of identity achievement, a committment which despite recent changes persists as more relevant to men than women. Jones et al. (1978) included political awareness in their definition of intellectual competence. They may as well have asked for batting averages: like sports, politics continue to be a predominantly male interest. Sexual maturity was evaluated in part by the frequency of heterosexual activity; without some sense of the quality and purpose of this activity evaluations of

its maturity seem tenuous at best. Thus some of the failure to establish differences between masculine and androgynous subjects may be attributed to the implicitly masculine conceptions of adjustment which permeate this area of research.

Theorists currently conceive the androgyne as a "superperson" capable both of switching masculine and feminine masks as the situation dictates, and when appropriate of synthesizing the two styles into a more humane gestalt. Bem (in press, cited in Kelly & Worell, 1977) asserts that the androgynous person could:

> "...blend these complementary modalities into a single act, being able , for example, to fire an employee if circumstances warrant it, but to do so with sensitivity for the human emotion that such an act inevitably produces." (p.1114)

It is of some interest that even Bem perceives the masculine response to predominate in this hypothetical incident. Of greater interest is her optimism that the conflict could be resolved by expressing sensitivity for the errant employee. It is equally plausible, as Kelly and Worell note, that the successful resolution of such conflicts demands the forfeiture of one or the other mode of action. In these situations the possession of both masculine and feminine attributes may become a deficit, a source of conflict rather than an avenue for resolution.

1.5 The Measurement of Sex Roles

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) is a 60 item self-report measure of sex role orientation (Bem, 1974). Each item consists of a single descriptive word or phrase; respondents indicate on a seven point Likert scale the extent to which each characteristic is self-descriptive. Twenty items each form the masculinity (M) and femininity (F) subscales; the remaining 20 items are considered neutral and are not relevant to subsequent computations. Sex-typing is determined by the raw score difference between an individual's M and F scale scores, which is then normalized, using an independent groups t-test, with respect to the variation in scores on both scales.

Criticisms of the BSRI have focussed on two primary issues: (i) the use of the t-ratio and the quantitative definition of androgyny and (ii) Bem's contention that the M and F scale items are equally desirable.

Strahan (1975) addressed the numerous statistical difficulties associated with the use of the t-ratio. Most salient is his reminder that inferential use of the t-ratio requires independence of observations, an assumption which is clearly violated by Bem's procedure. Spence et al. (1975) advanced a theoretical criticism related to its use. They argued that simple difference scores obscure a potentially meaningful distinction between individuals scoring high on both the M and F scales and those scoring low on both scales. Androgyny, they

proposed, should be redefined as the possession of high levels of both masculine and feminine characteristics. Further, they argued that the t-ratio scoring procedure be replaced by a median-split method, whereby individuals scoring above the median on both scales be classified as androgynous and those scoring below both medians be considered "undifferentiated". The authors included self-esteem data to support this distinction, which demonstrated that androgynes report significantly higher levels of self-esteem than undifferentiated subjects. Bem (1977) responded to these criticisms by reanalysing her earlier data using the median-split procedure. As she discovered some differences, particularly in self-esteem, she now concurs with the distinction.

More recently criticisms of the median-split method have begun to emerge. Sedney (1981) observed that the use of sample medians to classify sex role groups increases vulnerability to between-sample differences, and consequently threatens the generalizability of results. As one solution she proposed use of the median scores established by the test author rather than sample medians. This was particularly advised when sample medians deviate substantially from those originally reported.

A less simply reconciled problem with the BSRI concerns the relative desirability of items selected for the M and F scales. In the initial item selection, 100 student judges evaluated the extent to which 200 personality characteristics were socially

desirable for either an American man or woman. The final items were those judged to be significantly more desirable for one gender or the other. Computation of mean desirability scores for the two scales confirmed that ratings were significantly higher for the "appropriate" than for the "inappropriate" gender. Bem's contention that the M and F scale items are equally desirable is predicated on the finding that "...men and women are nearly equal in their perceptions of the desirability of sex appropriate characteristics, sex inappropriate characteristics, and the difference between them ($t \leq 1$ in all three comparisons)" (Bem, 1974, p. 158).

In perusing Bem's data, however, Strahan (1975) observed that her female judges thought it more desirable than the male judges for women to have M scale characteristics. When he approximated a t value from the data provided he found this difference to be significant. A replication of Bem's procedure (Walkup & Abbott, 1978) also showed this difference. Thus in both samples, females perceived the desirable female role as more masculine than their male peers.

A related issue is Bem's failure to obtain a sex-unspecified rating of trait desirability. Earlier research (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970) found that characteristics considered quite unacceptable in "mature adults" were nevertheless endorsed for "mature females". Bryson and Corey (1977), in addition, demonstrated that

sex-linked traits tend to receive more positive ratings when attributed to the appropriate sex regardless of the trait valence. Puglisi (1980) has since demonstrated that the sex-unspecified desirability of the F scale characteristics is significantly lower than those of the M scale characteristics. He attributed most of the variability to such questionable F scale items as "gullible", "child-like" and "shy".

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) is superior to the BSRI in this crucial respect. In developing the measure the authors (Spence et al., 1975) considered only traits which were judged to be desirable for both sexes. Items were assigned to the M scale if males were perceived to possess the characteristic more frequently than females, and to the F scale if the reverse was true. An optional third scale, the M/F, recognizes that some traits are perceived as socially desirable for one sex only; this is a bipolar scale containing such items as "passive-aggressive".

There is some evidence that the BSRI and the PAQ are comparable measures. A cursory examination of normative data for the questionnaires suggests their similarity, with notable exceptions in the observed proportions of feminine and androgynous males (see Table 1). When the scale scores are treated as continuous variables, the correlations between the BSRI and the PAQ are +.85 and +.73, for the M and F scales respectively (Kelly & Furman, 1978). The weaker correlation

between the F scales may be attributable to the desirability problem with the BSRI. The concordance is reduced when individuals are classified by the median-split procedure, with percentage agreement corrected for chance of 37.9 for the sexes combined, and 43.1 and 45.9 for males and females separately. Unfortunately, this problem is endemic to typological measurement. Some compensation is possible through the supplementary use of multiple regression to evaluate the relative influence of M and F scale scores in the determination of specific behaviours (Bem, 1977; Strahan, 1975).

Finally, a recent criticism of both inventories is the exclusion of sex-typed but socially undesirable traits from the M and F scales (Kelly, Caudill, Hathorn & O'Brien, 1977; Kelly & Worell, 1977). To examine the relationship between negative sex-typed traits and sex roles, Kelly et al. introduced 20 such characteristics to both the M and F scales of the BSRI. While individuals in all sex role categories admitted to some negative attributes, androgynous males endorsed the fewest and undifferentiated males the most negative items. These findings further substantiate the distinction between the androgynous and undifferentiated sex roles, and more crucially, also support the contention that negative as well as positive sex-typed traits are a functional aspect of sex role orientation.

Table 1

Comparison of Normative Data

for the BSRI and the PAQ

	BSRI (1977)		PAQ (1978)	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	%	%	%	%
M	34	14	37	16
F	8	32	16	34
A	32	27	20	29
U	25	28	27	20

1.6 The Present Study

There is evidence to support the hypothesis that assertiveness is associated with sex role orientation. The research on sex differences in assertiveness indicates that many of the stable differences are congruent with stereotypes of sex appropriate behaviour (Gambrill & Richey, 1975; Hollandsworth &

Wall, 1977). The extent to which individuals conform to these stereotypes should vary as a function of their sex role orientation.

Two studies have directly assessed the relationship between sex roles and assertiveness. Tolor et al., (1976) classified subjects as sex-typed if their ratings of sex appropriate traits were higher than those assigned to sex inappropriate traits. The groups were subsequently compared on their levels of self-reported global assertiveness. The authors' failure to establish differences between the sex role groups may be explained by their methodology. They did not employ a standardized measure of sex role orientation, and asked subjects to rate the desirability of traits rather than the extent to which these traits were self-descriptive. They also included both androgynous and undifferentiated subjects in the same category, although these groups have been shown to differ on a variety of salient dimensions. The second study (Currant, Dickson, Anderson & Faulkender, 1979) also failed to distinguish androgynous from undifferentiated subjects. They did, however, establish differences between sex-typed males and females. Subjects viewed videotaped assertiveness in both oppositional (negative) and positive expressive situations. They were asked to indicate the probability of their engaging in that behaviour in the same situation. As predicted, sex-typed females reported higher response probabilities in the expressive situations,

while sex-typed males' scores were higher in the oppositional situations.

The failure to properly identify androgynous subjects is a serious weakness in both studies, for it may be argued that assertiveness, as currently defined, is androgynous behaviour. Theorists who subscribe to Alberti and Emmon's (1974) orientation have proposed that assertiveness is comprised of two elements: noncompliance and recognition of the other's perspective. While the former may be perceived as the active or masculine component, the latter clearly requires more feminine or other-oriented qualities. It might be expected that masculine individuals are capable of noncompliance, but not of recognizing the other's perspective, thus risking the perception of aggressiveness (Jakubowski, 1977). Some support for this hypothesis is provided by Smye and Wine (1980) who found adolescent boys to be more aggressive than their female peers in situations requiring assertiveness. In addition, Hoppe (1979) found masculine subjects to be more aggressive than other sex role groups in the deliverance of shock as a response to provocation. Feminine subjects, it is predicted, should emphasize the rights of others to the exclusion of their own, and thus comply more frequently than other groups. Theoretically, the androgyne's flexibility should enable these individuals to produce a response which synthesizes the noncompliant and other-oriented components of assertiveness more

frequently than other sex role groups.

The most apparent difficulty entailed in testing these hypotheses is the failure of standardized assertiveness measures to discriminate assertion from aggression; a measure which permits this differentiation is clearly necessary. For this reason, a projective measure of assertiveness[3] was developed from selected self-report inventory items. The scoring system for the "punitive" category was derived from the criteria suggested by Hollandsworth (1977). Also included was a category for explicit statements which recognized the other's perspective. In acknowledgement of the situation-specific aspect of assertiveness, the decision was made to control across the projective measure for the type of assertion. As the hypothesized group differences were expected to be exacerbated by high-risk situations, each projective situation involved an intimate, either a friend or a lover. Similarly, negative are more threatening than positive assertions in this context; thus, the situations all involved the expression of opposition and/or negative affect.

Differences between androgynous and masculine subjects should not emerge on self-report measures of global assertiveness, as these inventories are insensitive to the distinction between assertion and aggression. Thus, it was hypothesized that androgynous and masculine subjects would

---

[3] Described in Section 2.2

achieve higher scores on the standardized measure of assertiveness, the Adult Self-Expression Scale, than feminine and undifferentiated subjects. The same pattern was predicted for the Noncompliance component of the projective measure. However, it was also predicted that masculine subjects would tend to make more punitive statements than other sex role groups on the projective measure, while feminine and androgynous subjects would more frequently recognize the other.

A secondary interest in this study involved the relationship between self-concept and assertiveness. As self-concept has been demonstrated to covary with both self-rated assertiveness (Tolor et al., 1976) and sex role orientation (Bem, 1977; Orlofsky, 1977; Spence et al., 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), a self-concept measure was included to assess the extent to which the hypothesized group differences are attributable to group differences in self-concept.

II. Method

2.1 Subjects

Seventy-six female and 57 male undergraduate students at Simon Fraser University participated in the study. Median masculinity and femininity scale scores were established using the procedure suggested by Spence and Helmreich (1978) for unequal numbers. Median scale scores were calculated separately for males and females, and the average of the two medians used as the cutoff point. All subjects were then classified by sex and sex role and a subsample randomly selected so that each of the eight sex by sex role categories was represented by ten subjects. The data from these subjects were submitted to subsequent analyses. Data from the remaining subjects were used to refine the projective scoring system and to establish inter-rater reliabilities. Female subjects ranged in age from 18 to 45 with a mean of 24.65 years. Male subjects ranged from 18 to 49 with a mean of 23.5 years.

2.2 Measures

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to assess sex role orientation. The PAQ is comprised of 24 items rated on a five point Likert-type scale. Masculinity (M), femininity (F) and the bipolar M/F are each assessed by eight separate items resulting in maximal scores of 32 for each scale. For the total sample in this study median M and F scale scores of 20 and 23 respectively were established, which is comparable with the scores of 21 and 23 reported by Spence and Helmreich (1978) for college students. The distribution of subjects across sex roles is reported in Appendix A. The bipolar scale scores were not used in assigning subjects to sex role categories.

Adult Self-Expression Scale

The Adult Self-Expression Scale (ASES) is a 48 item self-report measure of assertiveness. Each item consists of a brief description of a situation; subjects are instructed to indicate on a five point scale, where 0=always and 4=never or rarely, the frequency with which they would make a specified response. Assertive responses are positively scored yielding a potential total score of 192. This scale was selected in anticipation of the older average age of Simon Fraser students.

The ASES was developed using community college students with a mean age of 25.4 years (Gay, Hollandsworth and Galassi, 1975) and has since been validated across a variety of adult populations (Hollandsworth et al., 1977).

The scale was initially reported to have high test-retest reliability and moderately high construct validity. Subsequent validation (Hollandsworth et al., 1977) using the multitrait-multimethod procedure demonstrated strong convergent and moderate discriminant validity. Bourque and Ladouceur (1979) have also demonstrated moderate correlations between total ASES scores and a behavioural measure of assertiveness.

The structure of this scale permits the extraction of situation-specific subscales. In order to compare the ASES with the projective measure of assertiveness, 15 items referring to friends and lovers were isolated, and total scores on these items (FLSUB) submitted to separate analyses, in addition to analyses of the total ASES scores.

Projective Measure of Assertiveness

This measure was comprised of nine situations derived from assertiveness inventory items (see Appendix B). Each situation involved a transgression by an intimate (male or female friend or lover), and required the expression of negative assertiveness. Only situations which were equally plausible in both platonic and heterosexual relationships and with both male

and female transgressors were included. The nine situations were selected from 18 pilot-tested for feasibility and the range of potential responses.

Subjects were instructed to write their probable verbal response to cue statements made by the transgressor. To minimize the most apparent demand characteristics of this task, subjects were assured that sometimes their actual response might differ from what they would like to say. Space was provided for an ideal response if such a discrepancy occurred. Subjects were presented with three situations involving each of a male friend, a female friend and a lover for a total of nine situations. The order of presentation was completely counterbalanced.

Responses to each situation were scored on a present/absent basis for the following 'components' of assertiveness derived from the theoretical literature:

(i) recognition of the problem : subject indicates that the situation is problematic

(ii) compliance : subject complies with the explicit or implicit request of the transgressor either by active collusion or passively by not addressing the problem

(iii) noncompliance : subject does not acquiesce to the behaviour and/or perspective of the transgressor. Scored to take one of three mutually exclusive forms:

(a) request for behaviour change: Subject specifies desired behaviour to the transgressor

(b) explicit statement: Subject makes an explicit statement about the problem, either confrontative or explanatory

(c) avoidance/compromise: Without directly addressing the problem, subject offers a compromise or creates an excuse to avoid compliance

(iv) punitiveness : Subject threatens direct or indirect punishment; uses antagonistic or derogatory remarks

(v) affect : Subject makes an explicit statement about own feelings to the transgressor

(vi) recognition of the other : Subject makes an explicit statement recognizing the perspective of the transgressor

With two exceptions, the scoring was based only on what the subject identified as his/her probable verbal response. The component "recognition of the problem" was scored on the basis of all the information provided by the subject, in order to record those instances when a subject's verbal response was compliant despite their perceiving the situation as problematic. "Punitiveness" was also scored on the basis of the entire response, as many subjects indicated that they would deliver punishment at some unspecified future time.

The responses of 24 subjects were scored by two independent raters and inter-rater reliabilities established. Table 2 summarizes the percentage of agreement and kappa coefficients (Cohen, 1960) for individual components.

Table 2

Inter-Rater Reliabilities

for the Projective Measure of Assertiveness

	Percentage Agreement	Kappa
Compliance/Noncompliance	98	.96
Punitiveness	93	.77
Type of Noncompliance	84	.76
Recognition of the Problem	94	.67
Affect	95	.65
Recognition of the Other	88	.56

The component "noncompliance" is most comparable to scores on the ASES, as it is defined simply as the refusal to acquiesce to the behaviour and/or perspective of the other. It was expected that analysis of these scores would yield results similar to those obtained for the ASES. It was also possible to combine the projective components to form an operational definition of 'adequate assertiveness'. Responses were scored as adequate assertions if they met the following criteria: noncompliance, taking either the form of requesting behaviour change or making an explicit statement about the problem, and

the incorporation of either a statement of affect or a statement recognizing the perspective of the other person. Responses incorporating a punitive element were eliminated from consideration.

Self Concept

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) is a 100 item self-report measure of self concept. Subjects indicate on a five point scale the extent to which descriptive statements are characteristic of them (completely false - completely true). Positive self-statements are positively scored yielding a potential total score of 500. The scale was constructed as a multi-dimensional measure of self concept; for the purposes of this study, however, only total scores were analysed.

2.3 Procedure

Subjects completed the questionnaire battery containing, in order of presentation, the Projective Measure of Assertiveness, the PAQ, the ASES and the TSCS. The study was presented as an investigation of interpersonal relationships. Subjects required approximately 45 minutes to complete the task.

2.4 Analysis of Results

Three major forms of analysis were appropriate to test the research hypotheses. Initial two way analyses of variance (sex x role) were conducted with ASES, FLSUB and TSCS scores as dependent variables. Additional three way analyses of variance (sex x role x relationship) were conducted for each of the projective components separately. The frequency of adequate assertions was also analysed by a three way analysis of variance with repeated measures. All multiple comparisons were analysed using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) procedure. The experimentwise error rate for post hoc comparisons was controlled using the Bonferroni technique.

The role of self concept as a potential moderator variable was investigated by two methods. Two way analyses of covariance were conducted for ASES, FLSUB and Noncompliance scores with TSCS scores as the covariate. Finally, separate multiple correlations were established for ASES, FLSUB and Noncompliance scores using TSCS, M scale, F Scale and M/F Scale scores as predictor variables.

III. Results

3.1 Comparability of Subjects

One way analyses of variance on each of the M, F and M/F scale scores within each sex role produced no significant sex differences. Thus, males and females within sex role groups were comparable in terms of their self-rated masculinity, femininity, and bipolar scores. In addition, androgynous subjects were found to be as masculine as masculine-typed subjects and as feminine as feminine-typed subjects.

A two way (sex x role) analysis of variance for age (see Table 3) produced a marginally significant sex by sex role interaction, F (3,72) =2.62, p=.06. An F test for simple main effects (Winer, 1962) established that the age differences were significant for females but not for males. Post hoc comparisons confirmed that masculine and undifferentiated females were significantly older than feminine and androgynous females, F (1,72) = 7.06, $p \leq .025$, with mean ages of 27.2 and 22.2, respectively.

3.2 Measures of Assertiveness

The primary measures of assertiveness were total ASES and FLSUB scores, and the Noncompliance scores from the projective measure. The results of separate analyses of variance are generally comparable for all three dependent variables.

As summarized in Table 4[1], the analysis of total ASES scores yielded a significant main effect for sex role, F (3,72) = 5.76, p=.0014. Subsequent planned comparisons demonstrated that, as predicted, androgynous and masculine subjects achieved significantly higher ASES scores than feminine and undifferentiated subjects, F (1,72) = 17.069, $p \leq .001$. The analysis of FLSUB scores produced similar results (see Table 5), with a significant main effect for sex role, F (3,72) = 5.25, p=.0025. Again, masculine and androgynous subjects achieved higher FLSUB scores than feminine and undifferentiated subjects, F (1,72) = 15.39, $p \leq .001$. In addition, there was a slight tendency for females to score higher than males, F (1,72) = 3.28, p=.0742, with respective means of 38.6 and 35.4.

As reported in Table 6, a three way (sex x role x relationship) analysis of variance of the Noncompliance scores, with repeated measures on the relationship variable, also produced a significant main effect for sex role, F (3,72) = 5.36, p=.0022. As predicted, feminine subjects gave fewer

---

[1]All analysis of variance tables can be found at the end of this section, beginning on p.49.

noncompliant responses than all other groups F (1,72) = 12.62, $p \leq .001$. The undifferentiated subjects were not significantly more compliant than the masculine and androgynous subjects, although the group means were ordered as predicted. Means for the three measures of assertiveness are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Group Means for

the Measures of Assertiveness

	A		M		U		P
ASES Total	122.50	=	122.20	>	105.50	=	102.60
PLSUB	41.00	=	39.90	>	33.05	=	34.10
Noncompliance	6.75	=	6.20	=	5.85	>	4.85

Analysis of the Noncompliance scores also yielded a significant main effect for sex, F (1,72) = 7.18, $p = .0091$. Females gave more noncompliant responses than males, with respective means of 6.375 and 5.45. However, females were also more likely to identify a situation as problematic, F (1,72) = 10.17, $p = .0021$, and subsequently to consider making a noncompliant response. When Noncompliance scores were reanalysed

with recognition of the problem as the covariate, the sex difference was eliminated (see Table 8). Thus, female subjects' tendency to give more Noncompliant responses can primarily be attributed to their differential sensitivity to the problem. Finally, a significant sex by relationship interaction emerged, F (2,144) = 5.04, p=.0077. An F test for simple main effects established that the differences due to relationship were significant for males but not for females. Post hoc comparisons demonstrated that males were more compliant with cross-sex antagonists (i.e., female friends and lovers) than they were with same-sex antagonists, F (1,117) = 11.006, $p \leq .001$, with means of 1.65, 1.625 and 2.175 respectively.

3.3 Adequate Assertions

The frequency of adequate assertions was submitted to a three way (sex x role x relationship) analysis of variance with repeated measures on the relationship variable. As reported in Table 9, only a significant main effect for sex emerged, F (1,72) = 5.65, p=.0202. While the frequency of adequate assertions was low for both sexes (only 9.3% of the responses met all criteria), females produced more adequately assertive responses than males, with respective means of 1.1 and .575.

3.4 Self-Concept as a Covariate of Assertiveness

Initial analysis of the TSCS scores (see Table 10) yielded a significant main effect for sex role, F (1,72) = 8.2, p=.0001. Again, planned comparisons indicated that androgynous and masculine subjects scored signficantly higher than feminine and undifferentiated subjects, F (1,72) = 22.72, $p \leq .001$. Analyses of covariance performed on the ASES and FLSUB scores had the effect of eliminating the sex role main effect (see Tables 11 and 12). However, analysis of the Noncompliance scores with TSCS scores as the covariate produced no substantial change. The significant main effects for sex, F (1,71) = 6.35, p=.014, and sex role, F (3,71) = 3.47, p=.0205, remained (see Table 13).

The results of multiple regression analysis confirmed the importance of self concept as a moderator variable. The best predictors of both ASES and FLSUB scores were TSCS and M Scale scores with R^2 of .42 and .36, respectively. In both instances the relationship tended to be stronger for females than for males. For the ASES scores the R^2 for females was .59 compared with .31 for males, F (37,37) = 1.84, p=.10[2]. The R^2 for FLSUB scores was .54 and .23 for females and males, respectively; however, this difference was clearly nonsignificant, F (37,37) = 1.58, $p \leq .50$. For females only, F scale scores were also a significant predictor of FLSUB scores. The addition of F scale

---

[2] Where F is the ratio of the squared standard errors of prediction for males and females.

scores significantly increased the R^2 to .59, F (3,36) = 17.14, $p \leq .01$.

Only M scale scores were a significant predictor of Noncompliance, with an r of +.34. Again, there was a nonsignificant tendency for the relationship to be stronger for females, z = .90, $p \leq .1841$, with respective correlations of +.46 and +.28.

3.5 Other Findings

Analyses of variance performed on the projective components produced several supplemental findings. Females were more likely than males to make statements recognizing the other person, F (1,72) = 6.96, p=.0102, with means of 1.7 and 1.0 for females and males, respectively (see Table 14). Planned comparisons of sex role groups revealed a nonsignificant tendency for feminine and androgynous subjects to make more recognition statements than masculine and undifferentiated subjects, F (1,72) = 2.89, $p \leq .10$.

Significant sex by relationship interactions emerged (see Tables 15, 16 and 17) for the components explicit statement, F (2,144) = 4.73, p=.0103, avoidance/compromise, F (2,144) = 4.27, p=.0158, and punitiveness, F (2,144) = 3.31, p=.0394. F tests for simple main effects showed the first two to be significant for females but not for males. Specifically, females made more explicit statements when their lovers were the transgressors

than when the trangressor was identified to be a friend, F (1,144) = 7.332, $p \leq .01$. Conversely, females made more avoidance/compromise responses with friends than with lovers, F (1,144) = 9.223, $p \leq .01$. The sex by relationship interaction for punitiveness was significant for males but not for females, with males making more punitive responses to friends of either sex than to lovers, F (1,144) = 5.005, $p \leq .025$.

An analysis of variance on the frequency of ideal responses (see Table 18) yielded a sex by sex role interaction, F (3,72) = 3.48, $p = .0203$, which was significant only for females. Post hoc comparisons demonstrated that undifferentiated and androgynous females gave more ideal responses than did feminine and masculine females, F (1,72) = 9.43, $p \leq .01$, with means of 4.5, 4.0, 2.9 and 1.1 for the groups respectively. While differential response rates made investigation of the content of ideal responses problematic, it was possible to make some comparisons between proportions. Males gave a higher proportion of punitive ideal responses than did females, $z = 3.321$, $p \leq .0005$, while females' ideal responses could more frequently be classified as adequately assertive, $z = 2.181$, $p \leq .015$. Finally, feminine subjects' ideal responses were more punitive than those of other sex role groups, X^2 (3) = 12.866, $p \leq .01$.

Table 3

Two Way (Sex by Role)

Analysis of Variance of Subjects' Age

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	46368.45	1	46368.45		
Sex	26.45	1	26.45	.75	.3902
Role	75.75	3	25.25	.71	.5472
Sex x Role	278.55	3	92.85	2.62	.0571
Error	2548.80	72	35.40		

Table 4

Two Way (Sex by Role)

Analysis of Variance of ASES Scores

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	1024007.5125	1			
Sex	945.3125	1	945.3125	2.44	.1225
Role	6690.7375	3	2230.2458	5.76	.0014
Sex x Role	1131.9375	3	377.3125	.97	.4095
Error	27867.5000	72	387.0486		

Table 5

Two Way (Sex by Role)

Analysis of Variance of FLSUB Scores

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	109594.0125	1			
Sex	201.6125	1	201.6125	3.28	.0742
Role	968.4375	3	322.8125	5.25	.0025
Sex x Role	223.2375	3	74.4125	1.21	.3119
Error	4423.7000	72	61.4403		

Table 6

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Noncompliance Scores

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	932.204	1			
Sex	5.704	1	5.704	7.18	.0091
Role	12.779	3	4.259	5.36	.0022
Sex x Role	1.746	3	.582	.73	.5362
Error	57.233	72	.795		
Relationship	3.308	2	1.654	2.66	.0732
Sex x R'ship	6.258	2	3.129	5.04	.0077
Role x R'ship	4.858	6	.809	1.30	.2594
S x R x R'ship	7.442	6	1.240	2.00	.0699
Error	89.467	144	.621		

Table 8

Two Way (Sex by Role) Analysis of Covariance:

Noncompliance Scores

with Recognition of the Problem as Covariate

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	.147	1			
Sex	3.412	1	3.412	1.75	.1903
Role	34.630	3	11.543	5.91	.0012
Sex x Role	6.486	3	2.162	1.11	.3517
Covariate	33.126	1	33.126	16.97	.0001
Error	138.574	71	1.952		

Table 9

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Frequency of Adequate Assertions

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	18.704	1			
Sex	1.8375	1	1.8375	5.65	.0202
Role	.0792	3	.0264	.08	.9701
Sex x Role	.9458	3	.3153	.97	.4123
Error	23.4333	72	.3255		
Relationship	.1583	2	.0792	.27	.7630
Sex x R'ship	.1750	2	.0875	.30	.7416
Role x R'ship	1.5083	6	.2514	.86	.5256
S x R x R'ship	2.0917	6	.3486	1.19	.3132
Error	42.0667	144	.2921		

Table 10

Two Way (Sex by Role)

Analysis of Variance of TSCS Scores

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Mean	9103727.1125	1			
Sex	800.1125	1	800.1125	1.14	.2890
Role	17252.1375	3	5750.7125	8.20	.0001
Sex x Role	2213.7375	3	737.9125	1.05	.3748
Error	50489.9000	72	701.2486		

Table 11

Two Way (Sex by Role) Analysis of Covariance:

ASES Scores with TSCS as Covariate

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Mean	37.5533	1			
Sex	477.8694	1	477.8694	1.47	.2293
Role	1706.7853	3	568.9284	1.75	.1645
Sex x Role	387.6252	3	129.2084	.40	.7552
Covariate	4790.7894	1	4790.7894	14.74	.0003
Error	23076.7106	71	325.0241		

Table 12

Two Way (Sex by Role) Analysis of Covariance:

FLSOB Scores with TSCS as Covariate

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	4.4942	1			
Sex	115.4138	1	115.4138	2.21	.1415
Role	194.1867	3	64.7289	1.24	.3017
Sex x Role	91.4403	3	30.4801	.58	.6275
Covariate	717.1554	1	717.1554	13.74	.0004
Error	3706.5446	71			

Table 13

Two Way (Sex by Role) Analysis of Covariance:

Noncompliance Scores with TSCS as Covariate

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	4.6568	1			
Sex	15.0755	1	15.0755	6.35	.0140
Role	24.7328	3	8.2442	3.47	.0205
Sex x Role	5.1379	3	1.7126	.72	.5425
Covariate	3.1484	1	3.1484	1.33	.2533
Error	168.5516	71	2.3739		

Table 14

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Statements Recognizing the Other

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	48.60	1			
Sex	3.267	1	3.267	6.96	.0102
Role	1.567	3	.522	1.11	.3498
Sex x Role	2.100	3	.700	1.49	.2242
Error	33.800	72	.469		
Relationship	.700	2	.350	1.19	.3059
Sex x R'ship	.233	2	.117	.40	.6723
Role x R'ship	2.333	6	.389	1.33	.2488
S x R x R'ship	1.200	6	.200	.68	.6640
Error	42.200	144	.293		

Table 15

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Explicit Statements

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	71.504	1			
Sex	.338	1	.338	.50	.4813
Role	.712	3	.238	.35	.7874
Sex x Role	.612	3	.204	.30	.8231
Error	48.500	72	.674		
Relationship	1.458	2	.729	1.76	.1764
Sex x R'ship	3.925	2	1.962	4.73	.0103
Role x R'ship	4.375	6	.729	1.76	.1123
S x R x R'ship	3.775	6	.629	1.52	.1772
Error	59.800	144	.415		

Table 16

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Avoidance/Compromise

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	109.350	1			
Sex	4.817	1	4.817	10.40	.0019
Role	3.017	3	1.006	2.17	.0987
Sex x Role	.150	3	.050	.11	.9552
Error	33.333	72	.463		
Relationship	4.525	2	2.262	4.95	.0084
Sex x R'ship	3.908	2	1.954	4.27	.0158
Role x R'ship	2.508	6	.418	.91	.4868
S x R x R'ship	2.525	6	.421	.92	.4825
Error	65.867	144	.457		

Table 17

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Punitive Statements

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	97.538	1			
Sex	.504	1	.504	.57	.4535
Role	2.646	3	.882	.99	.4008
Sex x Role	.412	3	.138	.15	.9262
Error	63.900	72	.888		
Relationship	.700	2	.350	.72	.4905
Sex x R'ship	3.233	2	1.617	3.31	.0394
Role x R'ship	.567	6	.094	.19	.9783
S x R x R'ship	1.100	6	.183	.37	.8939
Error	70.400	144	.489		

Table 18

Three Way (Sex by Role by Relationship)

Analysis of Variance with Repeated Measures:

Frequency of Ideal Responses

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	p
Mean	264.600	1			
Sex	.017	1	.017	.01	.9234
Role	9.100	3	3.033	1.69	.1759
Sex x Role	18.683	3	6.228	3.48	.0203
Error	128.933	72	1.791		
Relationship	.175	2	.088	.13	.8757
Sex x R'ship	.758	2	.379	.58	.5637
Role x R'ship	2.425	6	.404	.61	.7192
S x R x R'ship	.442	6	.074	.11	.9950
Error	94.867	144	.659		

IV. Discussion

In general, the hypothesis that sex role orientation would be a better predictor of assertiveness than gender was supported. Androgynous and masculine subjects, regardless of gender, reported higher levels of global assertiveness than feminine and undifferentiated subjects. Similarly, on the projective measure androgynous, masculine and undifferentiated subjects gave noncompliant responses more frequently than feminine subjects.

Predictions about the relationship between sex role orientation and specific components of an assertive response, however, were not supported. Masculine subjects did not provide more punitive-noncompliant responses than other sex role groups. However, the projective measure may not have been sensitive enough to detect aggression. Aggressive intent may be conveyed by such nonverbal behaviours as tone of voice or a menacing posture as well as or instead of explicitly punitive content. Thus, this hypothesis might better be tested by employing a role play measure of assertiveness. While there was a tendency for feminine and androgynous subjects to make more statements recognizing the other, this trend did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. Thus, these findings do not support the hypothesis that assertiveness is androgynous

behaviour. Rather, multiple regression analysis established that assertiveness is more related to masculinity than to femininity. Masculinity and self-concept were the best predictors of global assertiveness, while masculinity alone was the best predictor of noncompliance on the projective measure. A slightly different pattern emerged for females on the Friend/Lover subscale of the ASES, with the inclusion of femininity as a predictor. This finding probably reflects the equal weight given to positive and negative assertions on the subscale, although it is of some interest that the relationship is important for females only. With this single exception, assertiveness appears to be more strongly related to masculinity than to femininity, a finding which is consistent with other sex role research.

Perhaps the most intriguing outcome of this study was the finding that the differences between sex role groups disappeared when self-concept was controlled for on the ASES, but not on the projective measure of assertiveness. Thus, a high self-concept was associated with greater self-reported assertiveness, but not necessarily with more assertive content in response to the projective situations. Inherent differences between the measures may account for part of this discrepancy. As a more ambiguous measure, the projective task provides fewer clues about the socially appropriate response. Other research (Kiecolt & McGrath, 1979) has demonstrated that responding to self-rated measures of assertiveness is susceptible to a social

desirability bias. In order to test this possibility in the current study, the lie scale of the TSCS, which is a measure of social desirability, was correlated with total ASES, FLSUB and Noncompliance scores. As only nonsignificant correlations emerged, there is no evidence that the difference between the measures may be attributed to the greater susceptibility of the ASES to a social desirability bias.

A more critical difference between the projective measure and the ASES may be the greater specificity of the projective situations. Other researchers have reported poor to moderate correlations between self-reported assertiveness and assertiveness in both role play situations (Bourque and Ladouceur, 1979; Heimberg et al., 1979; Higgins et al., 1979; Nesbitt, 1979) and in situations involving a confederate (Cummins et al., 1977; Stebbins et al., 1977). Nesbitt (1979) observed that this reduced concordance may be attributable to the greater specificity introduced into his role play situations to make them more realistic. During the pilot study which preceded this author's research, subjects repeatedly asked for more detail about the context of the situations; this detail was provided in the revised version of the projective measure. One ASES item which illustrates the qualitative difference between the measures asks: "If you are angry at your spouse/boyfriend or girlfriend, is it difficult for you to tell them?". A negative response to this item does not necessarily mean that when

presented with a hypothetical situation involving the potential expression of anger a subject will necessarily choose to express that anger or will do so in a manner that can be classified as assertive.

The specificity of the projective situations relative to the ASES items may account for the presence of only a weak linear relationship between self-concept and noncompliance scores. It is possible that an individual who possesses a high self-concept does not need to be assertive as frequently as a person who has a less positive self-image. It might be argued that the latter's self-concept will be subject to greater fluctuation as a function of his/her interactions with others, and that he/she will consequently be more sensitive to potential violations of rights. If this reasoning is correct, one would expect a curvilinear relationship between self-concept and noncompliance scores. In order to test this possibility, subjects were grouped as having either high, moderate or low self-concept. A two way (sex by group) analysis of variance of their Noncompliance scores yielded a significant main effect for group. Subsequent group comparisons demonstrated, however, that subjects with low self-concepts gave fewer Noncompliant responses than subjects with both moderate and high self-concepts, while the latter groups did not differ. This supports the suggestion that the relationship between self-concept and Noncompliance scores is nonlinear.

In addition to the predicted sex role differences in assertiveness, several interesting sex differences emerged: all of which favoured females. Females were more likely to define the projective situations as problematic and, subsequently, to provide a noncompliant response. They made more explicit statements recognizing the rights of the other, and also gave more adequately assertive responses than males. Finally, females gave more adequately assertive ideal responses, while males' ideal responses tended to be punitive. One explanation of these findings might involve the importance of interpersonal relations for females relative to males. The differences observed in defining the situations as problematic suggest that females are more sensitive to interpersonal transgressions, a finding which may reflect the greater importance they attach to relationships (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

An alternative interpretation reflects a fundamental similarity between assertiveness and self-disclosure. The term "self-disclosure" refers to the process of verbally revealing information about oneself to another; a critical aspect is vulnerability or the risk of potential exploitation by the other. The socialization of male children is presumed to inhibit self-disclosure, with its emphasis on competitiveness and the equation of expressiveness with vulnerability. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), in a major literature review of sex differences, concluded that evidence does not support the assumption of sex

differences in global self-disclosure. Subsequent research (Derlega, Durham, Gockel & Sholis, 1981) has established differences in the amount the sexes will disclose on specific topics, however. These authors found males reluctant to disclose on "feminine" topics, operationally defined as those which involved expressions of affect.

Affective disclosure is a critical component of assertiveness as defined in this study. Its importance was also established empirically by Pearson (1979) who found assertiveness to be positively related to a factor she labelled "candour about feelings". Thus the differences observed in this study may reflect gender differences in willingness to reveal affect, particularly when such a disclosure risks increased vulnerability. This explanation appears to account for the sex differences observed in the frequency of statements recognizing the other. The hypothesis that males are more reticent than females to risk vulnerability may also explain their apparent insensitivity to the problematic nature of the projective situations. The mere identification of a situation as a problem is, to some extent, risky, for the other person may entirely reject this interpretation. Sattel (1976) and Derlega et al. (1981) have observed that inexpressiveness has its benefits as a strategy for maintaining power in interpersonal situations. They reasoned that without information about a person's feelings others cannot understand, predict or control their behaviour. It

is somewhat ironic that assertiveness has been promoted as a technique for increasing interpersonal power (Jakubowski, 1977), when the self-disclosing aspect may actually function to increase vulnerability to others.

In summary, this research generally supported the hypothesis that sex role orientation is a better predictor of assertiveness than gender. However, the evidence does not support the notion that assertiveness is androgynous behaviour. Consistent with other sex role research, assertiveness appears to be more strongly related to masculinity than to femininity.

Appendices

Appendix A

Distribution of Subjects:

Sex by Sex Role Categories

(N=133)

	Males		Females	
	n	%	n	%
M	15	26.3	11	14.5
F	12	21.1	25	32.9
A	15	26.3	24	31.5
U	15	26.3	16	21.1

Appendix B

Projective Measure of Assertiveness

1. A friend of yours has started to phone you late at night, though he never has anything important to say. Its late now and you are in bed, just about to doze off, when the phone rings. You wonder for a second if you should answer it, then decide to since it might be important.
Friend: "Hi, its me. I just got home from the library."

2. You are having lunch with a friend when he suddenly asks you if you would lend him $30 until he gets paid next week. You have the money but were planning to spend it on something else.
Friend: "Can I borrow $30? I overspent on the weekend and left myself short--I'll pay you back next week."

3. You have an 8:30 class one morning and have standing arrangements for your friend, who has a car, to drive you to school on those days. One such morning you are waiting for him, somewhat impatient as he is almost ten minutes late, when the phone rings.
Friend: "Hi. Look, I'm really sorry, but I went to a great party last night and didn't make it home until really late. Can you get to school by yourself today?"

4. A friend that you have known for a long time has recently begun to develop interests and opinions divergent from your own. Where you used to enjoy his company, you now find him uninteresting. His feelings for you, however, do not seem to have changed. You'd just as soon let the relationship peter out, and have politely refused to join him on several occasions. He doesn't seem to be getting the message, however, and one Saturday afternoon you receive the following phone call.
Friend: "Hi. That film you wanted to see is playing downtown. Why don't we go see it tonight?"

5. You are invited to a party by a friend. When you get there you realize that everyone knows everyone else--except you. Your friend gets you a drink then drifts off to socialize. After a half-hour of your unsuccessfully attempting to engage someone (anyone) in conversation, he returns.
Friend: "Isn't this a great party? I'm having a really good time."

6. You are experiencing some serious personal problems and, one night, talk about them with a friend. Within the next few days,

remarks are made by others which lead you to strongly suspect that he has betrayed your confidence. You meet him for coffee and he pointedly asks,
Friend: "How are you feeling today?"

7. In the midst of a heated discussion a friend has made a cutting remark which you found to be insulting and rude. You think that he intended to hurt your feelings, but he swears that no such thing was intended. In the middle of this exchange he says,
Friend: "If you misunderstood what I said, that's your problem. I won't apologize for something I didn't do."

8. You are in the midst of an important and interesting conversation. A friend suddenly bursts into the room and noisily pulling up a chair he flops down and exclaims,
Friend: "Let me tell you about the weird day I've just had!"

9. A friend asks to borrow your car so that he can run some errands. You don't need it, so you agree. He takes it Saturday morning and at about 8 p.m. that evening calls you from a bar, where he has obviously been for quite some time.
Friend: "Hi. I knew that you weren't going out tonight, so I've still got the car. Can I bring it back in the morning?"

References

Alberti, R.E. and Emmons, M.L. Your Perfect Right: A guide to assertive behaviour. San Luis Obispo, Ca.: Impact, 1974.

Alden, L. and Cappe, R. Nonassertiveness: Skill deficit or selective self-evaluation? Behaviour Therapy, 1981, 12, 107-114.

Bach, G.R. and Goldberg, H. Creative Aggression. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology , 1977, 45, 196-205.

Bem, S.L., Martyna, W. and Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Bloom, L.Z., Coburn, K. and Pearlman, J. The New Assertive Woman. New York: Delacorte Press, 1975.

Bourque, P. and Ladouceur, R. Self report and behavioural measures in the assessment of assertive behaviour. Journal of Behaviour Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1979, 10, 287-292.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F., Rosenkrantz, P. and Vogel, S. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Bruch, M.A. A task analysis of assertive behaviour revisited: Replication and extension. Behaviour Therapy, 1981, 12, 217-230.

Bryson, J.B. and Corey, D.M. Sex-diagnosticity in 100 personality trait adjectives. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1977, 3, 301-304.

Cohen, J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 37-46.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-Femininity: An exception to the famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cummins, D.E., Holombo, L.K. and Holte, C.S. Target specificity in a self-report measure of assertion. Journal of Psychology, 1977, 97, 183-186.

Currant, E.F., Dickson, A.L., Anderson, H.N. and Faulkender, P.J. Sex role stereotyping and assertive behaviour. Journal of Psychology, 1979, 101, 223-228.

DeGiovanni, I.S. and Epstein, N. Unbinding assertion and aggression in research and clinical practice. Behaviour Modification, 1978, 2, 173-192.

Derlega, V., Durham, B., Gockel, B. and Sholis, D. Sex differences in self-disclosure: Effects of topic content, friendship and partner's sex. Sex Roles, 1981, 7, 433-447.

Eisler, R.M., Hersen, M., Miller, P.M. and Blanchard, E.B. Situational determinants of assertive behaviours Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 330-340.

Eisler, R.M., Miller, P.M. and Hersen, M. Components of assertive behaviour. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 295-299.

Galassi, J.P., DeLeo, J.S., Galassi, M.D. and Bastien, S. The College Self-Expression Scale: A measure of assertiveness. Behaviour Therapy, 1974, 5, 165-171.

Gambrill, E.D. and Richey, C.A. An assertion inventory for use in assessment and research. Behaviour Therapy, 1975, 6, 550-561.

Gay, M.L., Hollandsworth, J.G. and Galassi, J.P. An assertiveness inventory for adults. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 340-344.

Heimberg, R.G., Harrison, D.F., Goldberg, L.S., Desmarais, S. and Blue, S. The relationship of self-report and behavioural assertion in an offender population. Journal of Behaviour Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1979, 10, 283-286.

Higgins, R.L., Alonso, R.R. and Pendleton, M.G. The validity of role-play assessments of assertiveness. Behaviour Therapy, 1979, 10, 655-662.

Hollandsworth, J.G. Differentiating assertion and aggression: Some behavioural guidelines. Behaviour Therapy, 1977, 8, 347-352.

Hollandsworth, J.G., Galassi, J.P. and Gay, M. The Adult Self-Expression Scale: Validation by the multitrait-multimethod procedure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 407-415.

Hollandsworth, J.G. and Wall, K.E. Sex differences in assertive behaviour: An empirical investigation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 217-222.

Hoppe, C. Interpersonal aggression as a function of subject's sex, subject's sex role identification, opponent's sex and degree of provocation. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47, 317-329.

Jakubowski, P.A. Assertive behaviour and clinical problems of women. In E.I. Rawlings and D.K. Carter (eds) Psychotherapy for Women. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1977.

Jones, W.H., Chernovetz, M.E. and Hansson, R.O. The enigma of androgyny: Differential implications for males and females? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 298-313.

Kelly, J.A., Caudill, S., Hathorn, S. and O'Brien, C.G. Socially undesirable sex-correlated characteristics: Implications for androgyny and adjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1186-1187.

Kelly, J.A. and Furman, W. Problems associated with the typological measurement of sex roles and androgyny. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1574-1576.

Kelly, J.A. and Worell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1101-1115.

Kiecolt, J. and McGrath E. Social desirability responding in the measurement of assertive behaviour. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 640-642.

Kipper, D.A. and Jaffe, Y. Dimensions of assertiveness: Factors underlying the College Self-Expression Scale. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1978, 46, 47-52.

Maccoby, E.E. and Jacklin, C.N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1974.

McFall, R.M. and Lillesand, D.B. Behaviour rehearsal with modeling and coaching in assertion training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 77, 313-323.

Mc Fall, R.M. and Marston, A.R. An experimental investigation of behaviour rehearsal in assertive training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 295-303.

Nesbitt, E.B. Rathus Assertiveness Schedule and College Self-Expression Scale Scores as predictors of assertive behaviour. Psychological Reports , 1979, 45, 855-861.

Orlofsky, J.L. Sex role orientation, identity formation and self-esteem in college men and women. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 561-575.

Orlofsky, J.L. and Windle, M.T. Sex role orientation, behavioural adaptability and personal adjustment. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 801-811.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.

Pearson, J.C. A factor analytic study of the items in the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. Psychological Reports, 1979, 45, 491-497.

Puglisi, J.T. Equating the social desirability of the Bem Sex Role Inventory Masculinity and Femininity Subscales. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1980, 44, 272-276.

Rakos, R.F. Content consideration in the distinction between assertive and aggressive behaviour. Psychological Reports, 1979, 44, 767-773.

Rathus, S. A thirty item schedule for assessing assertive behaviour. Behaviour Therapy, 1973, 4, 398-406.

Rich, A.R. and Schroeder, H.E. Research issues in assertiveness training. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83, 1080-1096.

Sattel, J.W. The inexpressive male: Tragedy or sexual politics? Social Problems, 1976, 23, 469-477.

Schwartz, R.M. and Gottman, J.M. Toward a task analysis of assertive behaviour. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 41, 910-920.

Sedney, M.A. Comments on median split procedures for scoring androgyny measures. Sex Roles, 1981, 7, 217-222.

Serber, M. Teaching the non-verbal components of assertive training. Journal of Behaviour Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 179-183.

Silvern, L.E. and Ryan, V.L. Self-rated adjustment and sex-typing on the Bem Sex Role Inventory: Is masculinity the primary predictor of adjustment? Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 739-763.

Smye, M.D. and Wine, J.D. A comparison of female and male adolescents' social behaviours and cognitions: A challenge to the assertiveness literature. Sex Roles, 1980, 6, 213-230.

Spence, J. and Helmreich, R.L. Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates and Antecedents. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L. and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 1975, 32, 29-39.

Stebbins, C.A., Kelly, B.R., Tolor, A. and Power, M. Sex differences in assertiveness in college students. Journal of Psychology, 1977, 95, 309-315.

Strahan, R.F. Remarks on Bem's measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 568-571.

Tolor, A., Kelly, B.R. and Stebbins, C.A. Assertiveness, sex role stereotyping and self-concept. Journal of Psychology, 1976, 93, 157-164.

Walkup, H. and Abbott, R.D. Cross validation of item selection on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1978, 2, 63-71.

Wiggins, J.S. and Holzmuller, A. Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behaviour. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 40-52.

Wiggins, J.S. and Holzmuller, A. Further evidence on androgyny and interpersonal flexibility. Journal of Research in Personality, 1981, 15, 67-80.

Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1962.

Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by Reciprocal Inhibition. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wolpe, J. The Practice of Behaviour Therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969.

Wolpe, J. and Lazarus, A. Behaviour Therapy Techniques. New York: Pergamon Press, 1966.