ASSERTION AS RELATED TO LOCUS OF CONTROL, NEED FOR APPROVAL AND PERSONALITY
Phase II

This portion of the study involved an investigation of Assertiveness and its relationship with the variables of Locus of Control, Need for Social Approval and Personality (N, E, L). A cross-cultural comparison between North Indian and South Indian women was also made. A brief review of the literature pertaining to these variables as related to assertion was given as follows:

Locus Of Control

The concept of Internal-External Locus of Control developed within the framework of Social Learning theory as propounded by Rotter (1954). It was seen that as far back as 1899, social scientists showed interest in the concept of Locus of Control as borne out by Veblen’s statement that "a belief in luck or chance represented a barbarian approach to life and was generally characteristic of an inefficient society" (Rotter, 1966). Veblen’s discussion implies that to find an answer to life’s problems in chance factors, fate or luck is not very productive.
Personality theorists had for a long time been trying to find a connection between the individual's willingness to accept responsibility for his actions and the consequences of his behaviour. "Concepts such as competence, helplessness, hopelessness, mastery and alienation have all been utilized in one way or another to describe the degree to which an individual is able to control the important events occurring in his life space." (Lefcourt, 1966).

Rotter (1954) suggested that a study of personality must include the study of the ways and means in which an individual interacted with his or her meaningful environment. His social learning theory utilised three basic constructs for measuring and predicting behaviour. These were Behaviour Potential, Expectancy and Reinforcement Value.

Behaviour Potential may be defined "as the potential of any behaviour's occurring in any given situation or situations as calculated in relation to any single reinforcement or set of reinforcements. The potential for the occurrence of any behaviour may be ultimately determined from its actual occurrence in any situation where other alternatives are present." (Rotter, 1954, p.105).

Expectancy may be defined "as the probability held by the Individual that a particular reinforcement will occur
as a function of a specific behaviour on his part in a specific situation or situations. Expectancy is independent of the value or importance of the reinforcement." (Rotter, 1954, p.107).

"The reinforcement value of any external reinforcement may be ideally defined as the degree of preference for any reinforcement to occur if the possibilities of their occurring were all equal." (Rotter, 1954, p.107).

Rotter (1954, p.112) further said, "A reinforcement is something that changes behaviour in some observable way, by either increasing or decreasing the potentiality of its occurrence." A distinction is also made between Internal and External Reinforcement. "Internal Reinforcement may be ideally defined as a subject's experience (or perception) that an event has occurred that is pleasant or unpleasant or that the subject expects will lead to a pleasant or unpleasant future event. ...External reinforcement is the occurrence of an event or act that is known to have predictable reinforcement value for the group or culture to which the subject belongs."

Rotter (1954) gave a series of formulas in order to facilitate the understanding of his concepts. These were as follows:
1. \( B \cdot p \cdot x, s_1, R_a = f(Ex, R_a, S_1 & R.V.a) \)

This formula may be read as follows:

"The potential for behaviour \( x \) to occur in situation 1 in relation to reinforcement \( a \) is a function of the expectancy of the occurrence of reinforcement \( a \) following behaviour \( x \) in situation 1 and the value of reinforcement \( a \)."

2. \( B \cdot p \cdot x, s_1, R(a-n) = (Ex, s_1, R(a-n) & R.V.(a-n)) \)

This may be read as follows:

"The potential of behaviour \( x \)'s occurring in situation 1 in regard to all potential reinforcements for which the individual has expectancies is a function of the expectancies of the occurrences of these reinforcements (a to n) in situation 1 and the values of these reinforcements."

If this prediction was to be expanded to cover a variety of situations the formula would read:

3. \( B \cdot p \cdot x, s(1-n), R(a-n) = f(Ex, s(1-n), R(a-n) & R.V.(a-n)) \)

This may be read as follows:

"The potentiality of behaviour \( x \)'s occurring in relationship to the reinforcements a to n in situations 1 to n is a function of the expectancies of these reinforcements' occurring in these situations and the values of these reinforcements."
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4. N.P. = f(F.M. and N.V.)

"The potentiality of occurrence of a set of behaviours that lead to the satisfaction of some need (need potential) is a function of the expectancies that these behaviours will lead to these reinforcements (freedom of movement) and the strength or value of these reinforcements (need value)."

The Internal Vs. External Locus of Control was first stated by Rotter (1966) and defined as follows:

"The role of reinforcement, reward or gratification is universally recognised. However, an event regarded by some persons as a reward or reinforcement may be differently perceived and reacted to by others. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behaviour or attributes versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself and may occur independently of his own actions. The effect of reinforcement following some behaviour on the part of a human subject, in other words, is not a simple stamping in process, but depends upon whether or not the person perceives a causal relationship between his own behaviour and the reward." (Rotter, 1966, p.1).
Some individuals were resolute in their belief that valued reinforcements were chance occurrences and men were mere pawns in the hands of fate. Others staunchly believed human-beings get what they deserved, and man was himself wholly and solely responsible for his fate. When a reinforcement was perceived by the subject to follow his own actions but at the same time was considered to be contingent upon the results of chance, fate, luck, the influence of powerful others, the individual was considered to believe in external control.

Individuals who held themselves personally responsible for what happened to them, rather than attributing responsibility to forces outside their control, who perceived events as contingent upon their own behaviour or their own relatively permanent characteristics, revealed their belief in internal control.

Myers (1988) said that over a thousand studies had been conducted to study the consequences of people's belief that they control their own destiny (termed "Internal Locus of Control"). These studies attempted to draw a comparison with those people who believed that chance or outside forces determined their fate ("externals"). "Understandably, people who have less control over their lives usually develop a more external locus of control. People who believe themselves internally controlled are also more likely to be
non-smokers, wear seat belts and to practice birth control (instead of trusting fate). They are more independent and resistant to being manipulated, they are better able to delay instant gratification in order to achieve long-term goals, and they make more money. By and large, all the research converges on the same conclusions. People benefit from a strong sense of personal effectiveness." (Myers, 1988, p.104).

Locus of control and assertion

A number of studies have been conducted to study the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness.

Bates and Zimmerman (1971) found that a moderate positive relationship existed between locus of control and non-assertiveness in interpersonal situations with college students as subjects.

Applebaum, Tuma and Johnson (1975) studied 44 males and 115 females drawn from the psychology classes of 2 small community colleges. The age-range of the subjects was from 17 to 49 years. The subjects were administered the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Rotter’s Internal-External Scale and the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule. Results indicated that internals describe themselves as more assertive than externals and this relationship is independent of social desirability.
In an earlier study Joe (1971) had found external locus of control to be associated with lower resistance to manipulation and higher degrees of social conformity. This had led Replogle et al., (1980) to suggest that "one underlying characteristic of individuals with an external orientation may be their lowered likelihood of manifesting assertive behaviour." They conducted a study with the purpose of exploring the relationship of the Internal-External locus of control construct and the self-reported assertiveness among female professionals. There was a moderately strong relationship between self-reports of assertiveness and generalized expectancy for control of reinforcement. Those who believe that they have power over what happens to them are more likely to exhibit assertive ability.

In another study, Hartwig, Dickson and Anderson (1981) administered Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, The College Self-Expression Scale, Conflict Resolution Inventory and Rathus Assertiveness Schedule to 121 undergraduates to assess the relationship between locus of control and assertiveness. They found Internality was related to assertiveness.

Other researchers found that training to be assertive can be successfully used to modify behaviour and also locus of control in adolescents (Waksman, 1984; Norem, 1979; Parr, 1974, for reference see Oberg, 1990).
Campbell, Olson and Kleim (1989) found an internal locus of control was positively correlated with assertiveness among undergraduate students in the U.S. Assertiveness was assessed in a conversation setting and also Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was administered. These findings imply that people who believe they substantially control events in their lives (internals) are more likely to be assertive in their interaction with others. These results uphold Hartwig, Dickson and Anderson's (1981) findings.

DeMan and Green (1988) in studying the relationship between neuroticism, extraversion, locus of control and assertiveness concluded that the association between assertiveness and neuroticism is reduced from a significant to a non-significant one if the locus of control variable is removed.

Oberg (1990) found that "the personality construct of locus of control appears to be a significant discriminator variable between delinquent and non-delinquent peers." Oberg's study was designed to determine:

1. whether assertiveness training would increase assertiveness among juvenile delinquents;
2. whether an increase in assertiveness would produce a corresponding increase in locus of control orientation; and
3. whether a change in locus of control and/or assertiveness bring about changes in the frequency of negative behaviour.

All the hypotheses were found to be statistically significant except that the study failed to yield any evidence that assertive training will lead to an increase display of assertive behaviour in incarcerated male juvenile delinquents.

**Need For Social Approval**

Approval seeking as a way of life had its genesis in the child-rearing practices. The way we would perceive ourselves and the beliefs we would have about ourselves would be of great importance. It was all very well to want people to like us and say nice things about us. But when this harmless desire for other people's approbation became an all-pervasive need trouble lied ahead. People who always needed others to endorse their feelings of self-worth could become very upset if such approval was withheld.

According to Reismann, 1950 (in McGuiffie, Jorgensen and Janzen) "individuals have shifted from an inner-directed orientation where decisions and behaviour stem from internalized standards, to an orientation where standards are based on the approbation of others". This is related to what Fromm, 1947 (in McGuiffie, Jorgensen and
Jenzen) calls, "the marketing orientation." The behaviour a person exhibits to increase his market value could be viewed as socially desirable or likely to win the approval of others. Crowne and Marlowe (1960) defined social desirability as the need for social approval and believed that the satisfaction of this need could be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviour.

The need for approval as a construct was developed by Crowne and Marlowe (1964). They defined an approval motivated person as one who always needed to gain others' approval, feared rejection if he behaved in a manner different from others and often conformed to group pressures and cultural norms. They also regarded need for approval as a unidimensional personality construct and included in it both "dependence on evaluation of others" and "avoidance of self-criticism." (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964).

Dyer (1976) said, "The need for approval is based on a single assumption - Don't trust yourself - check it out with someone else first." He further said that in our culture, approval-seeking was the norm on the basis of which we interacted with others. Independent thought was discouraged and if, for some reason, approval of others was not forthcoming, we were plagued by feelings of guilt, depression and unworthiness.
Johnson (1988) said, "many of us have ceased to choose for ourselves, instead selecting what we think others will approve of or have us do. .... This phenomenon — searching for approval past the point where it is socially or psychologically functional permeates our society......"

Examples of Typical Approval — Seeking Behaviour

This covered a large area of self-defeating behaviour patterns such as:

* Changing your stand on an issue to avoid disapproval.
* Sugar-coating a statement to avoid displeasing others.
* Flattering in order to make others like you.
* Feeling dejected or depressed when someone disagrees with you.
* Calling people "snobbish" which implies that one is begging for their attention.
* Tamely submitting to other people's point of view even if your opinion differs from theirs.
* Being excessively apologetic. (Dyer, 1976)

These approval — seeking activities made us conform to others' point of view, lowered our self-esteem and were related to unassertiveness and the desire to please others. However, this kind of behaviour had certain pay-offs also which included:

1. Placing responsibility for your feelings on others.
2. Since any change in you is contingent upon the approval of others, approval-seeking helps you to avoid changing.

3. By holding others responsible for any change in you, you successfully avoid risk-taking activities in your life.

4. Your dependence on social approval leads to the formation of a poor self-image which reinforces self-pity.

5. Expecting others to protect and take care of you as if you were a helpless child.

6. Blaming others for the way you feel.

7. Convincing yourself that the "significant-others" in your life like you.

8. Finding comfort when others notice you. (Dyer, 1976)

However, there are ways to avoid the trap of approval-seeking. Some have been suggested by Dyer (1976) and others have been given by Ellis and Harper (1975), Beck (1976); and Burns (1980).

Allen Johnson (1988) upheld these ways and means of resisting the temptation to seek the approval of others. Some of these techniques included:

1. Recognize that the thoughts, actions and feelings of others belong to them.

2. Be honest.
3. Thank the person who for whatever reason, disapproves of your behaviour.

4. Interact with someone who is likely to disagree with you or to try to manipulate you by withholding approval and practice not to be upset by it or by the reaction of the other person.

5. When tempted to seek approval, ask yourself, "would I be better off if this person approved?"

6. Accept the fact that some people may not understand you.

7. Do not engage in the habit of substantiating your opinion by asking "Isn't that right?" If you believe in what you believe there is no need for you to garner the support of others.

8. Correct yourself when you realise you have slipped into the trap.

9. Stop saying that you are sorry for your own mistakes and actions. (Allen Johnson, 1988)

There was a strong relationship between the approval motive, self-esteem, conformity and assertiveness.

Need for approval and self-esteem

The close theoretical ties between need for approval and self-regard have been clearly brought about in Carl Roger's (1951; 1959) formulations where he has pointed
to self-esteem as the most important factor which influenced a person's reactions to his social world.

According to Marlowe and Gergen (1970), the "heightened dependence on others for approval presumably stems from the individual's need to bolster his self-esteem. That a lack of self-esteem is characteristic of persons with strong need for approval may be inferred from the tendency of such persons to suppress possible shortcomings, to avoid introspection, and to avoid acting in an autonomous, self-assertive manner."

Hovland, Janis and Kelley (1953), and Crowne and Marlowe (1964) also suggested that a person with low self-regard "may have a strong need for social acceptance and thus be more reactive to wide-ranging cues of social approval" (cf Marlowe and Gergen p.15).

It followed that such a person may be trapped between fears of his inferiority and the desire to excel.

According to Rathus and Nevid (1980) "while your self-concept is your conception of yourself along a variety of dimensions, your self-esteem rests on your approval or disapproval of your positioning on them. Your self-esteem is a personal judgement of your worthiness, and it is based on your perception of the discrepancy, or distance between the way you see yourself and the way you think you ought to be - i.e. the discrepancy between your self-concept and your ideal self".
According to Kelley (1979) "Developing a positive self-concept and maintaining it is an important skill, since self-esteem is the cornerstone of assertion".

Percell (1977) held that assertion was self-reinforcing and enhanced a person's self-esteem.

Fensterheim and Baer (1975) said that a person's actions serve as a basis for his self esteem.

"The more you stand up for yourself and act in a manner you respect, the higher will be your self-esteem."

They offered the equation:

Assertion = Self - Esteem.

This was derived from another equation by William James:

\[
\text{Self Esteem} = \frac{\text{Success}}{\text{Pretensions}}
\]

(cf Fensterheim & Baer, 1975).

Approval and conformity:

Walker and Heyns (1962) defined conformity as, "movement toward some norm or standard".

Marlowe and Gergen (1970) felt that investigators rely on "need strength" as the basis for prediction of the occurrence of a particular behaviour. The underlying assumption was that if the motivation was strong the likelihood of the behaviour fulfilling the need would occur.
They explained this further with the help of an example saying, "if the measure indicates that the person needs social approval, it is assumed that he will also seek such approval in a conformity situation and thus manifest greater conformity".

Marlowe and Gergen (1970) while talking of the social skills of approval-motivated persons said, "such individuals are quite responsive to cues indicating when conformity may have a positive pay-off".

**Need for approval and assertion**

In the light of research conducted by several authors it could be stated that need for approval inhibits assertive behaviour.

Crandall (1966) found that females who had a high need for approval were less likely to express aggression than females with low need for approval. This finding provided indirect evidence for the negative relationship between assertiveness and need for approval as a number of researchers have expressed grave doubts about assertiveness being a distinct personality construct distinguishable from aggressiveness. In fact, Rathus et al, (1979) said, "...the construct of assertiveness is perhaps confounded with or at least not distinguishable from aggressiveness."
Kiecolt and McGrath (1979) found people who were high on social desirability sometimes scored high on assertiveness also. This was due to their tendency to describe themselves in unrealistically positive ways.

A numbers of researchers have also reported that fear of rejection, which was directly linked to need for approval, inhibited assertive responding. Subjects who were low on assertiveness had greater fears of being disliked, had negative expectations about the consequences of assertive responding, had a perfectionist attitude and were overly concerned about others (Fiedler and Beach, 1978; Pitcher and Meikle, 1980; Kelly, Kern, Kirkley, Patterson and Keane, 1980; Golden, 1981).

Lobel (1981) reported that need for approval differentially moderated the assertive responding of men and women in role-play situations that presented a confederate in a position of authority or equality.

Lohr and Bonge (1982) found higher need for social approval in people who are low on assertiveness. These findings were later contradicted by McNamara and Delamater, (1984) who reported lower need for social approval in persons who were low on assertiveness than those persons who were high on assertiveness.

Ramaniah et al. (1986) found non-assertive people more subservient, self-projecting, defensive and approval seeking whereas assertive people had higher self-regard,
social sensitivity and were more capable of developing intimate relationships with others.

**Personality**

Eysenck (1960) defined Personality as, "more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment."

(a) **Extraversion**

Eysenck's theory of Personality which he developed and modified over the years (1947, 1952, 1957, 1967) had four major dimensions of Personality, namely, Extraversion - Introversion, Stability - Neuroticism, Stability - Psychoticism and Intelligence. These dimensions functioned practically independently of each other.

Eysenck (1957) tried to link individual differences in Extraversion-Introversion (E/I) to hypothetical inherited differences in the functioning of the nervous system. For this purpose, he traced the origin of E/I from Pavlov's (1927) conceptualization of Excitation and Inhibition in the brain, from Hull's (1943) concept of reactive inhibition (Ir) and from Gray's (1965) level of arousal. He stated that those persons in whom reactive inhibition developed quickly,
was of a strong nature and dissipated slowly were more likely to develop extraverted patterns of behaviour. Whereas individuals in whom reactive inhibition was quickly dissipated were more prone to develop introverted forms of behaviour (Eysenck, 1957, 1963).

Ruch (1992) gave a table which "allows the deduction of hypotheses regarding the relationship between the Eysenckian typology and Pavlov's Types of Nervous System". This table is as given below:

**The four Hippocrates-Galen temperaments as characterized by the Pavlovian NSPs and the Eysenckian superfactors E and N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hippocrates-Galen typology</th>
<th>Pavlov's TNS</th>
<th>Eysenck's Superfactors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melancholic</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Unstable Introvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choleric</td>
<td>Strong unbalanced</td>
<td>Unstable Extravert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlegmatic</td>
<td>Strong unbalanced slow</td>
<td>Stable Introvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguine</td>
<td>Strong unbalanced mobile</td>
<td>Stable Extravert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSP = Nervous System Properties  
TNS = 4 Types of Nervous System

According to Ruch (1992), "Pavlov's weak type is the neurotic introvert according to Eysenck, both models consider them to be Galen's melancholic temperament type. Similarly, Pavlov's strong and unbalanced NS type corresponds with neurotic E, since both stand for the
choleric temperament. Furthermore, the strong, balanced and slow NS type is the stable introvert and the strong, balanced and mobile NS type can be equated with the Eysenckian stable extravert."

Ruch (1992) tested the aforementioned hypothesis in 3 samples of 159, 102 and 112 adults respectively. The objective was to "determine the correspondence between Eysenck's typology and Pavlov's TNS." Most of the results upheld the predictions. The main area of difference referred to the finding that the sanguine temperament and the choleric temperament seem to be equally unbalanced. However, the low balance of the former is a result of the "unexpectedly strong excitatory processes in the sanguine temperament" and the "low balance of the latter is due to weak inhibitory processes" (Ruch, 1992).

Eysenck's (1967) reasoning was based on the assumption that the differences between extraverted and introverted persons arose due to the differences in the excitatory and inhibitory potentials of their central nervous system. High neural inhibitions were indicative of extraverted persons because the resonance of their experiences was not long enough to support an inner thought life. Neural stimulus traces persisted in people who were low in neural inhibition. This resulted in the inward direction of attention which was so typical of the introvert.
Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) said, "the typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to and does not like studying or reading by himself, he craves for excitement, takes chances, acts on the spur of the moment and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer and generally likes change. He is carefree, easygoing, optimistic and likes to laugh and be merry.

On the other hand, a typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person, fond of books, rather than people, he is reserved and distant except to intimate friends. He does not like excitement, takes matters of life with appropriate seriousness and adopts a well-ordered mode of life. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic and places great value on ethical standards" (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1968).

Eysenck (1947) listed the following differences between Extraverts and Introverts:

1. "The I has a more subjective, the E a more objective outlook;
2. The I shows a higher degree of cerebral activity; the E a higher degree of behavioural activity;
3. The I shows a tendency of self-control (inhibition); the E a tendency to lack of such control."
Biscoff (1970) explained the differences between extraverts and introverts by saying, "the extravert displays emotions, is inclined to be volatile, and favours action over contemplative thought. The introvert hides feelings and seeks solutions to problems through passivity. To achieve true self-actualization, man must bring both introvertive and extravertive characteristics into proper and lasting balance."

Frost (1969) noted that "extraverts were assertive and lacking in submissiveness and self-criticism as predicted by Eysenck and Eysenck (1964)."

This was also brought about by Schaeffer's hypothetical model of social and emotional behaviour in children which was as given below:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Introversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Schaeffer's hypothetical model for social and emotional behaviour in children

As can be seen from the model, aggressiveness or assertiveness (since the two constructs are not regarded as independent and distinct and "the construct of assertiveness is perhaps confounded with or at least not distinguished from aggressiveness", Rathus et al, 1979) was related to extraversion.

Eysenck (1952) also gave the following diagram to explain the relationship of Extraversion and Introversion with other factors like assertiveness, spontaneity and persistence.

He said, "it is reasonable to find that persistence is closely associated with stability, and assertiveness also has a positive projection on this factor. Inferiority feeling and sensitivity are understandably loaded negatively with stability, as is also the factor 'spontaneity'. The second factor opposes 'assertiveness' and 'spontaneity' to
'inferiority' and 'sensitivity', this falls in with our conception of I and E respectively.

Extraversion and assertion:

A review of the earlier literature dealing with extraversion and assertiveness showed that though no studies directly compared these two qualities in the same subjects, there was indirect evidence to imply a relationship between the two qualities. In one such early study, Carment and Miles (1965) related persuasiveness to Intelligence and E. Their results indicated that more intelligent and E subjects were more persuasive though they were less inclined to be persuaded themselves. Persuasibility as defined by this study resembled Fensterheim and Baer’s (1975) definition of assertiveness. Hence, this study led to the presumption that assertiveness and E were positively related. Further evidence was provided by Rim’s (1971) study where he found significant positive relationships between risk-taking and extraversion. Since willingness to take risks seemed compatible with the definition of assertiveness it could be strongly argued that a positive relationship existed between assertiveness and extraversion.

Averett and McManis (1977) attempted to make a direct comparison of E and assertiveness. Subjects were 25 male and 78 female undergraduate college students who were
given the EPI for an assessment of E and the Adult Self Expression Scale (ASES) for a measure of assertiveness. They obtained a significant positive correlation of 0.46 (p<0.001) between the EPI scores and the ASES scores showing a marked tendency for subjects scoring high on one test to score high on the other also.

DeMan and Green (1988) studied assertiveness aggressiveness and E in 38 men and 78 women undergraduate university students. They were administered the Assertiveness-Aggressiveness Inventory which consisted of 36 items providing information on subjects' behaviour in various social situations. An assessment of extraversion was provided by the EPI (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1968). Their results showed aggression to be associated with extraversion. Since many investigators have expressed doubts about assertiveness and aggressiveness being independent constructs (Hollandworth, 1977; Rakos, 1979; Rathus, Fox and DeCristofaro, 1979) it could safely be concluded that assertiveness would also be related to extraversion.

(b) Neuroticism (N)

Eysenck (1960) considered neurotic symptoms to be "learned patterns" of behaviour which had become "unadaptive." Eysenck (1965) defined N as, "an over-reaction on the part of the individual to a variety of very strong
emotions being experienced under conditions where most people only feel weak emotions, if any, at all... There seems very little doubt that differences between people in emotionality or N are mediated by inherited difference in the lability and excitability of the ANS."

He further said, "the individual high on N is conceived to be a person with an over reactive, labile type of nervous system, a person who reacts too strongly and too persistently to strong stimuli" (Eysenck, 1968).

Thus, N, in Eysenck’s theoretical formulations, had a neuro-physiological base and was derived from the Hullian theory of drive.

Biscoff (1970) gave the following characteristics of neurotics:

1. Neuroticism is a primary structure and not merely a syndrome.
2. Derived from excitation of the autonomic nervous system.
3. Behaviour not as readily apparent to others as is Extraversion.
4. Less able to see in the dark than normal subjects.
5. When blindfolded will sway forward more than normal subjects.
6. Seem to have higher drive level than normals.

(cf Biscoff, 1970, p.498)
Neuroticism and assertion

There was considerable evidence to show that psychological health or adjustment bore a moderately high positive relationship with a global measure of assertiveness (Olczak and Goldman, 1981). The recent trend was to view assertiveness training within a "health" model orientation (Flowers, Whiteley and Cooper, 1978). Olczak and Goldman (1981) held that it was possible that an individual who made his desires explicitly known, had the ability to refuse unreasonable requests and did not allow others to take advantage of him was a more fully functioning and psychologically healthy individual. These findings were consistent with previous research which showed that people who rated themselves higher on assertiveness reported fewer neurotic tendencies and less situational anxiety (Orenstein et al, 1975), fewer fears (Morgan, 1974) and more self acceptance (Tolor et al., 1976) than the individuals who rated themselves low on assertiveness. DeMan and Green (1988) found neuroticism to be negatively related to extraversion in a study of 38 male and 78 female university undergraduate students. They also found that if the effects of locus of control were removed the relation between neuroticism and assertiveness was reduced from a significant to a non-significant one. This finding suggested that low N by itself was not able to guarantee assertive responding.
Assertiveness And Culture

Culture had a tremendous impact on the development of response styles. Different societies adopted different cultural practices which were reflected in the socialization and child-rearing practices. The cultural implications were also evident in interpersonal communication, development of response styles for expressing different emotions, coping skills etc. A response style which was accepted in one culture might not necessarily be acceptable in other cultures also.

A number of researchers have acknowledged the influence of culture in developing assertive skills. MacDonald (1975) observed that assertion training should be imparted to people whose social roles were poorly defined or in a state of cultural flux. Kelley (1979) also stressed the importance of culture in determining the appropriateness of assertive behaviour. Keane and Wildman (1980) feel that the appropriateness of definitions of suitable assertive behaviour for diverse cultural groups had not been addressed in empirical research.

Some Related Research

The components of assertive behaviour included both verbal and non-verbal cues and there were a number of studies to show strong cultural influences in the
utilisation of these cues while determining assertive behaviour.

Cheek (1976) strongly questioned the assumption that what was effective in interpersonal behaviour in the white culture would also be effective in the black culture. He suggested that any assessment of the components of assertion for blacks must also take into account the culture, language and mores governing the individual’s behaviour. Hazzard (1979) provided further support for Cheek’s arguments with his findings that black and white college students responded in different ways to self-report questionnaires of assertiveness.

Keane and Wildman (1980) found that black college students frequently responded in an unassertive manner to scenes role playing conflict and unreasonable requests. However, in this study the ways of measuring assertiveness were more suitable for a predominantly white cultural group.

Furnham (1980) administered the Wolpe-Lazarus Assertiveness Scale to 108 South African nurses who were further divided into three groups, namely, African, Indian and European. They were matched in terms of age, sex, language-competence, educational background and occupation. The three groups showed significant differences. The Europeans (whites) were the most assertive and the Indians the least.
Kimble, Marsh and Kiska (1985) measured assertiveness of Mexican-American males and females and Anglo-American males and females. Their results showed that, in comparison to females, males reportedly were more assertive. Older subjects reported more assertiveness compared to younger subjects. American females reported acting less assertively than other groups in the study.

Margalit and Mauger (1987), in a comparison of 58 female and 43 male Israeli and 56 female and 46 male American students (mean age range 24-25 years), found sex differences across cultures to be concentrated primarily around the dimension of aggressiveness with males scoring higher than females. Israelis tended to be more aggressive than Americans and were also more likely to disregard other people's rights. Americans were more self-confident, showed greater willingness to accept and give praise and were more likely to avoid conflicts.

Zane et al (1991) found assertion differences among Asians and Caucasians to be "situationally specific" with a majority of the differences occurring in "interactions with strangers."

Thompson, Ishii and Klopf (1991) found, in a comparison of 144 males and 108 female college students in the U.S. and 125 male and 116 female Japanese college students, that there was significant interaction between culture and sex. U.S. subjects were highly assertive whereas
Japanese subjects were only moderately so. In oral interactions Japanese subjects showed more apprehension. The interaction between sex and culture was also found to be significant. Thus, as can be seen, culture was a very important factor in determining the individual’s assertive responding to the environment.

India being a land of diverse cultures and religious groups, there were distinct regional differences in culture which would have a direct bearing on the differential assertiveness displayed by the people. Further, the disparity in the socialization process employed for rearing boys and girls left ample room for giving sometimes direct and, at other times, oblique messages to the girls that submissiveness and timidity were more acceptable traits than assertiveness, boldness and courage to stand up for their rights.

In this research work, an attempt was made to highlight the cultural differences between the North and South of India.
Inter-Cultural Variations Within India

Historical perspective

Through the ages, the Indian woman had been culturally and socially conditioned to meekly accept a social and familial status which was inferior to those of men. But things were not always so. The position of women during the early Vedic times was definitely superior, though at no point of time during the evolution of Indian society were they accorded equal status with men. The Rig Veda, which was considered the most ancient of the Hindu scriptures mentioned many female deities suggesting that the female ideal was worshipped. Baig (1958) said, "the mother goddess of Pre-Aryan times knew her power and strangely enough, in the Indian concept the woman is not "the weaker sex" but the embodiment of Shakti, the female principle of life, known in modern terms as energy and synonymous with power." This basic thought was expressed by Nanavutty (1958) who said, "the ancient Hindu pattern of living admitted women to the same privileges as men, and woman was held to be the embodiment of God's Shakti. His creative force working in and through man and the Universe. As such, she was the friend and equal of man. This was certainly true of Vedic times when women not only composed religious hymns but also partook in the ritual sacrifices and in all recondite discussions."
Mohan V, and Kapur (1985) said that in the ancient Indian culture women were worshipped. During Vedic times women had an exalted position in society. They were given good education, allowed to choose their life partners through "swayamwara", and girls were married only after they attained puberty.

But, unfortunately, during the later Vedic period the position of women began to deteriorate. It was during this period that the idea of existence of the soul was first put forth and it was believed that if a man did not have a son to perform his last rites his soul would suffer in hell. Thus the social status of women plummeted. Though still held in high importance, they became merely means of producing sons.

This decline in the status of women continued and as Nanavutty (1958) said, "the relegation of women to a subordinate role came much later with the formulation of the Laws of Manu. The reason for this reversal is to be sought in the economic and sociological changes in the structure of Hindu society and not in any religious sanction. Religious sanctions, however, were imposed at the time and the Hindu woman's sense of devotion and sacrifice exploited to her own great disadvantage." Mohan, V and Kapur (1985) said that the law-giver Manu, "reduced the status of women to that of a chattel. The status of women underwent such total retrogression that till today women of India are reeling under its impact."
Further, the norm of male supremacy was well established and accepted. Rudra (1975) pointed out that, "the Indian society has all along been a male dominated society, where the woman's place has been primarily confined to the home, her role limited to procreation, upbringing of children, and catering for the need of men-folk by way of creature comforts."

The acceptance of males being superior to females had its genesis in child-birth itself. Rudra (1975) pointed out, "the birth of a male child has always been and still is hailed with joy, whereas that of a female child is considered to be a family misfortune." Mohan V, and Majithia (1992) said, "In the case of females in the Indian set-up, the process of rejecting her begins as early as prenatal sex determination tests and subsequent attempt to female foeticide."

This attitude of rejection by the parents, left deep wounds on the psyche of the girl child leading to feelings of inferiority, guilt and despair. Her self-esteem also plummeted. According to Mohan, V (1989), "this attitude of rejection has an immense impact on the female psyche and growth of her personality. The parents use double standards and different codes for rearing a boy and a girl ... the girl is given food having less nutritional value ... she is taught to give in ... withdraw ... in terms of personality trait submissiveness is favoured ... This process of
differentiation continues in school. After creating all these environmental role differentiation, people start believing that girls by nature are dependent, docile, indecisive, timid, shy, nervous and affiliative." Since submissive behaviour was encouraged the girl child could not learn assertive skills as they were frowned upon. Her feelings of worthlessness and rejection, further, contributed to the development of unassertive modes of behaviour.

However, in India, over the years, the status of women in society has undergone a remarkable change. In modern times, not only is it customary for women to attain good education but they even have the freedom to hold a job of their choice. Today, the Indian women have equal opportunities of competing with the males in all walks of life. Gone are the days when women who showed a keen desire to work were looked down upon or degraded. They were treated as vassals whose only job was to look after the house and the children. Living in the confines of the four walls of their homes, women played a passive role in the family hierarchy. The modern Indian woman is a more awakened soul. She is more aware of her rights and privileges. But as the saying goes, "the more things change the more they remain the same." The Indian woman is still, to a large extent, an inhibited personality functioning under the constraints of familial and societal pressures.
Aryan versus Dravidian culture

India is a very large country and the impact of history, religion and diverse cultural practices would differ from one region to another. As Baig (1958) said, "India is as complex as the architecture of any of its temples. This is due to the impact of history and the synthesis of many religions, races and ways of life functioning independently of one another, and again the clear-cut divisions in Hinduism itself which arose some 5000 years ago in the first shattering impact of the Aryan way of life upon the indigenous Dravidians."

The Aryan way of life differed from the Dravidian society on a number of counts. Baig (1958) said, the Aryan society was "apparently patriarchal" and was a "society of nomads." All the power was vested in the father, the king or the priest. On the contrary, "Dravidian civilization was urban. Its centripetal force was apparently the mother-goddess burgeoning with life and steadfast as the seasons. The matriarchal system ... in South India was the antithesis of the patriarchal system."

In comparison to North Indians who bore the brunt of the Aryan culture, South Indians followed the Dravidian culture and could more or less maintain their cultural heritage intact through the ancient times to the modern era.
North India versus South India (cultural differences)

In India, regional difference brought about marked differences in the way of life of the people. According to Beteille (1975), "an analysis of any important aspect of Indian social life will have to start with a consideration of regional differences. The regions differ from each other in their geographical features and in their historical development. Corresponding to these factors, there are differences between them in material and non-material culture." He further said that "the systems of kinship and marriage" were very different in the Dravidian-speaking Southern states in comparison to the Indo-Aryan speaking areas of the North. He gave another example by differentiating the "role of women in agriculture in the paddy producing areas in the East and South from their role in the wheat producing areas in the North." Differences also existed in the extent of freedom of movement allowed to women in different parts of the country. Beteille (1975) held that "women in South Indian villages enjoy greater freedom of movement than their counterparts in North India."

There were marked cultural differences between North and South of India which, in turn, had an impact on the position of women. If we take the example of the institution of marriage (which had a strong impact on how women thought about themselves, whether they were able to maintain their self-respect and found happiness in their new
homes), we find that, surprisingly, the bridegroom who was considered suitable in South India would be totally unacceptable to North Indians. The differences of opinion on the outlook towards marriage could be listed on several points:

1. **In the South, many communities preferred to marry within their families.** Das (1975) said, "among many groups in South India, marriage is prescribed or preferred between certain relatives." However, marriage between all types of relatives was not allowed. Though a boy could marry his mother’s brother’s daughter or his father’s sister’s daughter, he could not marry his mother’s sister’s daughter which would be considered incestuous.

   If we compare this with the North, a completely different scenario emerges. Das (1975) said, "There is a ban on marriages between blood relatives and the South Indian practice of cross cousins or uncle niece marriage would be regarded as incestuous in the North."

   In the North, marriages were preferred among complete strangers and relatives, especially close ones, could never be regarded as prospective spouses.

2. **In South India, marriages took place within the village itself** whereas in North Indian villages the daughter of one family was considered to be the daughter of the whole village. Hence, they were not allowed to marry
local village boys. Das (1975) said, "villages in South India are not exogamous, permitting marriages to take place within the village. In effect, marriage networks in the South do not spread very far, and after her marriage the girl does not have to move in among complete strangers."

3. From this it followed that South Indian girls would be better adjusted in their marital homes as they would be among people they are familiar with. Das (1975) said, "many people think that this provided for better adjustment by the girl to her parents-in-law." Contrast this with the North Indian marriages where "after marriage the girl not only goes to live among people with whom she is totally unfamiliar but she also goes to a completely new place ... Thus the bride leads a very lonely life in the first few years of marriage." (Das, 1975).

4. In the South, "the prospects of marriage for a girl who was destitute or who was not very good looking were not entirely bleak. Her mother's brother or father's sister would be under a positive obligation to arrange her marriage with his-her own son" (Das 1975). In the North, though relatives would definitely help a destitute girl, there was no such support system whereby she could marry a relative in order to be assimilated in the social mainstream.
5. "Against the advantage of marrying into a known family and a familiar locality so that the girl is not suddenly placed in an entirely new and unfamiliar environment, must be weighed the disadvantage that some psychologists have pointed out - viz., the possibility that sexual adjustment is difficult when the husband and wife have known each other since childhood" (Das, 1975). This line of argument held that though familiarity established relative ease in "familial adjustment" it also "makes it difficult for a man to experience the same erotic excitement as he would for an unfamiliar woman" (Das, 1975). In the North, since the prospective bride and groom were virtually strangers, these difficulties were not encountered in the physical side of marriage.

6. In the South, the family members of the bride could interact freely with her after marriage. This did not happen in the North. Das (1975) said, "... visits from her relatives are not encouraged. Customarily, the girl's senior relatives were not allowed to accept food or water from any household in her conjugal village."

7. The North and South differed radically in the social outlook towards marriage. "Whereas in the South, marriage is a means of reinforcing an already existing relationship, in the North it is used primarily for establishing new relationships (Das, 1975)."
Though there were marked differences between North and South with regard to the suitability of the bridegroom, cultural differences in the outlook towards marriage and the differential treatment the brides received in their marital homes, there were some similarities also. It was observed that like in the North, male babies were preferred to female babies. Consequently, the child-rearing practices differed for the sexes. This discrimination between the sexes dealt a severe blow to the self-esteem, personality and self-respect of the female children. Further, their cultural indoctrination also determined whether these women would be passive or would display a more assertive style of interacting with others.