To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Rosemary Gaetano Layne entitled "The Effect of Group Assertive Training on Resident Assistant Job Performance." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Psychology and Guidance.

Eugene W. Schoch

Eugene W. Schoch, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Robert L. Williams

Sharon L. Lord

Bertha Hellams

K. Owen McCullough

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

THE EFFECT OF GROUP ASSERTIVE TRAINING ON RESIDENT ASSISTANT JOB PERFORMANCE

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Rosemary Gaetano Layne

March 1976

1270496

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the effects of group assertive training on the job performance of resident assistants in the residence hall system at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following questions: (1) Will resident assistants trained in assertiveness differ on self-report measures from those resident assistants not trained in assertiveness? (2) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ with respect to evaluations by their immediate supervisors? (3) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ with respect to evaluations by residents on their living units? (4) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ on behavioral ratings of assertiveness?

Subjects in the study were fourteen male and twelve female resident assistants who volunteered for the assertive training experience. Subjects were matched by sex and pretest assertiveness scores on the College Self Expression Scale and were randomly assigned to either the assertive training treatment group or to a control group which received no assertive training until after data for this study were collected.

Subjects in the assertive training treatment group received four, ninety-minute assertive training sessions combining the procedures of behavior rehearsal with videotaped and group feedback, coaching, and homework assignments. Subjects in the control group received no treatment during the four weeks of the study, but did experience these sessions subsequent to the study.

Pretest and posttest scores for all subjects were obtained on (1) a self-report measure (The College Self Expression Scale), (2) supervisor evaluations (Resident Assistant Job Performance Form), (3) student evaluations (Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form), and on (4) a videotaped Behavioral Performance Test which included measures of Eye Contact, Scene Length, and Response Content. The four job-related scenes on the Behavioral Performance Test were rated for each subject by two trained observers.

Findings from the analysis of covariance tests indicated that three of the six null hypotheses were rejected. These three were the hypotheses associated with (1) the self-report measure, (2) Eye Contact ratings, and (3) Response Content ratings.

The hypothesis of no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted assertiveness scores was rejected. The subjects in the assertive training group received significantly higher scores ($p < 0.05$) on the College Self Expression Scale than did subjects in the control group.

The hypothesis of no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted eye contact ratings on the behavioral performance test, was also rejected. Subjects in the assertive training treatment group maintained eye contact with a confederate for a greater length of time ($p < 0.001$) than did subjects in the control group.

The hypothesis of no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted content ratings on a behavioral performance test was rejected. The subjects in the assertive training group received

significantly higher content ratings ($p < 0.001$) during the four scenes of the behavioral performance test.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introduction	1
	The Problem	4
	Null Hypotheses	6
	Assumptions	7
	Limitations	7
	Definition of Terms	8
	Organization of the Study	9
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
	The Positive Effects of Assertive Training	10
	Treatment Variables in Assertive Training	13
III.	METHOD	22
	Design of Study	22
	Subjects	22
	Instrumentation	23
	Job Performance	26
	Experimental Procedure	29
	Posttests	34
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	36
	Results	36
	Discussion	49
V.	CONCLUSION	53
	Summary	53
	Implications and Suggestions for Further Research	55
LIST OF REFERENCES		60
APPENDICES		65
A.	INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY	66
B.	SUBJECT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	81
C.	BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE TEST	83
D.	THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE RESIDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTION	93

CHAPTER PAGE

E. TRAINING PROGRAM USED IN THE STUDY 97
F. TABLES 105

VITA 112

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Summary of Interrater Reliability for Eye Contact and Content Variables of the Behavioral Performance Test	30
2.	Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Treatment and Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	37
3.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Treatment and Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	38
4.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	43
5.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	44
6.	Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	45
7.	Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures	46
8.	Subject Demographic Data	82
9.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Treatment and Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test	106
10.	Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Treatment and Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test . . .	107
11.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test	108
12.	Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test	109

TABLE PAGE

13. Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test 110

14. Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test 111

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

On the campuses of many colleges and universities, residence hall undergraduate and graduate staff members are being used effectively to aid in the personal growth of resident students. Although the size and the objectives of the campuses may vary, residence hall staff members, in general, provide a wide range of services for residents. This wide variety of professional responsibilities points to the need for training programs which recognize the many facets of resident assistant job responsibilities and which prepare these staff members by helping them develop skills in human relations. The present study examined the effect of a group assertive training program on several measures of resident assistant job performance.

The Role of the Resident Assistant

Just as the concept of college living has evolved from the dormitory in which residents merely hung their hats and slept, to the modern concept of a residence hall, which provides a total living-learning experience for residents, so too has the concept of resident assistant evolved to encompass much more than a person who merely monitors student behavior. Based on Greenleaf's (1974) survey of residence hall objectives on a number of campuses, this author concludes that the responsibilities of resident assistants include such functions as knowing the students in

their living unit; knowing the campus community so that there is an understanding of how administrative decisions are made; understanding the referral resources on the campus; serving as an advisor to promote hall activities; assisting residents in developing guidelines for living in a group environment; assuming a responsibility for defining and understanding the goals of the hall and the unit for which there is a responsibility; being available, friendly, and open to students so that each can develop as a fully functioning individual; and balancing job responsibilities and personal life to encourage self-growth as well as growth for residents.

Because of this wide variety of professional responsibilities, it is of paramount importance to provide for resident assistants training and development in self-understanding, communication skills, and sensitivity to and awareness of others. Further, because resident assistants are often exposed to a variety of stress situations in their positions, they may need training in handling their own emotions and feelings. Powell, Plyler, Dickson and McClellan (1969) contend that resident assistants often experience anxiety and guilt in dealing with certain aspects of their jobs. They point out that resident assistants sometimes become so engrossed in their jobs that they neglect their own self-interest. Most importantly, they state the necessity for resident assistants to be able to express their positive and negative feelings and emotions in order to achieve success in this human relations position.

The Potential Value of Assertive Training for Resident Assistants

One of the basic tenets of training for assertive behavior is that, as a result of the training process, individuals will "begin to value

and reward the assertions of each individual, acknowledging his right to express himself without fear of guilt, valuing his right to an opinion, and recognizing his unique contribution" (Alberti & Emmons, 1974, p. 5). Once resident assistants have learned to assert themselves, they will encourage the residents on their units to do likewise. For example, residents who cannot tell their roommates that the stereo is too loud, will be coached by the resident assistant to do so in an assertive manner for the mutual benefit of both roommates.

According to Alberti and Emmons (1974), assertive behavior enables a person to stand up for one's legitimate rights and to exercise one's own rights without undue anxiety, to express one's honest feelings comfortably, and to exercise one's own rights without intruding upon the rights of others. It conveys respect rather than deference for the other person's behavior.

At the left end of the continuum is nonassertive behavior, which enables one's own rights to be violated. Nonassertive people inhibit their honest, spontaneous reactions and typically feel hurt, anxious, angry or generally displeased about their behavior (Jakubowski-Spector, 1973a). At the other end of the continuum is aggressive behavior, characterized by people who stand up for their rights in such a manner that the rights of others are violated either emotionally or physically. Aggressive people often respond too vigorously, leaving a deep and negative impression for which they may later be sorry.

Lawrence (1970) has shown that assertiveness cannot be usefully conceptualized as a general personality trait. Rather, it is more

accurate to assume that relatively healthy persons, such as resident assistants, may find themselves in certain situations in which they may react nonassertively or aggressively. Therefore, because resident assistants may react nonassertively or aggressively in certain job situations, they may be hindering their effectiveness with their residents. It is the contention of the present study that an assertive training program can help integrate assertive behavior into the repertoire of residence hall staff members and can thereby improve their job performance.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of group assertive training on resident assistant job performance. Using an experimental and a no-treatment control group of resident assistants, this study attempted to answer the following questions: (1) Will resident assistants trained in assertiveness differ on self-report measures from those resident assistants not trained in assertiveness? (2) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ with respect to evaluations by their immediate supervisors? (3) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ with respect to evaluations by residents in their living units? (4) Will the two groups of resident assistants differ on behavioral ratings of assertiveness?

The independent variable in this study was defined as the group (assertive training or control) to which resident assistants were

assigned. Subjects in the assertive training group received four, ninety-minute training sessions, combining the procedures of behavioral rehearsal with videotape and group feedback, coaching, and homework assignments. Subjects in the control group received no treatment until after the treatment period and all data for this study had been collected.

The dependent variables were (1) scores on the self-report assertiveness test, (2) scores on supervisor evaluations, (3) scores on resident evaluations, and (4) scores on the behavioral rating situations.

Significance of the Study

Studies dealing with group assertive training have, in the main, established that assertive training can be effective in changing nonassertive and aggressive behavior of college students. However, no studies have dealt with generalizing these findings to any type of employment situation. Although a theoretical link between assertiveness and on-the-job behavior of bank officers was demonstrated in a recent study (Leader, 1973), there have been no empirical attempts to apply the results of an assertive training program to increasing the job performance or interpersonal skills of employees in any setting.

The results of this study could influence the planning of training programs for residence hall staff, and also the direction of future research in the generalizability of assertive training. Because the results indicated that resident assistant participation in assertive training led to improved job performance, the next logical step for researchers is to compare this type of training with current methods being utilized to train staff. In any case, the present study was a

necessary step in the process of discovering how resident assistants transfer assertive training they receive in groups.

Null Hypotheses

The propositions tested in this study were concerned with the effects of group assertive training on various measures of resident assistant job performance by comparing subjects who received this training with subjects in a no-treatment control group. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted assertiveness scores.

2. There is no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by supervisor evaluations.

3. There is no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by student evaluations.

4. There is no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted eye contact ratings resulting from observations of a behavioral performance test.

5. There is no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted scene length measures resulting from observations of a behavioral performance test.

6. There is no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted content ratings resulting from observations of a behavioral performance test.

Assumptions

In conducting this study the following assumptions were made:

1. Resident assistant job performance is a construct which can be measured by supervisor evaluations, student evaluations, and evaluations on a behavioral performance test.

2. The four scenes selected for the behavioral performance test are representative of those types of situations which resident assistants would encounter in their residence hall experiences.

3. Assertiveness is a construct which can be learned in a group training situation.

4. Selected individuals could be taught to discriminate the various degrees of assertive responses and to rate these responses.

5. The increased levels of assertiveness would be transferred by resident assistants to actual job situations.

Limitations

This study was limited to resident assistants employed at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville during the Spring quarter of 1975. The sample of resident assistants was further limited to those who volunteered to participate in the six hour assertive training program. Consequently, the generalizability of the results is limited to those resident assistants who participated during this time period.

Results are also limited to the specific type of assertive training employed in the present study. An additional limitation resides in the

nature of the diverse job experiences of the resident assistants, thus limiting the ability to control extraneous job variables.

Definition of Terms

Resident assistant refers to a university employee who is charged with the general supervision of a floor of residents in a residence hall.

Head Resident refers to a full-time professional university employee who is charged with supervision of the general operation of a residence hall and who is the immediate supervisor of a staff of resident assistants.

Assertive behavior refers to behavior which enhances a person's position without violating the rights of others either physically or emotionally.

Adjusted assertiveness scores refers to posttest scores on the College Self Expression Scale adjusted on the basis of pretest CSES scores (covariate).

Adjusted job performance scores refers to posttest scores on the two job performance instruments adjusted on the basis of pretest scores on the two instruments (covariates).

Behavioral performance test refers to a live enactment of four job-related scenes. A confederate was used in the scenes to represent a student and to stimulate responses from each subject.

Adjusted eye contact scores refers to posttest eye contact scores adjusted on the basis of pretest eye contact scores (covariate). Eye contact was measured during the behavioral performance test with a stop watch to determine the amount of time the subject maintained eye contact

with the confederate for each scene. The amount of time eye contact was maintained was converted later into a percentage of eye contact for each scene.

Adjusted scene length scores refers to posttest scene length scores adjusted on the basis of pretest scene length scores (covariate). Scene length was measured during a behavioral performance test with a stop watch to determine the exact time length of the subject's response.

Adjusted content scores refers to posttest content scores adjusted on the basis of pretest content scores (covariate). Content was measured by raters using a 0-4 Likert scale.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, a consideration of the significance of the study, null hypotheses to be tested, assumptions, limitations of the study, and definition of terms. A review of the literature related to the study is presented in Chapter II while Chapter III includes the methods utilized. The results and discussion are reported in Chapter IV, followed by the summary and conclusions in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter research related to assertive training as compared to other types of therapy will be presented, along with a number of studies which demonstrate the effects of assertive training on a variety of adjustment problems with subjects ranging from schizophrenics to college students. In addition, research which investigated the various treatment variables utilized in assertive training and which supported the principles of behavior rehearsal, practice homework assignments, trainer coaching, and group feedback will be cited.

The Positive Effects of Assertive Training

A review of the literature reveals that assertive training, often coupled with such other techniques as relaxation training and systematic desensitization, has been successfully used in a number of case studies with problems related to timidity (Hosford, 1969; Lazarus, 1971; Lazarus & Serber, 1968; Salter, 1949; Stevenson, 1959; Varenhorst, 1969; Wolpe, 1954, 1958; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966). Further, assertive training has been used successfully with a wide variety of clinical problems such as self-mutilation, chronic crying, hallucinatory and delusional behavior, compulsive behavior, and homosexual pedophilia (Edwards, 1972; Nydegger, 1972; Rimm, 1967; Seitz, 1953; Walton & Mather, 1963). Assertive training has also been found to be more effective than other methods such as direct advice, nondirective reflection-interpretation, group insight

therapy, and systematic desensitization in decreasing various types of social inhibition (Johnson, Tyler, Thompson, & Jones, 1971; Lazarus, 1966; Lomont, Gilner, Spector & Skinner, 1969; Serber & Nelson, 1971).

Since 1970, there have been an increasing number of experimental studies conducted with nonassertive college students to determine the comparative effects of group assertive training and other methods of behavioral group counseling. Hedquist and Weinhold (1970) compared assertive training, which they labeled behavioral group counseling, to a social learning treatment and a control situation with a group of twenty matched-pairs of socially anxious and nonassertive college students. During the treatment, subjects in the behavioral group were asked to specify problem situations generally taken from situations on the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness and then role play their responses to these situations. After receiving positive and negative feedback from the group members and the trainers, they overtly rehearsed the situation as often as needed until they emitted more appropriate responses. Using as criteria the frequency of verbal assertive responses made by each subject outside the group in situations which they had identified as distressing at the beginning of treatment, results indicated that the two treatment groups exhibited significantly more verbal assertive responses than did the traditional discussion group control situation. A follow-up six weeks after treatment yielded results which were in the predicted direction, but no longer significant.

Rathus (1972) conducted a study with fifty-seven college women randomly selected from volunteers who indicated they would like to be

more outgoing and less fearful in social situations. For a period of seven weeks, three groups received assertive training, three groups discussed fears and related problems, and the remaining subjects received no treatment. Although posttest results on the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule revealed that assertive training subjects reported significantly greater gains in assertive behavior and made significantly lower scores on the Temple Fear Survey Inventory than did control subjects, a videotaped behavioral assertiveness performance test did not yield significant differences.

With the addition of videotaped assertive models, a later study by Rathus (1973) reported more favorable results. Of the seventy-eight nonassertive college women who volunteered for treatment, twenty-eight were randomly assigned to assertive training, twenty-five to a placebo treatment consisting of observation of videotpaed models discussing and becoming desensitized to fears, and twenty-five to a no-treatment control group. Results showed that the assertive training group received significantly higher posttest assertiveness scores than did the discussion group or control group on both the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule and on an audiotaped behavioral performance test.

In a recent study using extremely brief treatment (twenty-four minutes), nonassertive college women were assigned to one of four treatment situations: (1) an assertive training group utilizing modeling, feedback, and coaching, (2) a logical directive group which was read an essay on assertiveness, (3) an attention control group which was read an essay on assertiveness and was given an opportunity to express

disagreement, or (4) a control group (Lawrence, 1970). This study concluded that on the behavioral performance test the assertive training group demonstrated a significantly greater gain in the ability to disagree on social issues for which specific training was given and on social issues for which no training was given. This ability persisted through a two-week follow up.

To date, the only published study which has focused on the use of group assertive training in treating aggressive behavior has concluded that experimental subjects showed significantly greater improvement than did placebo-control subjects on subjective measures of discomfort and anger and on objective measures of assertiveness and comfort level, although scores on the Lawrence Assertive Inventory, while in the predicted direction, were not significant (Rimm, Hill, Brown, & Stuart, 1974). In this study, seven male college students who reported having difficulty controlling their tempers were given eight hours of assertive training which consisted of role-playing anger-inducing scenes, while the six subjects in the placebo-control group received eight hours of discussions concerning understanding anger.

Treatment Variables in Assertive Training

It appears that the questions now being posed by researchers concern what types of assertive training procedures are effective with what types of clients, rather than whether assertive training is effective in modifying nonassertive or aggressive behavior.

Following Serber's (1972) lead, a number of the present studies of assertive training procedures now stress the paralinguistic component of

assertive behavior and focus on such nonverbal behavior as eye contact, body posture and facial expression, in addition to the explicit verbal message. However, a large portion of the recent literature involved the relative effectiveness of various combinations of treatment procedures, e.g., modeling, behavior rehearsal, coaching, homework assignments, and projected consequences (Loo, 1972; Perkins, 1972; Young, Rimm, & Kennedy, 1973).

According to McFall and Marston (1970), in a reference to early studies using assertive training, the technique of behavior rehearsal as typically described "appears to be complex, unsystematic, and unstandardized, relative to other behavior therapy techniques" (p. 295). As an example, McFall and Marston pointed to the Wolpe and Lazarus (1966) study in which any combination of treatment variables were utilized. These variables included

> . . . a hierarchical presentation of stimulus situations, operant shaping by the therapist, constructive criticism, role playing, role reversal, repeated playbacks of tape-recorded responses, response practice, homework assignments, postural and vocal analysis and training, therapist exhortation and lecturing, modeling, relaxation, and fixed-role or exaggerated-role therapy. (McFall & Marston, 1970, p. 295)

In an attempt to experimentally investigate the training components of behavior rehearsal, McFall and Marston (1970) randomly assigned forty-two nonassertive college students to one of two experimental or control situations: (1) behavior rehearsal with performance feedback, (2) behavioral rehearsal only, (3) group insight therapy, or (4) no-treatment control. After four, one-hour treatment periods, results showed that subjects in the behavior rehearsal groups exhibited significantly

greater assertiveness than subjects in control groups and that there was a nonsignificant tendency for subjects in the behavioral rehearsal with performance feedback to exhibit more assertion and less anxiety. Although the results of this study were weak, it was the first published attempt to test transfer of training by utilizing a follow-up "in-vivo" telephone assessment which examined trainee responses to a confederate magazine salesperson. In addition, an autonomic measure of subject pulse rate was utilized to determine pretest to posttest change.

McFall and Lillesand's (1971) subsequent study utilized treatment conditions similar to those of McFall and Marston (1970) with the addition of symbolic verbal modeling and therapist coaching on all trials. One experimental group practiced their responses overtly, and the other group practiced their responses covertly. After two, twenty-minute treatment sessions, results indicated that subjects in the experimental groups showed a greater increase in assertiveness than subjects in the no-treatment control group, with subjects in the covert rehearsal group showing somewhat more improvement than subjects in the overt rehearsal group.

Adding the training component of "projected consequences" to the McFall and Lillesand (1971) study, Loo (1971) replicated the study with the addition of in situ reactions by another to the assertive behavior of the role player. Subjects were seventeen male and nineteen female college student volunteers who met the screening criteria and were assigned to one of three groups: (1) an overt behavior rehearsal group as employed in the previous experiment, (2) a projected consequences

group which added this component to the overt behavior rehearsal format, and (3) a no-treatment control group. Results indicated that after the two training sessions, no significant differences existed between the two experimental groups.

Perkins (1972) also compared methods of modifying assertive behavior using the three treatment procedures of assertive training, modeling, and a combination of assertive training and modeling in an attempt to increase assertive behavior in "drafted" low assertive college students. The techniques utilized in the assertive training group were (1) behavior rehearsal, (2) reinforcement of assertive responses, (3) depropagandization, and (4) practice outside the group. Although results indicated that none of the three treatment procedures produced a change in the dependent variable of assertiveness, Perkins suggested that results might have been significant if a more motivated group of students had been used and if a behavioral performance test had been used to measure the dependent variable.

Studies which have focused on the relative effects of modeling on components of assertive behavior have yielded conflicting results. In a study designed to compare the effectiveness of modeling, roleplaying, and modeling plus roleplaying in changing nonassertive behavior in college students, subjects were assigned to one of six, twenty-minute treatment conditions (Friedman, 1969). Results of self-reports and behavioral tests indicated that modeling plus roleplaying subjects differed significantly from all treatment groups except the improvised roleplaying group. Two-week and four-week follow-up studies indicated

that, for males, the modeling plus roleplaying subjects maintained their verbal assertiveness, while for females, the improvised roleplaying subjects best maintained their verbal assertiveness.

Eisler, Hersen and Miller (1973) reported modeling plus behavior rehearsal to be significantly more effective than behavior rehearsal only or a control situation in increasing the assertive behavior of nonassertive psychiatric patients. Although this study indicated that observation of a videotaped model was effective in increasing the experimental subjects' acquisition of assertive skills as demonstrated by behavior assessment tests, it must be noted that these types of patients may have had some bearing on their need to have responses modeled for them.

Two recent studies have indicated that modeling added little to the effects of behavior rehearsal alone or behavior rehearsal plus coaching. In the first study, McFall and Twentyman (1973) conducted four separate experiments with nonassertive college students and concluded that regardless of the specific type of models utilized (tactful versus abrupt) or the media utilized (videotape versus audiotape), modeling added little to the aforementioned procedures on performance, on self-report, and on behavioral assessment measures.

In the second study, Galassi, DeLo, Galassi and Litz (1974) utilized thirty-two (sixteen male and sixteen female) nonassertive college students as subjects in an assertive training program which included numerous components, e.g., modeling, coaching, homework, discussion, etc. Student evaluations of the relative effectiveness of the various

components indicated that coaching and behavior rehearsal were the most important aspects of the program and that modeling was somewhat less important (Galassi, DeLo, Galassi, & Litz, 1973). Subjects in the Galassi, DeLo, Galassi and Litz (1974) study were randomly assigned to two experimental and two control groups in a Solomon four group design. The experimental group met twice per week and received a total of eight, ninety-minute training sessions. All subjects were then posttested on the College Self Expression Scale and on a behavioral performance test consisting of five scenes. Self-report (The Subjective Unit of Disturbance Scale) and behavioral indices were used to evaluate performance in the behavioral performance test. Results showed significant differences between experimental and control groups on the self-report measure, The College Self Expression Scale, length of eye contact time, the quality of the assertive content statements, and the length of the role playing scenes. Experimental subjects reported less anxiety on the Subjective Unit of Disturbance Scale, had a higher assertiveness score as measured by The College Self Expression Scale, demonstrated more eye contact, better assertive statements, and shorter, more concise behavior performance scenes. Response Latency was the only variable on which significant differences were not obtained. Although no significant differences were found between the two experimental nor between the two control groups, results indicated a pretesting effect for two of the dependent varibles ("felt anxiety" and assertive content) for the control groups. Since control subjects who were pretested experienced less anxiety and gave better assertive responses on the

posttest than those who were not pretaped, the authors suggested that the pretest may constitute a one-session treatment for the former group.

In contrast to earlier studies (Hedquist & Weinhold, 1970; McFall & Lillesand, 1971; McFall & Marston, 1970; McFall & Twentyman, 1973), the results of a one year follow-up study (Galassi, Kostka, & Galassi, 1975) indicated that the experimental subjects attained significantly higher scores on a paper-and-pencil measure of assertiveness, reported significantly lower levels of anxiety in the behavioral test, emitted significantly more concise verbal responses, and had significantly higher assertive content scores than control subjects. Unlike the posttest results, experimental and control subjects did not differ significantly on percent of eye contact or in average total response latency, although the difference for eye contact was in the predicted direction.

It is clear, then, that studies investigating methods of assertive training have tended to yield seemingly contradictory results. This phenomenon may be due in part to the wide array of instruments used to measure specific assertive training results. Studies utilized paper-and-pencil instruments ranging from those not designed specifically to measure assertiveness, e.g., the A-S scale of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Scale and the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness to those specifically for measuring assertiveness, e.g., The College Self Expression Scale, the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule. In addition, varying types of behavioral performance tests were used along with various combinations of in vivo follow-up methods. Due to this diversity in measurement instruments, there is little agreement as to the significant outcomes in these

experiments. However, based on the studies cited, it appears that behavior rehearsal with videotaped feedback, trainer coaching, and homework assignment methods are the most effective components of assertive training. Therefore, the present study utilized these methods in the assertive training treatment and drew heavily from those specific methods presented in Galassi, DeLo, Galassi and Litz (1974). A placebo-control group was not used in the present study because previous research has found that subjects in assertive training groups showed more positive change than did subjects in placebo-control and no-treatment control groups (Lawrence, 1970; McFall & Marston, 1970; Rathus, 1972, 1973; Rimm, Hill, Brown, & Stuart, 1974).

A review of the recent literature also indicates that female subjects have generally been used in studies focusing on nonassertive behavior, while male subjects were used in studying aggressive behavior. Although there is a recent trend toward assisting females to assert themselves (Jakubowski-Spector, 1973a, 1973b), the present study used an experimental group of both male and female resident assistants. Butler (1973) found that college women were less able than men to set limits for themselves or to express negative feelings, while college men had difficulty in expressing positive feelings, thus suggesting a need to include both men and women in assertive training groups. Further, Sansbury (1974) stressed that it is important to have an approximately equal number of men and women in the group since most of the problems men wished to work on involved women. The present study used groups of both male and female resident assistants whose behavior problems were both nonassertive and aggressive.

An important concern stemming from the studies cited has been the lack of generalizability of assertive training from the specific situations within treatment to situations in real life different from those emphasized in treatment. This was especially evident in the case studies which sought to identify individual problems and correct them with specific procedures. Generalization to situations outside those in treatment was not emphasized. The present study attempted to measure the generalizability of group assertive training to situations outside the training group, specifically, job performance in a residence hall environment.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Design of Study

The general design of the present study followed the pretest-posttest control group design as described in Campbell and Stanley (1969). The data were analyzed by means of an analysis of covariance in which pretest scores were used as the covariate while posttest scores served as the dependent variable. The level of significance necessary to reject the null hypotheses was established as the 0.05 level.

Subjects

Subjects for the study were twenty-six resident assistants who were employed by the Office of Residence Halls at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville during the Spring quarter of 1975. These subjects were recruited as volunteers after a talk given at individual residence hall staff meetings and by a follow-up memorandum (Appendix A) of an Assertive Training Group for resident assistants to be conducted by one of the head residents at the University of Tennessee. Resident assistants were informed that research data would be collected from the group via the administration of a paper and pencil test and videotaping of a behavioral performance test. They were informed that the anonymity of the volunteers would be carefully protected.

From a total population of 140 available resident assistants, fourteen male and twelve female resident assistants volunteered for the assertive training experience. Subjects ranged in age from nineteen to twenty-three. They had been employed as residence hall staff members from two to seven quarters excluding Spring of 1975. Subjects represented nine of the twelve traditional male, female, and coeducational residence halls at the University of Tennessee. A traditional residence hall refers to one constructed in either suite-type or double-room fashion with supervision and programming by a resident assistant who resides on the floor. (The apartment residence hall facility and the athletic residence hall were eliminated from the present study.)

In order to obtain basic demographic data on the subjects, the author developed a Staff Data Sheet. Information included such items as sex, age, class rank, residence hall, number of quarters employed as a residence hall staff member, and residence hall differentiate. The term "residence hall differentiate" refers to the types of living arrangements which vary in the amount of programming, supervision, and opposite-sex visitation privileges. Specific demographic data on the subjects are available in Appendix B.

Instrumentation

The instruments used to measure change in assertiveness and job performance were: (1) The College Self Expression Scale: A Measure of Assertiveness, (2) a student evaluation of resident assistant job performance developed by the author, (3) a supervisor evaluation of

resident assistant job performance developed by the author, and (4) a rating form used to score resident assistant behavior on a behavioral performance test. In addition, a staff data sheet was used to gather basic demographic data on the subjects. Sample copies of the instruments used in this study are available in Appendix A.

The College Self Expressions Scale: A Measure of Assertiveness (CSES)

The College Self Expression Scale is a fifty-item self report scale specifically designed to measure assertiveness in college students (Galassi, DeLo, Galassi & Bastien, 1974). Utilizing three dimensions of assertiveness (positive assertiveness, negative assertiveness, and self-denial), this scale touches upon the expression of a variety of feelings in a number of interpersonal contexts, e.g., family, strangers, business relations, authority figures, and like and opposite sex peers. Positive assertiveness consists of the expression of feelings of love, affection, admiration, approval, and agreement. Negative assertiveness includes expressions of feelings of anger, disagreement, dissatisfaction, and annoyance. Self-denial includes overapologizing, excessive interpersonal anxiety, and exaggerated concern for the feelings of others. The CSES utilizes a five-point Likert format (0-4) with twenty-one positively worded items and twenty-nine negatively worded items. High scores are indicative of an assertive response pattern.

Construct validity of the CSES was obtained in two separate studies between scores on the Gough Adjective Checklist (Galassi, DeLo, Galassi & Bastien, 1974) and also on the eight aggression-hostility scales of the

Buss-Durkee Inventory (Galassi & Galassi, 1975). Results of the first study indicated that the assertive individual is "expressive, spontaneous, well defended, confident, and able to influence and lead others." Conversely, the nonassertive person shows an

> . . . inadequate and negative self-evaluation, feelings of inferiority, a tendency to sustain subordinate roles in relationships with others, a tendency to be over solicitous of emotional support from others, and excessive interpersonal anxiety. (p. 68)

Results of the Galassi and Galassi (1975) study indicated that most of the eight aggression-hostility scales of the Buss-Durkee Inventory were either unrelated or inversely related to assertiveness as measured by the CSES.

Concurrent validity was established in four separate studies by using the method of contrasted groups and through correlations of self and judges' ratings of assertiveness (Galassi & Galassi, 1974). In the first two studies, CSES scores of 121 student teachers and CSES scores of college residents were correlated with ratings of their assertiveness made by immediate supervisors and their resident assistants respectively. The third and fourth studies utilized the method of contrasted groups and compared the CSES scores of male college student legislators to the scores of male college students in general and to scores of college males enrolled in "nonpeople" oriented majors such as engineering. This study also compared female college legislators to college women in general and to college females enrolled in traditional female college majors such as home economics. Similarly, the method of contrasted groups was used in the fourth study to compare college students who did not seek counseling

or who sought only vocational-educational counseling to those college students who sought personal adjustment counseling.

Test-retest reliability coefficients were .89 and .90 and were obtained from studies with a sample of introductory psychology students and a sample of upper division and beginning graduate students respectively over a two-week period.

For purposes of this study, the author modified items six and sixteen of the CSES. In each of these items, the work "roommate" which appeared on the original CSES was changed to "suitemate or neighbor" and "friend" respectively because resident assistants at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville reside in private rooms. Since it was not feasible to change the word "roommate" in item nine, a third paragraph was added to the directions for the CSES to clarify this point.

Job Performance

Using the resident assistant job description for the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (Appendix D), the author developed three separate measures of resident assistant job performance: (1) The Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form (SFF), (2) The Resident Assistant Job Performance Form (JPF), and (3) the Behavioral Performance Test (BPT).

The Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form (SFF)

In order to obtain student input concerning the job performance of the subjects, the SFF was developed by the author. This eighteen-item rating form was composed of ten positively worded items and eight negatively worded items which were based on the outcome goals of the

assertive training program (Appendix E). The SFF utilizes a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "almost always" to "never or rarely" to "no basis for evaluation."

The Resident Assistant Job Performance Form (JPF)

The Resident Assistant Job Performance Form (JPF) is a fifteen-item scale developed by the author for use by an immediate supervisor, the Head Resident, in evaluating the job performance of his/her staff. Using the outcome goals of the assertive training program, these items were developed to determine the resident assistant's relationship with his/her supervisor and other authority figures, and, to a lesser extent, his/her relationships with residents and floor officers as well as his/her ability to maintain floor discipline. The items are based on a five-point Likert scale and consist of six positively worded items and nine negatively worded items.

The Behavioral Performance Test (BPT)

The third measure used in this study to evaluate job performance was the observers' ratings of the subjects' performance on a videotaped behavioral performance test (Appendix C). The scenes emphasized (1) refusing a request, (2) making a request, (3) asking for a behavior change, and (4) paying a compliment. Two trained raters who had no knowledge of the subjects' group assignments or of the experimental hypotheses were shown both the pretest and posttest videotapes of a behavioral performance test, presented in random order. The raters then evaluated the adequacy of the subjects' responses for each of the four scenes.

A rating scale, modified from that described in Galassi, Galassi and Litz (1974), was used to determine subjects' eye contact, response length, and response content of the verbal response on each of four job-related behavioral scenes. Eye contact and response length were measured with a stop watch as described in Appendix C. Content of the verbal message for each scene was determined on a 0-4 Likert scale with 0 representing a nonassertive or aggressive response and 4 representing an unqualified or directly assertive response.

Two doctoral-level graduate students majoring in Educational Psychology at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, were selected to rate the videotaped behavioral performance test. Both raters were familiar with behavior observation techniques and the concept of assertive training. In order to keep the sex variable constant in the experiment, one of the raters was male and the other was female. Neither rater was aware of the purpose of the study nor of the hypotheses tested in the study.

The raters received two, one-hour training sessions which consisted of instruction by the author as well as practice ratings of videotaped assertive behavior scenes. During the training sessions, the raters were required to independently rate ten videotaped scenes. No discussion between the raters was permitted during the rating of the videotpaed scenes.

Interrater reliability for the training session was computed by dividing the total number of agreements by the total number of agreements plus disagreements. The reliability for the ten training scenes was .90.

Because the results of the present study rely heavily on ratings of the behavioral performance test by the two observers, a check was made on the reliability of the raters' scoring of the dependent variables of Eye Contact and Content on the pretest and posttest scenes of the behavioral performance test. Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients were computed for each scene, as well as across all scenes, in order to determine the degree of relationship between the scores assigned by the observers. The results of these checks, which are reported in Table 1, show that there was a high degree of agreement between the two raters.

Experimental Procedure

Twenty-six resident assistants who volunteered for the assertive training program in the Spring of 1975 served as subjects. To determine the degree to which resident assistants who volunteered for the assertive training program differed in assertiveness from the total population of resident assistants, all 140 resident assistants were mailed the Staff Data Sheet and the College Self Expression Scale one week prior to the beginning of the treatment. The population of resident assistants received the Staff Data Sheet, the CSES, and an accompanying letter (Appendix A) in their campus mailboxes and were asked to complete and return the instruments. Approximately 91% (128 of 140) of the resident assistants completed and returned the instruments. An analysis was then performed in order to determine whether the resident assistants who volunteered for the assertive training experience differed significantly from those resident assistants who did not volunteer. A t-test was

Table 1

Summary of Interrater Reliability for Eye Contact and Content Variables of the Behavioral Performance Test (Expressed in Terms of Pearson's r)

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Pretest	Posttest
One	Eye Contact	.9881	.9957
	Content	.9380	.9141
Two	Eye Contact	.9828	.9784
	Content	.8558	.8072
Three	Eye Contact	.9878	.9917
	Content	.6127	.6174
Four	Eye Contact	.9744	.9847
	Content	.8879	.9425
Across All Scenes	Eye Contact	.9911	.9955
	Content	.7975	.8072

performed using scores on the pretest College Self Expression Scales. Results of the t-test ($t = 1.19$, $df = 126$, $p < .238$) indicated that the volunteers did not differ significantly from the nonvolunteers with respect to their degree of assertiveness.

Scores obtained on the CSES were ranked separately for the fourteen male and the twelve female subjects who volunteered for the assertive training program. Subjects were then matched by sex and by scores on the CSES and were randomly assigned individually to either the experimental group or to the control group.

In addition to the pretest scores on the CSES, pretest scores for all subjects were obtained on the SFF, the JPF, and the BPT. The SFF and an accompanying letter (Appendix A) were distributed by mail to ten students selected at random from the population of residents living for at least two months on the floor of each resident assistant participating in the experiment. In order to determine which residents met this criterion, the official residence hall roster for each living unit was used. Ten of the residents who met this criterion were selected to receive the questionnaire by use of a table of random numbers.

The Resident Assistant Job Performance Form and an accompanying letter (Appendix A) were mailed to Head Residents of the residence halls in which the subjects were employed. The Head Residents were asked to evaluate their entire staffs in an effort to assure the anonymity of the resident assistants participating in the study.

All subjects were administered the behavioral performance test one day prior to the first training session. Each subject was videotaped in

four job-related situations in which assertive behavior could be used with profit. Subject responses were individually taped during a session with a same-sex confederate who had no knowledge of the subject group assignment nor of the experimental hypotheses.

Immediately following the behavioral performance test, each subject was informed of his/her group assignment. The experimental group was informed that they must attend the four treatment sessions, since the skills which would be stressed in training could only be built with practice. Control group subjects were told that they would begin their assertive training sessions in approximately one month.

Experimental Group

The Assertive Training experimental group met for ninety minutes once a week for four weeks. During the training sessions, behavior rehearsal, videotaped and group feedback, coaching, and homework assignments were utilized. Behavior rehearsal refers to a type of role-playing in which the trainee is encouraged to practice behavior which he/she does not currently possess. After feedback is received, the trainee modifies responses in an attempt to improve assertive behavior. Group feedback is defined as communication to the trainee of similarities and differences between the trainee's response and the model assertive response. Feedback includes information about content of the verbal message, eye contact, body posture, gestures, facial expressions, voice, and timing. Videotaped feedback refers to a replay of the videotaped behavior rehearsal scene intended to present the trainee with the actual picture of his/her behavior performance. Coaching is defined as hints

and directions given by the trainer to the trainee before, during, and after the behavior rehearsal.

Because it was assumed that subjects could formulate their own responses to the training situations after certain groundwork had been laid, training models were not utilized. However, either the trainer or the group members occasionally served to model responses in the event that any trainee needed such a model.

In the first session, after each subject introduced him/herself, the rationale for the training was presented, and facilitator expectations were given. The resident assistants were then asked to write down and rank in order of difficulty three specific job-related situations and three specific social situations in which they would like to act more assertively. The remainder of the first session was devoted to a discussion of assertive behavior. Distinctions were made between nonassertive, aggressive, and assertive behavior, stressing the nonverbal components of assertive behavior.

The second session was devoted to the techniques of stating positive or negative feelings and making simple requests. After a brief explanation of the outcomes of assertive training, and interpersonal rights and limitations, the facilitator asked for volunteers to role play scenes dealing with either the expression of feelings or making a simple request. At the end of the session, each subject was given a homework sheet and was instructed to record the specifics on an assertive act he/she performed prior to the next meeting.

The third and fourth training sessions stressed refusing a request and asking someone to change his/her behavior respectively. Each session

began with a discussion of homework assignments in the large group setting. Then scenes with immediate videotaped feedback, coaching, and discussion by the group were enacted.

Various handouts were distributed in the assertive training sessions and are described in Appendix E along with a more detailed summary of the training program used in the study.

Control Group

Subjects in the control group received no assertive training during the four weeks of the experiment. However, after posttest data were taken, the no-treatment control group was given the assertive training in order to ensure that all resident assistants who volunteered for the assertive training would, in fact, receive the training. It must be pointed out that the training of the control group was done for ethical purposes only and had no effect on the experiment, since all data were collected prior to the administration of the assertive training to the control group.

Posttests

Posttest data were collected from the experimental and the control subjects on the CSES, the SFF, the JPF, and on the BPT subsequent to the fourth assertive training session. The CSES and the behavioral performance test were completed by the experimental and control subjects exactly six days after the fourth training session, making certain that these measures were taken on the same day of the week and at the same time of day that pretest measures had been collected. The SFF, JPF, and accompanying

letters (Appendix A) were mailed to the residents and Head Residents respectively on the day following the fourth assertive training session. Residents and Head Residents were asked to return the completed questionnaires within five days. This procedure enabled all posttest data to be collected prior to the administration of the assertive training to the control group.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Hypotheses one through six were stated in the null form and tested for significance using a one-way analysis of covariance. This univariate technique was chosen because the total number of subjects involved in the study (N = 26) did not justify a multivariate technique. According to Gorsuch (1974), a minimum of five observations per dependent variable (preferably more) is required in order to justify the use of a multivariate statistical test.

The first hypothesis predicted no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted assertiveness scores. Pretest and posttest scores were obtained for treatment subjects and for control subjects on the College Self Expression Scale as shown in Table 2.

Posttest means on the College Self Expression Scale were adjusted on the basis of pretest CSES scores (covariate). As can be seen in Table 3, the F statistic ($F = 4.338$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .046$) which resulted from the analysis of covariance indicated that the treatment and control groups were significantly different. Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected. Because these results indicated that treatment subjects received significantly higher posttest scores on the CSES than did control subjects, it would seem that the assertive training was valuable in increasing the level of assertiveness of treatment subjects as measured by this self-report instrument.

Table 2

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Treatment and Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest		Posttest	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
CSES	treatment	132.385	15.851	144.000	21.637
	control	130.385	17.289	132.769	17.517
JPF	treatment	49.846	5.956	51.308	5.588
	control	45.308	6.562	47.615	8.170
SFF	treatment	52.692	4.029	53.462	5.093
	control	51.385	5.331	52.385	6.090
Eye Contact	treatment	37.2	24.9	84.8	9.3
	control	44.9	27.0	51.1	19.5
Scene Length	treatment	19.006	6.206	17.313	4.301
	control	15.931	7.452	13.013	5.786
Content	treatment	2.462	.596	3.125	.557
	control	2.173	.670	2.231	.430

Table 3

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Treatment and Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary df'	MS'	F	P
CSES	between	1	556.282	4.338	.046*
	within	23	128.248		
JPF	between	1	1.697	.110	.999
	within	23	15.386		
SFF	between	1	.431	.051	.999
	within	23	8.523		
Eye Contact	between	1	76.1	45.411	.001*
	within	23	1.7		
Scene Length	between	1	53.838	3.035	.091
	within	23	17.741		
Content	between	1	3.713	19.724	.001*
	within	23	.188		

*$p < .05$

The second hypothesis predicted no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by supervisor evaluations. Supervisors completed the Resident Assistant Job Performance Form as pretest and posttest indicators of resident assistant job performance. Means and standard deviations for this variable are presented in Table 2.

Posttest means on the JPF were then adjusted on the basis of JPF pretest scores (covariate). Results of the analysis of covariance ($F = .110$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .999$) showed no significant differences between the two groups (Table 3). Therefore, hypothesis two was accepted. Based on the results of the analysis of covariance, it would seem that the assertive training was not helpful in increasing scores on supervisor evaluations of resident assistant job performance as measured by the JPF.

The third hypothesis stated that there is no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by student evaluations. Students residing in the living units of the treatment and control group subjects completed pretest and posttest forms of the Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form. Means and standard deviations for this variable are shown in Table 2.

Posttest means on the SFF were then adjusted on the basis of SFF pretest scores (covariate). A nonsignificant F value ($F = .051$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .999$) resulting from the analysis of covariance indicated that there was no difference between the treatment and control groups on this dependent variable (Table 3). As a consequence, the third hypothesis was

accepted. It is clear from the results of this analysis of covariance that assertive training was not helpful in increasing student evaluation scores of resident assistant job performance as measured by the SFF.

The fourth hypothesis predicted no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted eye contact ratings resulting from rater observations of a behavioral performance test. While observing pretest and posttest scenes on a behavioral performance test, raters recorded the amount of time subjects maintained eye contact with a confederate during each of four scenes. Recorded eye contact was later converted to percentage of eye contact for each scene by dividing the amount of time eye contact was maintained by the scene length. The means and standard deviations presented in Table 2, page 37, indicate that treatment group resident assistants increased the amount of time they maintained eye contact with a confederate, while control group resident assistants did not increase the amount of time eye contact was maintained.

The F statistic ($F = 45.411$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .001$) which resulted from the analysis of covariance indicated that the treatment and the control groups were significantly different (Table 3, page 38). Thus, the fourth hypothesis was rejected. Based on the results of the analysis of covariance, it would seem that the assertive training was helpful in increasing the percentage of eye contact maintained by treatment group resident assistants on the behavioral performance test.

The fifth hypothesis predicted no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted scene length measures resulting from rater observations of a behavioral performance test. While

observing pretest and posttest scenes on a behavioral performance test, raters recorded the total length of each behavioral scene. Means and standard deviations (expressed in seconds) for the variables of scene length are reported in Table 2, page 37.

Posttest scene length scores were adjusted on the basis of pretest scene length scores (covariate). As is indicated in Table 3, page 38, results of the analysis of covariance ($F = 3.035$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .091$) yielded no significant differences between treatment and control groups on this variable. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was accepted. It is clear from the results of this analysis of covariance that assertive training was not helpful in decreasing the scene length on a behavioral performance test. In fact, the results of this study show that control group resident assistants demonstrated more concise responses than did treatment group resident assistants on the scenes of the behavioral performance test.

The sixth hypothesis predicted no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted content ratings resulting from observations of a behavioral performance test. Content was measured during a behavioral performance test by raters using a 0-4 Likert scale. As can be seen from the means and standard deviations reported in Table 2, treatment group resident assistants received higher posttest scores than did control group resident assistants.

Posttest content scores were adjusted on the basis of pretest content scores (covariate) and an analysis of covariance was applied. The resultant F statistic ($F = 19.724$, $df = 1/23$, $p = .001$) indicated that

the treatment and control groups were significantly different (Table 3, page 38). Thus, the sixth hypothesis was rejected. Based on the results of the analysis of covariance, it appears that assertive training was helpful in improving the quality of assertive responses in treatment group resident assistants as demonstrated on the scenes of the behavioral performance test.

In order to determine whether the male treatment and control groups and female treatment and control groups differed on each of the six dependent variables, an analysis of covariance was performed between male treatment and male control groups and between female treatment and female control groups. Results of these analysis of covariance tests are reported in Tables 4 and 5. Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations for male treatment and control groups, while Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for females on the six dependent variables. Mean eye contact and standard deviations are expressed in percentages. Mean scene length and standard deviations are expressed in seconds.

As is indicated in Table 4, the male treatment group differed significantly from the male control group on the College Self Expression Scale ($F = 6.493$, $df = 1/11$, $p = .026$) and on Eye Contact ($F = 27.410$, $df = 1/11$, $p = .001$). That is, the male treatment group resident assistants received higher CSES scores and demonstrated a higher percentage of eye contact on the behavioral performance test than did male resident assistants in the control group. No significant differences were found between male treatment and male control groups on the dependent measures of JPF, SFF, Scene Length, or Content (Table 4).

Table 4

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary			
		df'	MS'	F	P
CSES	between	1	703.108	6.493	.026*
	within	11	108.293		
JPF	between	1	3.861	.377	.999
	within	11	10.250		
SFF	between	1	.297	.023	.999
	within	11	12.713		
Eye Contact	between	1	55.7	27.410	.001*
	within	11	2.0		
Scene Length	between	1	1.738	.108	.999
	within	11	16.067		
Content	between	1	1.225	4.174	.063
	within	11	.293		

* $p < .05$

Table 5

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary df'	MS'	F	P
CSES	between	1	30.599	.197	.999
	within	9	155.014		
JPF	between	1	19.360	.860	.999
	within	9	22.523		
SFF	between	1	.557	.115	.999
	within	9	4.838		
Eye Contact	between	1	25.0	34.232	.001*
	within	9	.7		
Scene Length	between	1	167.488	13.099	.006*
	within	9	12.787		
Content	between	1	1.267	10.592	.010*
	within	9	.120		

*$p < .05$

Table 6

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest		Posttest	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
CSES	treatment	133.714	18.936	150.000	20.257
	control	133.286	20.213	135.429	21.125
JPF	treatment	48.857	3.625	51.857	4.298
	control	47.429	5.996	49.571	6.024
SFF	treatment	51.714	4.608	52.000	5.657
	control	52.714	4.923	53.429	7.068
Eye Contact	treatment	46.7	26.8	84.4	11.6
	control	38.5	29.9	42.5	17.2
Scene Length	treatment	19.279	4.894	15.607	5.158
	control	17.286	9.921	15.300	5.900
Content	treatment	2.661	.636	3.196	.732
	control	1.750	.520	2.036	.351

Table 7

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Six Dependent Measures

Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest		Posttest	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
CSES	treatment	130.833	12.937	137.000	22.847
	control	127.000	14.199	129.667	13.397
JPF	treatment	51.000	8.149	50.667	7.202
	control	42.833	6.824	45.333	10.250
SFF	treatment	53.833	3.251	55.167	4.167
	control	49.833	5.811	51.167	5.076
Eye Contact	treatment	39.6	24.7	85.2	6.8
	control	52.4	23.4	61.1	18.3
Scene Length	treatment	18.687	7.967	19.304	1.909
	control	14.350	3.094	10.346	4.767
Content	treatment	2.229	.496	3.042	.292
	control	2.667	.459	2.458	.423

Results of the analysis of covariance for female treatment and female control groups (Table 5) showed significant differences on the variables of Eye Contact ($F = 34.232$, $df = 1/9$, $p = .001$), Scene Length ($F = 13.099$, $df = 1/9$, $p = .006$), and Content ($F = 10.592$, $df = 1/9$, $p = .010$) on the behavioral performance test. As can be seen in Table 7, on the behavioral performance test treatment group females maintained eye contact for a higher percentage of time and demonstrated more assertive content than did control group females. However, control group females delivered more concise responses as indicated by their scene length measures. No differences were found between female treatment and female control groups on the College Self Expression Scale, the JPF, or on the SFF.

In order to determine differences between treatment and control subjects on the dependent variables of Eye Contact, Scene Length, and Content of the four scenes on the behavioral performance test, analysis of covariance tests were performed for each of the scenes on the behavioral performance test. Shown in Table 9 (Appendix F) are the results of these analyses. It can be seen that significant differences were found between treatment and control groups on both Eye Contact and Scene Length in Scene One, Eye Contact in Scene Two, and Eye Contact and Content in Scenes Three and Four. Presented in Table 10 (Appendix F) are means and standard deviations for treatment and control groups on each of the four scenes of the behavioral performance test. Because each of the behavioral performance test scenes required demonstration of a different type of assertive behavior, e.g., making a request, refusing a request, significant differences were found between treatment and control groups on different behavior components from scene to scene.

Analysis of covariance tests were also performed for male treatment and male control groups and for female treatment and female control groups on each of the four scenes on the behavioral performance test. Results, which appear in Tables 11 and 12 (Appendix F), show that for males, significant differences were found in Scene One, Two and Three for Eye Contact, and in Scene Four for Eye Contact and Content. Significant differences were found between female treatment and female control groups in Scene One for Eye Contact and Scene Length; in Scene Two on Eye Contact; in Scene Three on Eye Contact, Scene Length, and Content; and in Scene Four for Eye Contact. The means and standard deviations for male treatment and control groups and for female treatment and control groups on each of the four behavioral scenes are presented in Tables 13 and 14 respectively (Appendix F). In the main, it can be seen that differences detected between treatment group resident assistants and control group resident assistants were different for males and females from scene to scene.

An interesting outcome of the present study was the male/female difference detected on the Content component of the fourth scene of the behavioral performance test. This particular scene was concerned with the resident assistant's complimenting of the confederate. On the pretest, male resident assistants in both the treatment and control groups had rather low content scores, indicating their inability to give a compliment. As a result of the assertive training, male treatment group resident assistants improved significantly more than control group resident assistants on their ability to compliment. Females, however,

showed no significant change from pretest to posttest possibly due to the fact that pretest scores of both the female treatment and female control groups were relatively high. This finding lends support to Butler's (1973) results, which showed males to have difficulty expressing positive feelings.

In general, however, no other improvement differences attributable to sex of the subjects were found. That is, the improvement scores on each of the dependent variables and on each of the four scenes of the behavioral performance test, closely paralleled the overall improvement scores.

Discussion

The present study demonstrated the effectiveness of a group assertive training program with male and female resident assistants. The program included a behavioral performance test which required subjects to respond assertively in four scenes that paralleled actual situations resident assistants typically encounter in their residence hall positions. Significantly better performance was obtained by treatment subjects compared to control subjects on the variables of Eye Contact and Content of the scenes. That is, the assertive training treatment group maintained eye contact for a greater percentage of time during the posttest than the group not receiving assertive training. Further, the quality of assertive responses achieved by the treatment group subjects was superior to that of subjects in the control group as was reflected by the significantly higher posttest Content score obtained by the treatment group. These

findings were consistent with the results of other researchers who measured the outcomes of assertive training through use of a behavioral performance test (Friedman, 1969; Galassi, Galassi, & Litz, 1974; Lawrence, 1970; McFall & Twentyman, 1973; Rathus, 1973).

The only dependent variable on the behavioral performance test which showed no significant difference between the treatment group and the control group was the component of Scene Length. Resident assistants in the treatment group did not demonstrate shorter, more concise responses than did resident assistants in the control group. It is interesting to note that the duration of response on behavioral performance tests has yielded conflicting results in two published studies. The results of a study by Eisler, Hersen, and Miller (1973) supported their hypothesis that assertive subjects would exhibit significantly longer speech duration than would nonassertive subjects. Conversely, the results of a study by Galassi, Galassi, and Litz (1974) supported their hypothesis that assertive subjects would emit significantly more concise verbal responses than would subjects in the control group.

An analysis of the dialog of each behavioral scene in the present study indicated that neither a concise response nor a lengthy response necessarily was indicative of assertive behavior. For example, subjects who immediately yielded to the confederate's request (Scene One) had a shorter scene length than did subjects who refused the request and gave a brief explanation. Thus, the present study lends support to neither theory concerning duration of response on scenes of a behavioral performance test.

The significantly higher scores for the treatment group on the self-report measure, the College Self Expression Scale, indicated that treatment resident assistants were more willing than the control group resident assistants to be assertive more frequently in a variety of interpersonal contexts, e.g., family, strangers, business relations, authority figures, like and opposite sex peers. It can be surmised that if treatment resident assistants responded more assertively than control resident assistants in these situations as a result of the assertive training experience, it is likely that the treatment group resident assistants will be more satisfied with themselves and, thus, be in a frame of mind to perform well on their jobs.

The major question in this study was whether or not treatment effects observed in assertive training sessions actually transferred to real-life situations of job performance in a university residence hall setting. Unfortunately, the question of transfer of assertive training is one which has not been dealt with adequately in most published studies to date. As reported in Table 3, page 38, the present study revealed significant differences between treatment and control groups with respect to scores on self-measures (The College Self Expression Scale), and on the two behavioral components of Eye Contact and Content on the behavioral performance test. However, significant differences were not found to exist on the two measures of resident assistant job performance, The Resident Assistant Job Performance Form and the Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form.

A possible explanation for this failure to detect differences in resident assistant job performance on the JPF and the SFF is that neither

the immediate supervisors nor the residents selected were able to detect specific changes in the behavior of the resident assistants in the treatment group during the four week treatment period. It is plausible that even though changes in assertive behavior occurred in treatment group resident assistants, supervisors and selected residents may not have had close or frequent enough contact with the resident assistants. Consequently, changes in behavior were not detected.

The findings in the present study indicate significant differences in scores between the treatment group and the control group on the College Self Expression Scale and on the behavioral components of Eye Contact and Content on the behavioral performance test. That is, trained resident assistants have become significantly more assertive as was demonstrated on both a self-report measure and on simulated job performance measures. From these results, it may reasonably be concluded that there is some validity for using group assertive training in a resident assistant training program.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of group assertive training on resident assistant job performance.

Subjects for the study were twenty-six resident assistants who were employed by the Office of Residence Halls at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville during the Spring quarter of 1975. From a total population of 140 available resident assistants, fourteen male and twelve female resident assistants volunteered for the assertive training experience.

Pretest assertiveness scores obtained on the College Self Expression Scale were ranked separately for the male and the female subjects who volunteered for the assertive training program. Subjects were then matched by sex and by scores on the CSES and were randomly assigned individually to either the treatment group or to the control group.

Pretest and posttest scores for all subjects were obtained on a self-report measure (College Self Expression Scale), supervisor evaluations (Resident Assistant Job Performance Form), student evaluations (Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form), and on Eye Contact, Scene Length, and Content on a videotaped Behavioral Performance Test. The four job-related scenes on the Behavioral Performance Test were rated for each subject by two trained observers.

Subjects in the assertive training experimental group received four, ninety-minute assertive training sessions combining procedures of behavior rehearsal, videotaped and group feedback, coaching, and homework assignments. Subjects in the control group received no treatment during the four weeks of the study.

The data collected in this study were subjected to an analysis of covariance in which pretest scores were the covariate while posttest scores served as the dependent variables.

The first hypothesis of no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted assertiveness scores was rejected at a statistically significant level. The subjects in the assertive training group received significantly higher scores on the College Self Expression Scale than did subjects in the control group.

The second hypothesis of no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by supervisor evaluations, was accepted. There was no statistically significant difference between resident assistants in the treatment and resident assistants in the control group as measured by supervisors on the Resident Assistant Job Performance Form.

The third hypothesis of no difference between the treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted job performance scores as measured by student evaluations, was accepted. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between subjects in the treatment group and subjects in the control group as measured by resident evaluations on the Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form.

The fourth hypothesis of no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted eye contact ratings on a behavioral performance test, was rejected at a statistically significant level. Subjects in the assertive training treatment group maintained eye contact with a confederate for a significantly greater length of time than did subjects in the group not receiving assertive training.

The fifth hypothesis of no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted scene length measures on a behavioral performance test, was accepted. Resident assistants in the treatment group did not demonstrate significantly shorter, more concise responses than did resident assistants in the control group.

The sixth hypothesis of no difference between treatment and control groups with respect to adjusted response content ratings on the behavioral performance test, was rejected at a statistically significant level. The resident assistants in the assertive training group received significantly higher observer ratings of Content on the 0-4 Likert scale during the four scenes of the videotaped behavioral performance test.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

At a most general level, the evidence presented in this study provides additional support for the value of group assertive training as a method of increasing assertive behavior in male and female college students. In addition, it can be concluded that as a result of the assertive training program, resident assistants in the treatment group demonstrated an increase in general assertiveness and an increase in two

forms of simulated job performance. These increases included a willingness to be assertive as measured by a self-report (CSES), and an improvement in training behavior as measured by the eye contact and response content variables on the four job-related scenes of the video-taped behavioral performance test.

In spite of the fact that supervisor and student evaluations of resident assistant job performance showed no difference between the treatment and the control group, the results of the behavioral performance test lend partial support to the utilization of assertive training in a resident assistant training program. Because the behavioral performance test stressed four situations which resident assistants often encounter in their residence hall positions, it is possible that the resultant increased assertive behavior as measured by increased eye contact and content scores could, in fact, generalize to actual job performance.

It must be pointed out that the "no difference" found between treatment and control groups on the JPF and the SFF may be considered, in themselves, positive outcomes of the assertive training. According to Alberti and Emmons (1974), when nonassertive individuals begin acting assertively, their established pattern of interaction with other individuals is disrupted. In effect, the other individuals may react negatively to this change of behavior. For example, it is possible that a resident assistant who had been acting nonassertively with respect to enforcement of residence hall regulations would evoke negative sentiment from residents if he/she suddenly (as a result of the assertive training

experience) began to assert him/herself and enforce these regulations. The data from the present study showed no negative sentiment to have been aroused as a result of the assertive training program.

The utilization of the assertive training model presented in this study seems to have merit due to the increases shown in general assertiveness and in two forms of simulated job performance. However, additional research should be conducted in order to substantiate the generalizability of these findings to actual situations within the residence halls. It is suggested that future research include an in vivo measure to examine this concept. In addition, it is recommended that this measure include additional behavior components emphasized in the assertive training model such as voice tone and quality, facial expressions, and gestures.

The present study substantiates the fact that there continues to be a problem with obtaining job performance instruments to measure supervisor and student evaluations of resident assistant assertive behavior. It is suggested that future research concentrate on developing reliable and valid measures of supervisor and student input. If such instruments can be constructed, they might be used in future research to compare the assertive training model presented in this study to other forms of resident assistant training.

Further, it is probable that the effects of assertive training on job performance cannot be measured within the time span of days and weeks. Rather, these effects may need to be investigated over a longer period of time in order to detect changes in job performance.

It is recommended that the present study be replicated with resident assistants employed by other residence hall systems in order to increase the generalizability of the present findings. It must be pointed out that because the goals of various residence hall programs may vary, it is imperative that directors of residence hall training programs consider their respective goals prior to deciding whether to implement group assertive training. Because of the flexible nature of the assertive training sessions, it is possible to pattern the content of the behavior rehearsal scenes after specific residence hall goals and/or job descriptions. In this manner, the training sessions will have relevance for varying residence hall programs.

Finally, although the training model used in the present study included both male and female volunteer resident assistants with either nonassertive or aggressive response patterns, the primary focus of the present study was not the comparison of differential effects of assertive training for each of these categories of subjects. In general, no improvement differences attributable to sex of the subjects were found (with the exception of the male/female difference on the Content component of the fourth scene on the behavioral performance test). That is, the improvement scores on each of the dependent variables and on each of the four scenes of the behavioral performance test, closely paralleled the overall improvement scores. Future researchers, however, may desire to use this assertive training model with exclusively male or female groups, with groups in which subjects are exclusively nonassertive or exclusively aggressive, or with groups in which the subjects are

nonvolunteers. In this manner, any differential effects of the assertive training on these specific types of subjects can be examined.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Alberti, R.E., & Emmons, M.L. Your Perfect Right (2nd ed.). San Luis Obispo, California: IMPACT, 1974.

Butler, P.E. Assertive training: teaching women not to discriminate against themselves, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 082 103).

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. Experimental and quasiexperimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973.

Edwards, N.B. Case conference: assertive training in a case of homosexual pedophilia. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 55-63.

Eisler, R.M., Hersen, M., & Miller, P.M. Effects of modeling on components of assertive behavior. Journal of Behavior Therapy and and Experimental Psychiatry, 1973, 4, 1-6.

Friedman, P.H. The effects of modeling and roleplaying on assertive behavior (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1968) Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29, 4844B. (University Microfilms No. 69-912).

Galassi, J.P., DeLo, J.S., Galassi, M.D., & Bastien, S. The college self expression scale: a measure of assertiveness. Behavior Therapy, 1974, 5, 165-171.

Galassi, J.P., DeLo, J.S., Galassi, M.D., & Litz, M.C. Reactions to an outreach program for nonassertive college students. West Virginia University, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Reprint No. ED 086 911)

Galassi, J.P., DeLo, J.S., Galassi, M.D., & Litz, M.C. Assertive training in groups using video feedback. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 390-394.

Galassi, J.P., & Galassi, M.D. Validity of a measure of assertiveness. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1974, 21, 248-250.

Galassi, J.P. & Galassi, M.D. Relationship between assertiveness and aggressiveness. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 352-354.

Galassi, J.P., Kostka, M.P. & Galassi, M.D. Assertive training: a one year follow up. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 451-452.

Gorsuch, R.L. Factor Analysis. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1974.

Greenleaf, E.A. The role of student staff members. In D. DeCoster & P. Mable, (eds.) Student Development and Education in College Residence Halls. Washington: American College Personnel Association, 1974, 181-194.

Hedquist, F.J., & Weinhold, B.K. Behavioral group counseling with socially anxious and unassertive college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 237-242.

Hosford, R.E. Overcoming fear of speaking in a group. In Krumboltz, J.D. & Thoresen, C.E. (eds.), Behavioral Counseling. New York: Holt, 1969.

Jakubowski-Spector, P. Facilitating the growth of women through assertive training. The Counseling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 75-86. (a)

Jakubowski-Spector, P. An introduction to assertive training procedures for women. Washington: APGA, 1973. (b)

Johnson, T., Tyler, V., Thompson, R., & Jones, E. Systematic desensitization and assertive training in the treatment of speech anxiety in middle-school students, Psychology in the Schools, 1971, 8, 263-267.

Lawrence, P.S. The assessment and modification of assertive behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 396B. (University Microfilms No. 70-11, 888.)

Lazarus, A.A. Behavior rehearsal vs. nondirective therapy vs. advice in effecting behavior change. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.

Lazarus, A.A. Behavior Therapy and Beyond. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Lazarus, A.A., & Serber, M. Is systematic desensitization being misapplied? Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 215-218.

Leader, G.C. Interpersonally skillful bank officers view their behavior. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1973, 9, 484-497.

Lomont, J.F., Gilner, F.H. Spector, N.J., & Skinner, K.K. Group assertion training and group insight therapies. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 463-470.

Loo, R.M.Y. The effects of projected consequences and overt behavior rehearsal on assertive behavior. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 34, 5448B. (University Microfilms No. 72-6988)

Manderino, M.A. The effects of a group assertive training procedure on undergraduate women (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 1389B. (University Microfilms No. 74-20, 139)

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

McFall, R.M. & Marston, A.P. An experimental investigation of behavior rehearsal in assertive training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 2, 295-303.

McFall, R.M., & Twentyman, C.T. Four experiments on the relative contributions of rehearsal, modeling, and coaching to assertion training. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 8, 199-218.

Nydegger, R.V. The elimination of hallucinatory and delusional behavior by verbal conditioning and assertive training: a case study. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 225-227.

Perkins, D.G. The effectiveness of three procedures for increasing assertiveness in low assertive college students (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1972) Dissertations Abstracts International, 1972, 33, 1293B-1294B. (University Microfilms No. 72-24, 200)

Powell, J.R., Plyler, S.A., Dickson, B.A., & McClellan, S.D. The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.

Rathus, S.A. An experimental investigation of assertive training in a group setting. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1972, 3, 81-86.

Rathus, S.A. Instigation of assertive behavior through videotape-mediated assertive models and directed practice. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 57-65.

Rimm, D.C., Assertive training used in treatment of chronic crying spells. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1967, 5, 373-374.

Rimm, D.C., Hill, G.A., Brown, N.N., & Stuart, J.E. Group-assertive training in treatment of expression of inappropriate anger. Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, 791-798.

Salter, A. Conditioned Reflex Therapy. New York: Farrar, Strous, 1949.

Sansbury, D.L. Assertive training in groups. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 53, 117-122.

Seitz, P.F. Dynamically-oriented brief psychotherapy: psychocutaneous excoriation syndromes. Psychosomatic Medicine, 1953, 15, 200-213.

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

Serber, M. & Nelson, P. The ineffectiveness of systematic desensitization and assertive training in hospitalized schizophrenics. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1971, 2, 107-109.

Stevenson, I. Direct instigation of behavioral changes in psychotherapy. AMA Archives of General Psychiatry, 1959, 1, 115-123.

Varenhorst, B.B. Helping a client speak up in class. In Krumboltz, J.E. & Thoresen, C.E. (eds.), Behavioral Counseling. New York: Holt, 1969.

Walton, D., & Mather, M.D. The application of learning principles to the treatment of obsessive-compulsive states in the acute and chronic phases of illness. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1963, 1, 163-174.

Wolpe, J. Reciprocal inhibition as the main basis of psychotherapeutic effects. Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 1954, 72, 205-226.

Wolpe, J. Psychotherapy by Recriprocal Inhibition. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wolpe, J., & Lazarus, A.A. Behavior Therapy Techniques: A Guide to the Treatment of Neuroses. Oxford: Pergamon, 1966.

Young, E.R., Rimm, D.C., & Kennedy, T.D. An experimental investigation of modeling and verbal reinforcement in the modification of assertive behavior. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 317-319.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE
37916

Humes Hall
1911 Holt Avenue

Area Code 615
Phone 974-5171

February 10, 1975

TO: All Resident Assistants
All Assistant Head Residents

FROM: Rosemary Layne, Head Resident, Humes Hall

RE: Assertive Training for RA's and AHR's

Instructor: Rosemary Layne

Course: Ed Psych 4553

Title: Student Leadership Workshop

Section: 31191

Academic credit: one hour

Class meetings: four, 90-minute sessions

Class time: Arranged by group consensus
Probably 6:15-7:45 Tuesdays

One of the necessary skills for success in interpersonal relationships is assertiveness. If you tend to bottle-up your emotions (nonassertiveness) or to "lash out" at others (aggressiveness), this course can be of benefit to you. Because assertiveness can be learned, there will be a special class offered this Spring quarter for RA's and AHR's. Through videotaped role-playing and group feedback, an attempt will be made to change aggressive or nonassertive behavior to assertive behavior.

If you would like to become skilled in assertiveness, fill out the bottom portion of this memorandum and return it to me through Campus Mail, or call me at 5174.

The place, day, and time of the class sessions will be announced later.

NAME_____ SUGGESTED CLASS TIMES: _____

HALL_____ _____

PHONE_____ _____

RETURN TO ROSEMARY LAYNE, HUMES HALL, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE _____

March 31, 1975

Dear

Although you probably know me as a residence hall staff member, I am also a graduate student in the Educational Psychology Department, majoring in College Student Personnel and hoping to complete my Ed.D. degree in December, 1975. In order to do this, I need your help in filling out the enclosed questionnaire for part of my dissertation.

So that I can receive enough data to make statistical comparisons, I need a 100% return from every staff member on this questionnaire. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

I hope that you will take the time to fill out this questionnaire, put it in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope and either drop it by the main desk of Humes or put it in the Campus Mail Box at your hall main desk. Please try to do this by Thursday, April 3.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Layne

RGL/tag

STAFF DATA SHEET

A. Sex

1___female
2___male

B. Age

1___18-19
2___20-21
3___22-24
4___25 or over

C. Year in school

1___Sophomore
2___Junior
3___Senior
4___Graduate

D. Differentiate

1___A
2___B
3___C
4___D

E. Number of quarters employed as a residence hall staff member (including Spring 1975). Summer session counts as one quarter.

1___one
2___two
3___three
4___four
5___five
6___six
7___seven
8___eight or more

F. Hall

1___North Carrick
2___South Carrick
3___Clement
4___Dunford
5___Greve
6___Hess
7___Humes
8___Massey
9___Melrose
10___Morrill
11___Reese
12___Strong

G. Educational Psychology Academic Course Supplements taken (see Residence Hall Staff Manual for complete descriptions).

___Development of Leadership and Administrative Skills (Instructors: Pat Ball, Maggi Carini, Mike Blachly, or Mary Ellen Mitchell)
___Seminar in Career Decision Making (Instructor: Joann Velcich)
___Decision Making (Instructors: Joe Merkle, Phil McCullough)
___Assertive Training (Instructor: Dr. Bertha Williams)
___Managing Organizations
___Seminar in Communication
___Preparation of Training Workshops
___Organizational Concerns
___A Case Study Approach to Paraprofessional Training
___Art of Helping (Instructor: Dr. Bob Walker, Bill Hayes or Gayle Roberts)
___RA Course (a general course which all RA's employed prior to summer of 1974 were required to take)
___Other (please specify)

THE COLLEGE SELF EXPRESSION SCALE

The following inventory is designed to provide information about the way in which you express yourself. Please answer the following questions by indicating the appropriate number from 0 to 4 to the left of each question

0 — Almost Always or Always
1 — Usually
2 — Sometimes
3 — Seldom
4 — Never or rarely

Your answer should reflect how you generally express yourself in the situation.

If in answering any of the 50 questions you find that the situation described is not presently applicable to you—for example, if you do not have a roommate, please do not skip the question. Instead, answer it in terms of how you think you would be likely to react if you were in the situation—for example, if you had a roommate. Please do not skip any of the questions.

_____ 1. Do you ignore it when someone pushes in front of you in a line?

_____ 2. When you decide that you no longer wish to date someone, do you have marked difficulty telling the person of your decision?

_____ 3. Would you exchange a purchase you discover to be faulty?

_____ 4. If you decided to change your major to a field which your parents will not approve, would you have difficulty telling them?

_____ 5. Are you inclined to be overapologetic?

_____ 6. If you were studying and if your suitemate or neighbor were making too much noise would you ask him/her to stop?

_____ 7. Is it difficult for you to compliment and praise others?

_____ 8. If you are angry at your parents, can you tell them?

_____ 9. Do you insist that your roommate does his/her fair share of the cleaning?

_____ 10. If you find yourself becoming fond of someone you are dating, would you have difficulty expressing these feelings to that person?

_____ 11. If a friend who has borrowed $5.00 from you seems to have forgotten about it would you remind this person?

_____ 12. Are you overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings?

_____ 13. If you have a close friend whom your parents dislike and constantly criticize would you inform your parents that you disagree with them and tell them your friend's assets?

_____ 14. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favor for you?

_____ 15. If food which is not to your satisfaction is served in a restaurant, would you complain about it to the waiter?

_____ 16. If one of your friends without your permission eats food that he/she knows you have been saving, can you express your displeasure to him/her?

_____ 17. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show you some merchandise which is not quite suitable, do you have difficulty in saying no?

_____ 18. Do you keep your opinions to yourself?

_____ 19. If your friends visit when you want to study, do you ask them to return at a more convenient time?

_____ 20. Are you able to express love and affection to people for whom you care?

_____ 21. If you were in a small seminar and the professor made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it?

_____ 22. If a person of the opposite sex whom you have been wanting to meet smiles or directs attention to you at a party, would you take the initiative in beginning a conversation?

_____ 23. If someone you respect expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, would you venture to state your own point of view?

_____ 24. Do you go out of your way to avoid trouble with other people?

_____ 25. If a friend is wearing a new outfit which you like, do you tell that person so?

_____ 26. If after leaving a store you realize that you have been shortchanged, do you go back and request the correct amount?

_____ 27. If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you unable to refuse?

_____ 28. If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feeling rather than express your annoyance?

_____ 29. If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?

_____ 30. Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified?

_____ 31. If a friend does an errand for you, do you tell that person how much you appreciate it?

_____ 32. When a person is blatantly unfair, do you fail to say anything about it to him/her?

_____ 33. Do you avoid social contacts for fear of doing or saying the wrong thing?

_____ 34. If a friend betrays your confidence, would you hesitate to express annoyance to that person?

_____ 35. When a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you, do you call his/her attention to the matter?

_____ 36. If you are particularly happy about someone's good fortune, can you express this to the person?

_____ 37. Would you be hesitant about asking a good friend to lend you a few dollars?

_____ 38. If a person teases you to the point that it is no longer fun, do you have difficulty expressing your displeasure?

_____ 39. If you arrive late to a meeting, would you rather stand than go to a front seat which could only be secured with a degree of conspicuousness?

_____ 40. If your date calls on Saturday night 15 minutes before you are supposed to meet and says that she/he has to study for an important exam and cannot make it, would you express annoyance?

_____ 41. If someone keeps kicking the back of your chair in a movie, would you ask him/her to stop?

_____ 42. If someone interrupts you in the middle of an important conversation do you request that the person wait until you have finished?

_____ 43. Do you freely volunteer information or opinions in class discussions?

_____ 44. Are you reluctant to speak to attractive acquaintances of the opposite sex?

_____ 45. If you lived in an apartment and the landlord failed to make certain necessary repairs after promising to do so, would you insist on it?

_____ 46. If your parents want you home by a certain time which you feel is much too early and unreasonable, do you attempt to discuss or negotiate this with them?

_____ 47. Do you find it difficult to stand up for your rights?

_____ 48. If a friend unjustifiably criticizes you, do you express resentment there and then?

_____ 49. Do you express your feelings to others?

_____ 50. Do you avoid asking questions in class for fear of feeling self-conscious?

March 31, 1975

TO: Head Residents
FROM: Rosemary G. Layne
RE: HELP needed

As part of my dissertation research, I need the help of certain Head Residents in rating Resident Assistants and Assistant Head Residents on each of the following statements. Although this questionnaire is not intended to be a comprehensive measure of staff performance, it does contain items pertaining to selected aspects of staff job performance.

Please be assured that this information will be kept strictly confidential and will not be shown to the staff member in question. When you have completed the form, please return it to me through Campus Mail by Thursday, April 3rd.

I sincerely appreciate your time and cooperation in this matter.

RGL/tag

cc Ken Stoner, Associate Director of Residence Halls

Resident Assistant Job Performance Form

Using the rating scale below, place the appropriate number or sign to the left of each item.

The name of the staff member you are evaluating is _____.

SCALE

0	1	2	3	4	X
almost always or always	usually	sometimes	seldom	never or rarely	no basis for evaluation

_____ 1. Hesitates to visit residents who keep to themselves.

_____ 2. Voices his/her opinions in staff meetings during discussions.

_____ 3. Plans social, athletic, and/or educational programs to meet the needs of residents on the floor.

_____ 4. Maintains an atmosphere conducive to study on his/her floor.

_____ 5. Is inclined to be overapologetic.

_____ 6. Has difficulty praising other staff members or floor officers.

_____ 7. Actively encourages residents to attend hall-wide programs.

_____ 8. Feels guilty after having enforced hall regulations.

_____ 9. Asks for explanation behind a hall-wide or departmental change in policy.

_____ 10. Tends to bottle-up his/her emotions.

_____ 11. Would hesitate to start conversations with referral agents whom he/she does not know.

_____ 12. Would have difficulty explaining university policy to an irate parent.

_____ 13. Communicates to the Head Resident successes he/she has had in dealing with residents.

_____ 14. Tends to "explode" and act out his/her aggression either verbally or physically.

_____ 15. Seems to be saying one thing and meaning another.

April 29, 1975

TO: Head Residents

FROM: Rosemary Gaetano Layne

RE: Your help

As the final step in my dissertation process, I need your help in completing the enclosed questionnaires.

It is important that you complete these and mail them to me by Tuesday, May 6.

I really appreciate your help and the time you have spent in doing this for me. THANK YOU!

RGL/tbm

March 31, 1975

Dear resident,

I am a graduate student in the Educational Psychology department, majoring in College Student Personnel and hoping to complete my doctorate in December, 1975. In order to do this, I need your help in filling out the enclosed questionnaire for part of my dissertation.

Although the questionnaire asks for your opinion about your resident assistant's behavior, it will not be shown to his/her supervisor and will not be used for purposes of job evaluation. Rather, it will be used solely to measure the results of a training program that certain residence hall staff members will receive. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

I hope you will take five minutes to fill out this questionnaire, put it in the enclosed envelope, and drop it in the Campus Mail box at your hall's main desk. Please try to do this by Thurdsay, April 3. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call me at 974-5174.

Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Gaetano Layne
Graduate Student
Educational Psychology

RGL/tag

Resident Assistant_____
Student_____

Resident Assistant Student Feedback Form

Using the 0 to 4 scale which follows, please place the number or sign that most nearly expresses your feeling about your resident assistant's behavior.

0	1	2	3	4	X
almost always or always	usually	sometimes	seldom	never or rarely	no basis for evaluation

_____ 1. My RA really makes an effort to know each resident.

_____ 2. It is too noisy on our floor to study.

_____ 3. My RA compliments floor officers or residents for jobs well done.

_____ 4. My RA is not clear in communicating his/her stand on enforcement of the university's policies.

_____ 5. My RA works well with floor government.

_____ 6. My RA hesitates to ask residents to change their behavior when it is bothering someone.

_____ 7. If my RA were studying for an important exam to be given in a few hours, he/she would tell me to come back later if I wanted to visit.

_____ 8. It is difficult to know the feelings of my RA.

_____ 9. My RA is consistent in disciplinary action.

_____ 10. My RA actively encourages residents to attend floor and hall-wide programs.

_____ 11. I respect my RA.

_____ 12. My RA tries to bring the residents on the floor closer together.

_____ 13. My RA really "chews out" residents for misbehavior or violations of residence hall policy.

_____ 14. My RA helps our floor develop an atmosphere where residents respect each other's rights and privileges.

_____ 15. My RA has trouble saying "no" to residents.

_____ 16. My RA looks me in the eye when he/she talks to me.

_____ 17. My RA seems afraid to handle "touchy" situations.

_____ 18. I have the feeling that my RA is not being honest with me when I ask him/her a question.

_____ How many quarters (excluding Spring 1975) have you been a resident on this RA's floor?

April 29, 1975

Dear Resident,

Thank you so much for filling out the questionnaire which I sent you last month. The success of my dissertation really depends on students such as you who take the time to help me in this task.

In order to complete my project, I need your final comments concerning your resident assistant. This will be the last questionnaire I will ask you to complete.

Please complete the questionnaire, put it in the enclosed envelope, and drop it in the Campus Mail box at your hall main desk or hall post office. Try to do this by Monday, May 5.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Gaetano Layne
Doctoral Student
Educational Psychology

RGL:tag

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 8

Subject Demographic Data

Identification Number	Group	Sex	Age	Class	Number of quarters employed
1	Treatment	F	22	Senior	7
2	Treatment	F	20	Junior	4
3	Treatment	F	20	Junior	3
4	Treatment	F	20	Junior	3
5	Treatment	F	20	Junior	6
6	Treatment	F	20	Senior	3
7	Treatment	M	20	Junior	3
8	Treatment	M	21	Senior	3
9	Treatment	M	21	Senior	6
10	Treatment	M	21	Junior	3
11	Treatment	M	20	Junior	3
12	Treatment	M	21	Junior	5
13	Treatment	M	21	Senior	3
14	Control	F	21	Junior	3
15	Control	F	20	Junior	3
16	Control	F	20	Junior	3
17	Control	F	19	Sophomore	3
18	Control	F	23	Graduate	5
19	Control	F	19	Sophomore	3
20	Control	M	21	Junior	3
21	Control	M	21	Senior	6
22	Control	M	20	Junior	3
23	Control	M	19	Sophomore	3
24	Control	M	21	Senior	7
25	Control	M	19	Sophomore	3
26	Control	M	21	Junior	3

APPENDIX C

BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE TEST

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE- AND POSTTESTING OF SUBJECTS

Resident Assistants were instructed to enact the scenes in the same way they would if the scene were occuring in real life.

Resident Assistants were then given a sheet of paper on which the instructions to the scenes were written. (The confederate's dialog was not included on this sheet). The subject was asked to read the instructions to the first scene and was then asked if he/she had any questions. When the subject indicated that he/she was ready, the videotape machine was started. This procedure was repeated for scenes two through four.

BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE TEST

SCENE I

You have had a particularly hectic day with no time even to stop for lunch. You know that this evening you plan to work for a few hours on a project for class but you really feel that you need to spend most of the evening relaxing and unwinding because you can feel yourself getting tense . You have come into your room to drop off some books on your way to your next class. There is a knock at the door and your Assistant Head Resident has come to see you.

Confederate: "Hi _____ some of the staff will be interviewing an RA candidate tonight, and we wondered if you could join us for about an hour and a half at 7:30."

SCENE II

It is 2:00 am Tuesday and you hear loud music and laughter coming from a room down the hall. This particular room had been warned previously about late parties and you had received previous complaints about these residents although no one has complained this morning about the noise. You are angry about this inconsiderate behavior and decide to go to the room . . .

Confederate: (Innocently) "Is anything the matter?"

SCENE III

One of the other staff members has continually asked you to swap duties, but has never said anything about repaying you. You resent this staff member for this kind of negligence and would like him/her to do something to change this pattern of behavior. Tonight this staff member comes to your room to visit you.

Confederate: "Hi _____. Is there any way you could take my duty this Saturday?"

SCENE IV

One of the residents on your floor has worked very hard painting some Halloween scenes on your floor in preparation for a party for orphans you will be holding in a few days. He/she is a shy person whom you don't see very much. As you're walking back from class you see him/her on a bench apparently studying.

Confederate: "Hi."

SCORING PROCEDURES FOR BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE TEST

Eye Contact

The amount of time a staff member maintained eye contact with the confederate was measured for each scene. Raters were instructed to begin timing when the confederate finished his/her last word in the script. Timing was stopped when the experimenter gave the signal that the scene was finished. Stop watches were used to record this variable.

During the training session, rater time measurements were said to agree if the time was within .5 seconds in either direction.

Scene Length

Using a stop watch, the experimenter measured the exact amount of time of the staff member's response. Timing was begun when the confederate finished his/her last word in the script. Timing was stopped when it was clear that the staff member had finished his/her response.

Content

Content was measured on a 0 to 4 Likert scale with 4 representing unqualified or direct assertiveness and 0 representing a nonassertive, aggressive, or irrelevant response. Each scene was scored according to the specific scene directions which follow.

RATING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCENE I (RA INTERVIEW)

Your scoring will begin with the staff member's response to the confederate's request for him/her to interview an RA candidate that night. Begin scoring after the confederate says " . . . could you join us for an hour and a half at 7:30?"

4 Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Any statment in which the staff member refuses to interview the candidate)

a. "I can't make it tonight"
"No, I won't be able to help you out tonight."
"I'm sorry, I really can't tonight."

b. Any of the above plus a fact. (Has to refuse by saying "I can't" or "I won't")
"I really need to unwind tonight"
"I've had a hectic day."
"I have something else I need to do."

3 Qualified assertiveness

a. Any response in 4a plus excuses (Has to say "I can't" or "I won't")
"I can't make it tonight. I have a class."
"Sorry, not tonight. I have a date."

b. Tempers the refusal with qualifying words which tend to soften it.
"I don't think I can make it."
"I sort of have a lot to do."

2 Implied assertiveness (Implies that he/she can't make it, but never really refuses)

a. "I've got a lot to do tonight."
"Gee, I really have to study tonight."
"I sort of wanted to stay in tonight."

1 Qualified nonassertiveness (agrees to interview the candidate, but sets time limit or other parameters)

a. "I'll be there, but I need to leave at 7 pm."
"Try to get someone else, but if you can't, I'll do it."
"I guess I'll be able to make it, but don't count on me."

0 nonassertiveness (makes no response or gives in)

a. "I'll be there."

RATING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCENE II (NOISY STUDENTS)

Your scoring will begin with the staff member's response to the confederate's statement, "Is anything the matter?"

4 Unqualified or direct assertiveness (Makes a specific statement of what he/she would like the students to do)

a. "Turn down your stereo."
"Break up the party."
"Close your door and try to keep the noise down."
"Give me your ID. I'm going to write an incident report."

b. Any of the above plus a reason for making the request.
"Your loud music is bothering me."
"I've warned you several times already. Now I'll have to take disciplinary action."

3 Qualified assertiveness

a. Any of the response in 4a plus excuses
"Your behavior is bothering other people."
"Other people have complained."

b. (Tempers the request with words that tend to soften the request.)
"Do you think you could be a little more quiet?"

2 Implied assertiveness (Implies that he/she would like them to be quiet but never really makes a specific request)

a. "Please try to think of other people."
"I just want to warn you that you're making too much noise."

1 Qualified aggressiveness (Implies that he/she would like them to be quiet by "couching" the request in should's, ought's or can'ts)

a. "You just can't play loud music at 2:00 in the morning."
"You really should turn down your stereo."

0 Aggressive (Lectures or verbally attacks or labels the confederate)

a. "You're being very inconsiderate of others."
"How many times do I have to tell you?"
"You have to realize people have to live with other people."
"What's the matter with you?"
"Do you know what time it is?"

If this response occurs with a 4 or a 3 level response, drop the score 2 points)

RATING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCENE III (DUTY SWAPPING)

Your scoring will begin with the staff member's response to the confederate's request to swap duty. Begin scoring after the confederate says " . . . Is there any way you can take my duty this Saturday?"

4 Unqualified or direct assertiveness* (Any statement in which the staff member confronts the confederate)

a. "I've had some bad feelings about the way we've been swapping duty."
"Your method of swapping duty has 'got to me.'"

3 Qualified assertiveness (Uses qualifying words, or partially confronts the confederate, but leaves it open for discussion at another time)

a. "I've been sort of angry with the way we've been swapping duty."
"I'd like to get with you sometime to see when you can take one for me."

2 Implied assertiveness (Implies that she/he has noticed the problem by making a point to get the confederate to arrange a duty swap)

a. "When can we trade?"
"I'm not going to take your duty until you pay me back."
"Not until you take one for me."

1 Passive aggressive (refuses to take the duty but does not indicate that sometiing is wrong)

a. "No, I have plans for Saturday."
"No, I can't take your duty."

0 nonassertive (agrees to take the duty—makes no mention that something is amiss)

a. "Yes, I'll take it."

* The key issue is not whether the staff member swaps duty. Rather, the important point is that the staff member ask for a specific behavior change on the part of the confederate.

RATING INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCENE IV (HALLOWEEN DECORATIONS)

Your scoring will begin after the confederate says "Hello."

4 Unqualified or direct assertiveness (any statement in which the staff member states his/her feeling)

a. "I really appreciate the Halloween signs you painted."
"I appreciate all the time you put into decorating the floor."

b. 4a plus compliment
"They really look good."
"The kids will really appreciate it."

c. 4a or 4b plus
Any attempt to involve the student in floor activities

3 Qualified assertiveness (utilizes qualifying words to express the appreciation)

a. "I wanted to tell you how much I appreciate the signs."
"I was thinking about how much I appreciate your work on the floor."

b. 3a plus a compliment
"The floor really looks good."

c. 3a or 3b plus
Any attempt to involve the student in the floor activities

2 Implied assertiveness (does not express personal feelings, but does compliment the student)

a. "The floor looks great."
"You ought to be an art major."
"You really have talent."

b. 2a plus any attempt to involve the student in floor activities.

1 Incomplete response (any attempt to get the student to join floor activities without expressing appreciation or making compliments)

a. "Why don't you come down to my room and play cards?"
"Let's see if we can get some people to come to the party."

0 Irrelevant response (no attempt to show appreciation, to compliment, or to include the student)

a. "What are you studying?"
"Do you always study here?"

If this response precedes a 4 response, drop score one point.
If this response precedes a 3 or 2 response, drop score one point.

RATING SHEET FOR BEHAVIORAL PERFORMANCE TEST

Subject_____

Tape Number_____

Rater_____

SCENE I

Eye Contact	Scene Length	Content
_____	_____	_____

SCENE II

Eye Contact	Scene Length	Content
_____	_____	_____

SCENE III

Eye Contact	Scene Length	Content
_____	_____	_____

SCENE IV

Eye Contact	Scene Length	Content
_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX D

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE RESIDENT ASSISTANT JOB DESCRIPTION

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF RESIDENCE HALLS

Resident Assistant Position Description

Resident Assistants assume a role of leadership in all aspects of residence hall living. A positive contribution in the areas of academic, social/educational programming, interpersonal relationships and support of residence hall and university policy is expected from all. As a staff member, each Resident Assistant is expected to devote a minimum of 14 hours per week to specific duties in the residence hall. The following job performance expectations specify the major responsibilities delegated to each individual Resident Assistant.

I. Assist in the development of the floor and hall educational/social program.
   a. Identify academic and co-curricular interests of students.
   b. Assist the student in evaluation of his interests and needs.
   c. Direct students to other individuals and programs related to their interests.
   d. Provide the necessary support and encouragement of athletic, cultural, social, and academic events.

II. Assist the student in integrating his academic and co-curricular interests.
   a. Express rationale for faculty/community/student interaction.
   b. Facilitate contacts, make introductions and stimulate conversation between students and faculty members.
   c. Be a resource person and referral agent for campus services that aid the students' intellectual development. Conduct follow-up (when appropriate) on help received by those students referred.
   d. Be a resource person for information regarding the various academic departments and their faculty members.

III. Facilitate student-to-student and student-to-staff interaction.
   a. Develop and maintain on-going relationships with residents.
   b. Assist the floor government in the encouragement of student gatherings.
   c. Initiate contacts, make introductions, stimulate conversation among residents of adjoining rooms and in the hall.
   d. Initiate contact between students and other staff members.
   e. Initiate contact between students and interest groups according to needs and interests of students.

IV. Serve as a knowledgeable consultant for floor residents concerning university supporting services.
   a. Be a resource person and referral agent for universty and community services such as the counseling center, health service, residence halls, food services, student activities office, financial aids office, placement center, campus special clinics and services, off-campus services, and others as appropriate.

b. Be a resource person for university agencies able to assist a student in evaluating his vocational skills and interests.
c. Conduct follow-up (when appropriate) with the student for all these university services.

V. Assist the student in making and evaluating vocational decisions.
a. Initiate contacts and stimulate conversation between students and individuals who may serve as a vocational standard against which the student's own skills and interests can be evaluated.

VI. Assist the floor and/or hall representatives in developing a viable governmental system.
a. Assist the government in the encouragement of resident gatherings.
b. Provide support and encouragement of athletic, cultural, social, and academic events.
c. Attend floor and hall organizational meetings, as appropriate.
d. Attend floor and hall functions, as appropriate.
e. Assist officers by serving as a resource person concerning program ideas, university policies and procedures, available university and community resources, and other assistance as appropriate.

VII. Assist the student in his desire for personal growth.
a. Assess with the student his skills in communication and interpersonal relationships and help him establish objectives in these areas.
b. Act as a referral agent for students desiring professional assistance in this area.

VIII. Assist floor residents, student government, and university agencies in interpreting and insuring compliance with Department of Residence Halls and university rules and regulations.
a. As an employee of the Department of Residence Halls: (1) utilize every possible opportunity to support its purposes; (2) communicate your views and recommendations to your immediate supervisor.
b. Support, interpret, and enforce in positive, active terms residence hall and university policies such as those specifically related to drugs, alcohol, visitation, and conditions of the housing contract.
c. Encourage and assist in the enforcement of university and residence halls rules and regulations by the residents, and, when necessary, refer violators to the Head Resident.
d. Know channels for adjudication on floor, hall, and university rule violations.

IX. Assist the suporting staff in keeping residence facilities functional for the use of residents, present and future.
a. Assist residents to occupy and vacate facilities via check-in/check-out procedures.
b. Investigate and follow-up floor and room damage.
c. Investigate and follow-up public area damage.
d. Interpret and encourage the enforcement of residence halls' policies and procedures.

X. Assist in managerial areas of responsibility.
   a. Conduct management of informational surveys, when requested.
   b. Reconcile the floor rosters with students actually living in the rooms.
   c. Assist in the identification of persons who make unauthorized use of hall facilities.
   d. Assist in hall administration as scheduled by the Head Resident, such as performing a six hour per week desk duty commitment and conducting maintenance inspections.

XI. Participate in the general staff efforts to upgrade Resident Assistant performance and personal growth.
   a. Attend the Fall RA-Workshop.
   b. Attend in-service training program sessions.
   c. Attend hall staff meetings.
   d. Assist in the selection of new Resident Assistants.
   e. Participate in hall staff activities as directed by the Head Resident.
   f. Be available for scheduled duty time or on-call time at the times indicated by the Head Resident.
   g. During the contract period, enroll in at least one course from the elective alternatives provided by the Department of Residence Halls, to supplement personal growth and development.

APPENDIX E

TRAINING PROGRAM USED IN THE STUDY

BEHAVIOR OUTCOMES OF ASSERTIVE TRAINING

1) Feeling Talk—Resident assistants will compliment and praise residents with spontaneity; will express their negative feelings to residents, fellow-staff members and others when warranted; will be open and frank about their feelings; will answer questions honestly; and will avoid bottling up emotions. Example: That was a fantastic job you did decorating the bulletin board. (or) I think the proposed appliance policy is much too conservative.

2) Assertive Talk—Resident assistants will not let others take advantage of them; will enforce compliance with university housing regulations without assuming an aggressive or superior manner; and will insist that they and the other members of the floor be treated justly. Example: I can't go to the Aquatic Center with you because I have made other plans.

3) Greeting Talk—Resident assistants will be outgoing and friendly with all residents on their floor, they will not avoid residents whom they believe are antisocial or belligerent, will smile brightly and speak to all residents when they encounter them, and will initiate introductions with residents who do not know each other.

4) Disagreeing Actively—Resident assistants will not pretend to agree with opinionated people for the sake of "keeping the peace"—even if these people are authority figures, e.g., Head Resident, Area Coordinator. They will avoid nodding in agreement, smiling encouragingly, and paying close attention when they do not agree with the speaker. Instead, they will state the reason for their disagreement.

5) Asking Why—Resident assistants will consider reasonable suggestions from others, but will not be ordered about at anybody's whim. When asked to perform an unreasonable or unenjoyable task by a person in authority, they will politely ask why they should comply and not settle for anything less than a convincing explanation.

6) Talking about Successes—Resident assistants will let others, e.g., staff members, Head Resident, Area Coordinator, know when they have had a successful floor program or have experienced success with an aspect of their job.

7) Accepting Compliments—After being given a sincere compliment, resident assistants will, at the very least, smile and say "Thank you." They will attempt to reward the compliment by smiling and saying something like, "Thank you. I appreciate that." When it does not appear awkward, they will extend the compliment by saying something like. "Thank you. My floor officers and I worked very hard on that project."

8) Using Appropriate Body Language—When resident assistants pay a compliment, express an opinion, greet someone, make or refuse a request, or ask someone to change a behavior, they will maintain an erect body posture, direct eye contact, loud voice, and appropriate facial expressions and gestures.

Modified from Spencer A. Rathus, "Instigation of Assertive Behavior through Videotape-Mediated Assertive Models and Directed Practice," Behavior Research and Therapy, 11, 1973, 57-65.

ASSERTIVE TRAINING PROGRAM

SESSION I

Purpose: To build rapport within group
To introduce cognitive aspects of assertive behavior

A. OVERVIEW (10 mins.)

Structure the program: Format; Facilitator expectations, e.g., confidentiality, participation, learning from each other.

B. WARM-UP (15 mins.)

Introductions: Sitting around a large circle, each person (1) introduces him/herself, (2) tells what building he/she is employed in and the length of time employed, (3) gives his/her reasons for being in the class, and (4) repeats the names of all the resident assistants who have been introduced prior to him/her.

C. RESIDENT ASSISTANT CONTRACT (10 mins.)

Resident assistants are given a blank assertive behavior contract to complete and sign. They are asked to write down and rank in order of difficulty three specific job related situations and three specific interpersonal situations in which they would like to react more assertively.

D. DISCUSSION OF ASSERTIVE BEHAVIOR (55 mins.)

1. Difference between aggression, assertion, and nonassertion. Draw behavior continuum on board, give examples of these three types of behavior in a restaurant scene in which man makes a request to return steak to kitchen. (12 mins.)
2. Handout—"A Comparison of Nonassertive, Assertive, and Aggressive Behavior" (modified from Patricia Jakubowski-Spector, Facilitating the growth of women through assertive training. The Consulting Psychologist, 1973, 4, 75-86). Explanation of handout with examples. (10 mins.)
3. Explain generalized and situational assertion, aggression, and nonassertion. (13 mins.)
4. Explain components of assertive behavior, e.g., confrontation, empathy, persuasion. (5 mins.)
5. Discussion of previous learning patterns which reinforced aggressive or nonassertive behavior, e.g., school systems, parents, societal expectations of how males and females "should" behave. (15 mins.)

SESSION II

Purpose: To explain the concepts of behavior rehearsal and components of assertive behavior
To teach the concepts of stating feelings and making requests.

A. EXPLANATION OF OUTCOMES OF ASSERTIVE TRAINING (8 mins.)

Facilitator distributes (1) Behavior Outcomes of Assertive Training and (2) Resident Assistant contracts which had been completed during Session I. Facilitator discusses the specific situations on the contracts with respect to the behavior outcomes of assertive training.

B. INTERPERSONAL RIGHTS AND LIMITATIONS (5 mins.)

Distribute and discuss handout, "Interpersonal Rights and Limitations" (from P. Jakubowski-Spector. An Introduction to Assertive Training Procedures for Women. Washington: APGA, 1973).

C. EXPLANATION OF RATIONALE FOR HIERARCHY OF ASSERTIVE TRAINING PROGRAM (2 mins.)

Facilatator explains that class will move from simple to complex tasks, e.g., stating feelings, making request, refusing requests, asking for behavior change.

D. DISCUSSION OF STATING FEELINGS AND MAKING REQUESTS (10 mins.)

Distribute and discuss handouts "Stating Feelings: Ideas to Keep in Mind" and "Making Simple Requests: Ideas to Keep in Mind" (modified from M. A. Manderino. The Effects of a group assertive training procedure on undergraduate women. Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974).

E. EXPLANATION OF CONCEPT OF BEHAVIOR REHEARSAL (15 mins.)

Explain difference between behavior rehearsal and role playing. Present and discuss concept of components of assertive behavior, e.g., eye contact; body posture; gestures; facial expression; voice tone, inflection, and volume; timing; content. Facilitator demonstrates components of assertive behavior. Facilitator illustrates the behavior of an aggressive, nonassertive, and an assertive person using the exact dialog, but varying the other behavior components.

F. COVERT REHEARSAL OF SCENE (5 mins.)

Resident assistants imagine themselves in a scene in which they ask a professor to review a lecture. Facilitator sets the scene and asks participants to imagine themselves succeeding in the scene.

G. SUBJECT ENACTMENT OF VIDEOTAPED SCENES (43 mins.)

In the large group setting, volunteers are asked to use behavior rehearsal to enact the "professor scene" or any other scene stressing the stating of feelings or making a simple request. Individuals in the group are asked to concentrate on watching one specific behavior component so they can later give feedback to the assertee on this behavior. After each scene is enacted, the assertees give their impressions of their success. Then the group gives feedback on the behavior components and the videotaped scene is replayed.

H. EXPLANATION OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT (2 mins.)

Distribute and explain "Between Session Practice Report" (from M. A. Manderino, 1974).

SESSION III

Purpose: To provide group reinforcement for homework assignments
To teach concept of refusing requests
To give resident assistants an opportunity to practice assertive scenes and obtain videotaped and group feedback

A. GROUP DISCUSSION OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS (45 mins.)

In the large group setting, resident assistants are asked to voluntarily report one example of assertive behavior which they performed during the past week. Resident assistants explain the situation in which they were assertive by describing what they said or did and how the other person(s) responded to this assertiveness. They are asked to focus on the feelings they experienced during and after the interaction.

B. DISCUSSION (9 mins.)

1. Facilitator explanation of concept of discrimination, i.e., deciding when not to be assertive (4 mins.)
2. Distribute and discuss handout, "Refusing Requests: Ideas to Keep in Mind" (modified from M. A. Manderino, 1974). (5 mins.)

C. SCENE ENACTMENT IN TRIADS (25 mins.)

Resident assistants form triads and enact scenes emphasizing refusing a request. While two resident assistants enact a scene of the assertee's choosing, the third member of the triad observes the behavior components. The facilitator moves around the room videotaping scenes for subsequent playback.

D. VIDEOTAPED PLAYBACK OF SCENES (10 mins.)

Scenes previously recorded are replayed for group and facilitator feedback.

E. BETWEEN SESSION PRACTICE REPORT (1 min.)

The Between Session Practice Report is distributed and resident assistants are encouraged to practice refusing requests during the next week.

SESSION IV

Purpose: To teach concept of asking someone to change behavior
To give resident assistants an opportunity to practice assertive scenes and obtain videotaped and group feedback

A. GROUP DISCUSSION OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS (25 mins.)

In the large group setting, resident assistants are asked to voluntarily report one example of assertive behavior which they performed during the past week. Resident assistants explain the situation in which they were assertive by describing what they said or did and how the other person(s) responded to this assertive behavior. They are asked to focus on the feelings they experienced during and after the assertive interaction.

B. EXPLANATION OF HANDOUT (5 mins.)

Distribute and discuss handout, "Requesting a Change in Behavior: Ideas to Keep in Mind" (modified from M. A. Manderino, 1974).

C. GROUP SCENE ENACTMENTS (60 mins.)

In the large group setting, resident assistants volunteer to enact a scene with a partner. Other individuals in the group are asked to watch a specific behavior component so that they can later give feedback to the assertee on these behaviors. After each scene is enacted, the group gives feedback on the behavior components and the videotaped scene is replayed.

APPENDIX F

TABLES

Table 9

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Treatment and Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary df'	MS'	F	P
	Eye Contact	Between	1	107.2	37.207	.001*
		Within	23	2.9		
One	Scene Length	Between	1	222.970	6.387	.018*
		Within	23	34.908		
	Content	Between	1	2.929	2.305	.139
		Within	23	1.270		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	44.2	13.383	.002*
		Within	23	3.3		
Two	Scene Length	Between	1	.059	.003	.999
		Within	23	17.981		
	Content	Between	1	1.204	1.225	.280
		Within	23	.983		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	101.4	30.763	.001*
		Within	23	3.3		
Three	Scene Length	Between	1	68.950	2.562	.120
		Within	23	26.914		
	Content	Between	1	5.953	11.818	.003*
		Within	23	.504		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	55.6	17.774	.001*
		Within	23	3.1		
Four	Scene Length	Between	1	21.924	.701	.999
		Within	23	31.266		
	Content	Between	1	3.829	4.979	.034*
		Within	23	.769		

*$p < .05$

Table 10

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Treatment and Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD
	Eye Contact	treatment	44.9	22.5	83.8	11.8
		control	40.8	35.5	41.6	25.7
One	Scene Length	treatment	19.369	9.190	17.231	5.348
		control	18.623	10.518	11.362	6.191
	Content	treatment	1.654	1.197	2.385	1.121
		control	1.346	1.505	1.538	1.520
	Eye Contact	treatment	49.1	34.1	83.7	14.2
		control	51.8	30.7	58.2	22.8
Two	Scene Length	treatment	19.300	2.055	16.162	5.230
		control	15.338	9.917	14.254	6.253
	Content	treatment	2.885	.712	3.115	.845
		control	1.885	1.325	2.038	1.406
	Eye Contact	treatment	37.2	24.9	82.6	15.5
		control	35.5	23.6	42.6	22.2
Three	Scene Length	treatment	18.531	6.778	18.385	6.168
		control	15.485	6.682	13.162	6.924
	Content	treatment	2.769	.857	3.538	.828
		control	2.615	1.044	2.500	.866
	Eye Contact	treatment	44.7	28.7	89.9	7.7
		control	52.6	24.1	62.1	24.8
Four	Scene Length	treatment	18.823	5.670	17.477	6.904
		control	14.277	8.812	13.277	6.300
	Content	treatment	2.538	1.391	3.462	.946
		control	2.846	1.405	2.846	1.265

Table 11

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary df'	MS'	F	P
	Eye Contact	Between	1	96.0	32.685	.001*
		Within	11	2.9		
One	Scene Length	Between	1	9.455	.391	.999
		Within	11	24.157		
	Content	Between	1	.246	.143	.999
		Within	11	1.714		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	45.1	13.856	.004*
		Within	11	3.3		
Two	Scene Length	Between	1	23.924	1.702	.217
		Within	11	14.054		
	Content	Between	1	.366	.364	.999
		Within	11	1.004		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	53.8	10.881	.007*
		Within	11	4.9		
Three	Scene Length	Between	1	3.937	.176	.999
		Within	11	22.335		
	Content	Between	1	1.034	1.535	.240
		Within	11	.673		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	35.7	9.894	.009*
		Within	11	3.6		
Four	Scene Length	Between	1	3.880	.097	.999
		Within	11	39.976		
	Content	Between	1	5.786	7.482	.019*
		Within	11	.773		

*$p < .05$

Table 12

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	ANCOVA Summary df'	MS'	F	P
	Eye Contact	Between	1	20.8	38.471	.001*
		Within	9	.5		
One	Scence Length	Between	1	297.146	7.559	.022*
		Within	9	39.311		
	Content	Between	1	3.581	3.499	.092
		Within	9	1.023		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	15.1	7.596	.021*
		Within	9	2.0		
Two	Scene Length	Between	1	36.834	1.808	.210
		Within	9	20.369		
	Content	Between	1	.917	.753	.999
		Within	9	1.217		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	49.1	25.536	.001*
		Within	9	1.9		
Three	Scene Length	Between	1	206.633	8.313	.017*
		Within	9	24.858		
	Content	Between	1	6.274	23.696	.001*
		Within	9	.265		
	Eye Contact	Between	1	16.8	5.012	.050*
		Within	9	3.3		
Four	Scene Length	Between	1	64.178	3.011	.114
		Within	9	21.315		
	Content	Between	1	.047	.111	.999
		Within	9	.422		

*P < .05

Table 13

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Male Treatment and Male Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest		Posttest	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
	Eye Contact	treatment	48.4	19.4	83.5	15.2
		control	33.1	39.8	25.3	21.2
One	Scene Length	treatment	21.014	5.430	15.614	4.698
		control	18.914	9.809	13.329	5.776
	Content	treatment	2.214	1.220	2.571	1.239
		control	.786	1.318	1.429	1.644
	Eye Contact	treatment	57.3	37.1	86.7	5.9
		control	44.1	35.9	50.2	23.7
Two	Scene Length	treatment	20.086	8.260	14.514	6.018
		control	17.557	12.760	15.900	6.782
	Content	treatment	3.143	.556	3.357	.748
		control	1.643	1.520	2.071	1.484
	Eye Contact	treatment	35.1	26.4	78.7	20.2
		control	27.5	24.4	37.6	23.3
Three	Scene Length	treatment	18.857	5.998	16.600	6.943
		control	15.786	7.938	15.329	7.158
	Content	treatment	2.857	1.069	3.286	1.075
		control	2.143	.945	2.357	.748
	Eye Contact	treatment	47.6	32.9	89.4	9.0
		control	44.2	26.6	56.7	25.5
Four	Scene Length	treatment	17.157	3.876	15.700	7.293
		control	16.886	11.122	16.643	6.557
	Content	treatment	2.429	1.427	3.571	1.134
		control	2.429	1.790	2.286	1.496

Table 14

Summary of Pretest and Posttest Means and Standard Deviations for Female Treatment and Female Control Groups on Each of the Four Scenes of the Behavioral Performance Test

Scene Number	Dependent Variable	Group	Pretest Mean	Pretest SD	Posttest Mean	Posttest SD
	Eye Contact	treatment	40.8	26.9	84.2	7.6
		control	49.8	30.7	60.6	15.6
One	Scene Length	treatment	17.450	12.613	19.117	5.851
		control	18.283	12.239	9.067	6.341
	Content	treatment	1.000	.837	2.167	1.033
		control	2.000	.632	1.667	1.506
	Eye Contact	treatment	39.6	30.6	80.3	20.4
		control	60.9	23.0	67.5	19.4
Two	Scene Length	treatment	18.383	6.933	18.083	3.734
		control	12.750	5.071	12.333	5.516
	Content	treatment	2.583	.801	2.833	.931
		control	2.167	1.125	2.000	1.449
	Eye Contact	treatment	39.5	35.2	87.2	6.7
		control	44.7	20.7	48.4	21.4
Three	Scene Length	treatment	18.150	8.172	20.467	4.877
		control	15.133	5.592	10.633	6.272
	Content	treatment	2.667	.606	3.833	.258
		control	3.167	.931	2.667	1.033
	Eye Contact	treatment	41.4	25.5	90.5	6.5
		control	62.4	18.4	68.4	24.6
Four	Scene Length	treatment	20.767	7.122	19.550	6.402
		control	11.233	4.156	9.350	3.049
	Content	treatment	2.667	1.472	3.333	.753
		control	3.333	.606	3.500	.447

VITA

Rosemary Gaetano Layne was born on October 14, 1946, in Youngstown, Ohio. She received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio, in 1968. Prior to graduate school, she spent two years at Lowellville High School in Lowellville, Ohio, as an English teacher and journalism advisor. As a graduate student, she held an assistantship in the Department of Guidance and Counseling at Youngstown State University. She received the Master of Science degree in Education with a major in Guidance and Counseling in June 1971 from Youngstown State University. From September 1971 to July 1975 she was employed by the Office of Residence Halls at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, where she served as Head Resident of Humes Hall. She entered the doctoral program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in March 1974 and received the degree of Doctor of Education with a major in Educational Psychology in March,1976. From August 1975 to the present she has served as a Counselor at Clayton Junior College in Morrow, Georgia. She is married to Dr. Benjamin H. Layne of Sweetwater, Tennessee.