CHAPTER - VI\textsuperscript{th}

DISCUSSION
In the preceding chapter, descriptive accounts of results obtained from different treatments presented in tabular, statistical and graphical forms were put forward. In this chapter, an attempt has been made at interpreting and discussing these results as a whole. In the light of various theoretical frameworks evolved by various psychologists and relevant experimental findings of others.

This chapter is stratified into four sections.

In the first section, emphasis has been laid on the fact that Assertiveness tendency is a function of multiple factors in the light of the obtained data and findings of other investigators.

In the second section, the role of personality factors on assertive behaviour of college students have interpreted with special reference to the data of the present study.

In the third section, the role of psychological needs on assertiveness of college students has been discussed.

Fourth section of this study deals with the impact of attitude towards risk taking on assertiveness tendency of collegiates.
Hypothesis-1

*The distribution of scores on assertiveness is normal for total sample (N = 820).*

The hypothesis has been tested by making the use of descriptive statistics. The results obtained after computational work are presented in Table 5.1 and 5.2.

A close scrutiny of the results given in Table 5.1 and 5.2 reveals that the values of Skewness and Kurtosis are within the limits of chance fluctuations and hence not significant at any accepted levels. This demonstrates that the variable of assertiveness is normally distributed. This has been supported by data thorough descriptive statistics. This makes us to accept the hypothesis at .01 level of confidence. This hypothesis gives strength to the operational definitions of assertiveness as an attribute differentially distributed among people.

Hypothesis-2

*The phenomenon of Assertiveness is a function of multiple factors.*

A thorough review of previous studies related to assertive behaviour revealed that investigators have studied the phenomenon of assertiveness in relation to several factors. These factors ranged from
individual differences to self-esteem and stress. In the preceding studies, a significant correlation has been found between these factors and Assertiveness.

These investigations ascertain the influence of a number of personal and social characteristics on assertiveness. Present investigation was also done to study the effect of factors like Personality factors, Psychogenic Needs and Attitude towards Risk Taking Behaviour and the results revealed that these variables are significantly correlated to Assertiveness tendency.

Thus, it may be convincingly argued, that assertiveness tendency is a function of multiple factors, thus, confirming the Hypothesis.

Hypothesis-3

Variation in personality factors would cause variations in assertive behaviour.

In this study, assertiveness of Extraverted and Neurotic respondents have been compared. For the comparison of assertive tendency of Neurotic and extraverted respondents, Mean and SD values for the obtained scores on Assertiveness Scale were calculated (Table 5.3).

There is an important question to be answered. The hypothesis formulated conceived personality factors as more basic than assertiveness, hence, assertiveness was treated as dependent variable and personality factor as independent variable. The point of view was kept in mind while formulating the hypothesis. The personality factors were uncorrelated, hence, could be treated as independent and univariate treatment of data was undertaken by computing t ratio.
The hunt of literature showed that some investigators have treated assertiveness as independent variable e.g. Twentyman, Pharr & Coroner (1983), in the context of assessing effectiveness of covert modification procedures. Compared high scorers and low scorers on an assertion questnaire in a behavioural role play test and found significant difference in the two groups. In another study Comean, Nancy & Hiebart (1991) investigated differences in the cognitive structure (i.e. conceptualization) of assertive and non-assertive people. Obviously, assertiveness has been treated as independent variable rather than dependent variables.

In the majority of studies e.g. Hess, Elizabeth & Bornstein 1980; Makela & Fimo 1980 etc.) have treated personality variable and attitudes as independent variables and the assertiveness as dependent. In the study reported in this thesis has been treated as independent variable. As already stated, personality variables have been assumed to be more basic than assertiveness.

Obtained mean values indicated that Neurotic respondents (M ± 23.53 ± 1.17) were found less assertive than the Extraverted respondents (M = 28.53 ± 1.91) (Fig. 5.4). The above table indicates that personality type plays a significant role in the scores of assertiveness. The obtained t value was also found significant at respectable level of confidence (t = 12.25 > .01). Thus, high on extroversion were also high on assertiveness.
Finally, to conclude, it is stated that the hypothesis, 'variation in personality factors would cause variations in assertive behaviour', is accepted. There is significant difference in assertive tendencies between the two groups- neurotic and extraverted. Extraverted respondents were found more assertive than neurotic respondents (See Fig. 5.4).

It is customary among psychologists and psychiatrists to study neurotics and extraverted because normal and abnormal states are believed to throw on the functioning of normal and abnormal personality. The assumption made that in mental disorder we observe ordinary human behaviour as exaggerated, the disease process is believed to serve as a kind of magnifying glass or microscope which emerges what is normally invisible to the naked eye. The assumption may be well founded, but it has certain implications which are closely related to problem of taxonamy.

If the main types of neurosis (hysteria and psychasthenia) are the prototypes of a classification of normal human beings into extroverts and introverts as Jung maintains.

Extroversion refers to being sociable, assertive and talkative (Barrick & Mount 1991). Extraversion is a trait characterized by tendencies to be socially outgoing and to express feelings and impulses freely (Nevid & Rathus 2005). Extraversion is characterized by being outgoing, talkative, high on positive affect (feeling good) and in need of external
stumulation. According to Eysenck Arousal Theory of extraversion, there is an optimal level of cortical arousal, and performance deteriorate as one becomes more of less aroused than this optimal level. At very low and very high levels of arousal, performance is low, but at a more optimal mid level of arousal, performance is maximized extroverts, according to Eysenck's theory, are chronomically under aroused and bored and are therefore in need of external stimulation to bring them up to an optimal level of performance.

This investigation establishes that Extroverted respondents are independent minded, stern, unconventional, rebellious, headstrong and admiration demanding. They possess dominance or ascendance and are assertive, aggressive and competitive. A part from the above mentioned characteristics of extraverted respondents, Cattell et.al. (1970) have enumerated some more behavioural correlates of extraverted persons.

High E Scores are indicative of extraversion High scoring individuals (Extroverted respondents) tend to be outgoing, impulsive and uninhibited, having may social contacts and frequently taking part in group activities. The typical extravert is sociable, like parties, has many friends, need to have people to talk to, and does not like reading or studying himself. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of the movement and generally an impulsive individual. He is found of practical jokes, always has a ready answer and generally
likes change. He is carefree, easy going, optimistic and like to 'laugh and merry'.

It has been shown to be positively correlated with social states and leadership qualities. Extraverted persons generally participate freely in group discussions, raise group problems, criticise group defects, shows more outgoingness, more labile emotions and feelings and greater motor skills. A cursory glance at these qualities show that assertive persons possess self confidence, courage and boldness which generates in them dominance and ascendency. This in turn may make them extraverted, i.e. competitive, independent minded, unconventional and admiration demanding. These qualities of extraverted respondents in form of self confidence, boldness and courage, make them comparatively more assertive. Self confidence is the basic ingredient of positive self evaluation i.e. self esteem. Thus, the finding that dominance is positively related with assertiveness is not at all strange. It is rather based on common logic. Extravert's tend to show more initiative and ambition (Barrick, Mount and Judge 2001). Therefore, it is possible that extraverted individuals are more assertive and proactive in taking advantage of potential opportunities for positive spillover. Some empirical studies showing positive relationship of assertiveness with self-esteem (Pardeck & Jolly 1990), achievement motivation (Borges et al. 1979), social behaviour (Hegland & Rix 1990), ego enhancement (Stanten 1990) as well as the finding of the present
investigation in which assertiveness has been found to be high in Extraverted respondents serves to substantiate this findings.

Extraversion is associated with optimal adjustment, rather than introversion and neuroticism. Extraverts score higher on questionnaires measures of positive mental health, attempts suicide less often, are more popular with their peers, are more responsive to treatments posses high level of arousal, that is why extraverted respondents were found more assertive than neurotic respondents.

It may be concluded that Extraversion means an outward turning of the libido. With this concept Jung (1994) denotes a manifest relatedness of subject to object in the sense of positive movement of subjective interest towards the object. Every one in a state of introversion thinks, feels and acts in relation to the object and more over in a direct and clearly observable fashion so that no doubt can exist about his positive dependence upon the object. In a sense, therefore is an outgoing transference of interest from the subject to object. If it is intellectual introversion, the subject think himself into the objects of a feeling extraversion then the subject feels himself into the object. The state of extraversion means a strong, if not exclusive, determination by the object. One should speak of an active extraversion when deliberately willed and of a passive extraversion when the object compells it i.e. attracts that interest of the subject of its own accord, even against the latters intention. Should the
state of extraversion become habitual the extraverted type appears (Jung 1954 P. 543).

While, neuroticism is a term traditionally applied to a class of behaviours that have been described as deviating from conventional ways of responding. Neuroticism is a fundamental personality traits in the study of psychology. Freud posits it as a general factor of regression and says that neurotic is one who regressed less severely. A neurosisris, in psycho-analytic theory, is an intellectual coping strategy that singmund Freud suggested was caused by emotions from past experience overwhelming or interfering with present experience. In carl Jung's theory of psychoanalytic psychology, a neuroses results from the conflict of the two psychic contents one of which must be uncouscious.

Neuroticism has been operativelly defined "as those personality characteristics which differ significantly between clinically judged neurotics and normals. It can be defined as an enduring tendency to experience negative emotional states. Individuals who scores high on neuroticism are more likely than the average to experience such feelings as anxiety, anger, guilt and clinical depression. They respond more poorly to environmental stress and are more likely to interpret ordinary situations such as threatening and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. They are often self conscious and shy, and, they have trouble controlling urges and delaying gratification. Neuroticism is related to emotional intelligence which involves
emotional regulation, motivation and interpersonal skills. It is also considered to be a predisposition for traditional neuroses, such as phobias and other anxiety disorders.

Neuroticism, according to Eysenck's theory, is based on activation thresholds in the sympathetic nervous system or visceral brain. This is the part of the brain that is responsible for the fight-or-flight response in the face of danger. Neurotic people, who have low activation threshold and unable to inhibit or control their emotional reactions, experience negative affect (fight or flight) in the face of very minor stressors they are easily nervous or upset.

Cattell (1965) Cattell and Scheier (1961); Scheier & Cattell (1985), Eysenck (1947) characterized neuratic personality as badly organized, dependent, schizoid, dyspesia, poor muscular tone, unsatisfactory home, no group membership and cyclthyemic. Generally, this factor delineates a general lack of personality integration, lack of adaptability and lack of general drive which might justifiable be called neuroticism. Eysenck (1953-57) refers to neuroticism (N) as "emotional liability or one responsiveness of a person and liklihood" of breakdown under stress." The general nature of 'N' is defined as instability, unadaptability, depressive mood, weak dependable attitudes, narrow interests, symptoms of nervous breakdown (Mohan 1976). Mood of the clinical psychologists (clinicians) regard it "as a propensity in born or acquired to have malad justed pattern of behaviour
during time of stress (Wig & Verma 1973, Cattell 1965, Cattell & Scheier 1961). Scheier & Cattell define it "as those personality characteristics which actually differs significantly behaviour clinically judged neurotics and normals. Thus, nurosis in our society is only that which is recognised by our physicians and psychiatrist, Cattell use the term 'neuroticism' as synonymous with neurosis and feels it varies in degrees among normals as well as abnormals. According to Cattell (1973), neuroticism is not a second order factor, but a mixture of anxiety and certain personality primaries which maximally distinguishes neurotics. Thus, neuroticis as a fundamental dimension of personality is attested F by the fact it is some which heritable (Jinks & Fulker 1970) factorily ubiquitous (Eysenck & Rachman 1965; Wiggins 1968), and stable overtune (Buros 1970).

High N scores are indicative of emotional liability and over activity. High scoring individuals tends to be emotionally over responsive and have difficulties in returning to a normal state after emotional experiences. Such individuals frequently complain of vague somatic upsets of minor kind, such as headaches, digestive troubles, insomnia, backache etc. and also report may worries, anxieties and other disagreeable emotional feelings. Such individuals are predisposed to develop neurotic disorders under stress, but such predispositions should not be confused with actual neurotic breakdown : a person may have high scores on N while yet functioning adequately in work, sex, family and society spheres.
(Eysenck & Eysenck 1968). These are the important causal factors responsible for less assertive tendency, among, neurotic respondents.

So, it may be concluded that neurotics were found less assertive than extraverts because, neurotics (i.e. people with high N scores) are described as actually afraid of social contacts and worried about their success in such contacts, this fear prevents them for making as many as contacts as they would like, although they are not as motivated to mix with as are the introverts.

**Hypothesis-4**

*Variations in Psychological Needs would cause variation in assertive behaviour.*

Human being possess fundamental, shared and universal needs. We are concerned here not about physical needs, like need for food, but psychological needs. These needs must be fulfilled to some degree for us to be able to function reasonably well in the world, for our wellbeing and continued growth. There are 15 normal needs or motives namely-Achievement, Deference, Order, Exhibition, Autonomy, Affiliation, Intraception, Sucorance, Dominance, Abasement, Nurturance, Change, Endurance, Heterosexuality and Aggressive (Edwards 1959/1985), derived from the theory of H.A. Murray. The assessment of these need patterns may help primarily for counselling and recruitment. These scales are considered to
be a measure of relatively independent normal personality characteristics. These lists are related to a list of manifest need as presented by Murray (1938).

People and animals are inherently active. As children, we push and pull things; we shake, throw, carry, explore, and ask questions about the objects that surround us. As adults, we continue to explore and to play. We play games, solve mysteries, read books, visit friends, undertake challenges, pursue hobbies, surf the Web, build new things, and do any number of activities because these activities are inherently interesting and enjoyable things to do. When an activity involves our psychological needs, we feel interest. When an activity satisfies our psychological needs, we feel enjoyment. So, we feel and are aware of our sense of interest and enjoyment but the underlying motivational cause of engaging our environment is to involve and satisfy our psychological needs. Playing games, solving mysteries, and undertaking challenges are interesting and enjoyable things to do precisely because they provide an arena for involving and satisfying our psychological needs.

Psychological needs are an important addition to our analysis of motivated behavior. Psychological needs is proactive. Psychological needs promote a willingness to seek out and to engage in an environment. The distinction between physiological and psychological needs is a relatively easy one to make, but the distinction between psychological and
social needs is more subtle. Psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness) exist within human nature and are, therefore, inherent in everyone. Three such organismic needs are autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Social needs arise from our unique personal experiences and thus vary considerably from one person to the next. The social needs we acquire (achievement, intimacy, power) depend on the type of social environment in which we were raised, currently live in, and attempt to create for our future self. Keeping these facts in mind, the present study was designed.

With a view to study the relation between Psychologenic Needs and Assertiveness among college students, having above average and below average need patterns were taken and their corresponding Assertiveness scores were compared by calculating their Mean and SD values on each of the 15 Need Patterns (Table 5.4).

A variation in obtained Mean Assertiveness scores indicated a difference in Assertiveness tendencies of Above average and Below average students, obtained Mean on different need patterns taken together. To check the statistical significance of these differences, the mean scores (Table 5.4) were subjected to t test.

College students showing variation in their assertiveness tendency is quite obvious. Preceeding studies have shown Assertiveness
to be associated to a number of factors like income (Yoshika 2000), recreation (Ryan, Kenonalay, Pralt & Shumovich 2000) group membership and identity with social status (Castella, Abad, Alonso & Silla 2000) mental ill health (Weinhardt, Carey & Verdecias 1998); aggression and verbal behaviour (Swanson & Mc Intyre 1998), physical and mental health (Northrop, Emen & Eddstein 1998) which are also related directly or indirectly, to the Psychogenic Needs. It can be more clearly understood while discussing individual need patterns.

(1) Achievement Need pattern and Assertiveness

Comparing the Assertiveness Scores of Above Average ($M = 34.43 \pm 1.054$) and Below Average ($M = 28.63 \pm 1.52$) respondents, on Achievement Need Pattern (Table 5.6, Fig. 5.5), it is evident that Above Average respondents were found more assertive than Below Average respondents on Achievement need pattern. Meaning thereby that a respondents showing high score on Achievement Need Pattern is always inclined towards dowing things in the best possible way with all his skill and effort. He is more interested in doing difficult things, better than others, in a successful manner. Such person are inclined towards achieving bigger goals in life. Achievement need means a need to accomplish task well. That is why, the amount of assertive tendency was found comparatively more in above average respondents. Thus, accomplishment of any such desire or goal is likely to cause Assertive, thus, establishing a relation between Achievement need pattern and Assertiveness.
Studies have shown that more inclination for Achievement is often associated with Approval Motive (Crowne & Marlow 1964), and a tendency to get importance, recognition and attract others towards oneself (Horney 1937; 1950; Lewin 1948). The data supports the previous finding of Mehta & Kumar (1985), Kundu (1975) Ameerjan. Girja & Bhadra (1978) and Rubit (1975).

(ii) Deference Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On the deference need pattern, the Mean Assertiveness Scores of Above Average and Below Average respondents was 25.96 ± 1.40 and 29.83 ± 1.41 respectively indicating greater amount of assertiveness among Below Average respondents on Deference Need Pattern. The Mean difference between these two groups was found statistically significant (t = 10.75 > .01). Thus, it is concluded that the dimension Difference differentiates the Above Average and Below Average college students on assertiveness. Our hypothesis in this regard stands accepted.

Deference need pattern may be defined a need to conform to customs and defer to other (Edwards 1959, 1985). Deference need pattern may be characterized by an individual's tendency to work in a definite frame where he is supposed to follow the suggestions, decisions and instructions of others. One is accepted to accept the loader's life of others, praise of the co-workers or supervisors and follow the customs and conventions. Precisely, the individual is comfortable in the environment
with less autonomy and more dependibility on others. A person with a High Deference score will tend to desire suggestions from others, follow up instructions, conform, and praise others. High scorers on this scale do not like to make decisions by themselves while low scorers do not like to be told what to do. An individual scoring high on Deference is likely to surrender against social pressures and restrictions (Crutchfield 1933). That is why respondents selected as Above Average Scorers on Deference need pattern were found comparatively more assertive than Below Average Scorers.

Thus, on the basis of above discussion it can be generalized that Deference Need Pattern is likely to affect the Assertive tendency of college students. The obtained result support the findings of Asch (1956), crutchfield (1955) Crowne & Marlow (1964), Schacter (1959), Tyler (1911), Fayal (1949) McClelland (1961), Mackenjie (1973) Singh (1995) etc.

(iii) Order Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On the Order need pattern, respondents belonging to Above Average (M = 31.90 ± 1.374) and Below Average (M = 24.56 ± 1.58) groups on Order need patterns were (Table- 5.6 Fig. - 5.5) found significantly different from each other (t = 24.18 > .01). Meaning thereby that Above Average group of college students were found comparatively more assertive than the respondents belonging to Below Average group on
order need pattern. So, the present result confirms the hypothesis of the present investigation.

High order scores, suggest a person who likes thing to be orderly, makes plans and wants things to run smoothly. High scorers are upset by disorder while low scorers dislike deadlines and rules.

High scorers on order dimension may be characterized as individual with high inclination of orderliness tends to be very systematic at work. His written work is neat and organized. He likes to keep things neatly and in order, makes advance plans for every work. He keeps his personal and professional belonging in a systematic way. With fixed timings for his daily routine, he wishes to run his life smoothly without his hiccups. One's wish for orderliness for physical dimensions, when creeps and intermingles with nonphysical dimensions, like leading a smooth and orderly life, perceiving work place to be non-chaotic, people working in a systematic orderly manner, then becomes a case of concern. That is why respondents belonging Above Average scorer group on Order need pattern were found more assertive than the Below Average scorer group.

Murray (1938) defined that every individual has endless needs and aspirations which can not be fulfilled at a single time. An individual tends to put these needs in a sequence of its importance and desire. Certain biological processes needs immediate fulfillment, while others can
be achieved at a long period of time. Murray states that human beings tend to list their goals in life which can be more than one for some. A person having high orderliness is likely to serialise these goals, in view of his priorities as well as capabilities, make him assertive to achieve the goal. However, any imbalance in listing one's properties or fulfilling, it can lead to an imbalance and affect the individual adversely. Thus, type of objects, which directly or indirectly hamper in achievement of goals can be the precursor of Assertive tendency.

(iv) Exhibition Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On the Exhibition Need Pattern the mean Assertiveness scores of Above Average and Below Average group of respondents was 26.56 ± 1.46 and 24.06 ± 1.123 respectively. It indicates that respondents of Above Average groups were found more assertive than the respondents of Below Average groups. The obtained mean difference between these two groups was found statistically significant (t = 8.33 > .01). The result confirms the hypothesis of this investigation.

People who score high on the Exhibition scale likely to say clever persons, gain attention and have others notice him. High scorers dislike being ignored while low scorers dislike the lime light. As might be expected, both Above Average and Below Average scorers on Exhibition need pattern scored significantly different scores on Assertiveness Scale.
Above Average respondents on Exhibition need pattern scored comparatively high score on Assertiveness Scale because their inclination for expression are very expressive and overt in more than one ways. Such persons like to say witty, clever things, jokes, events, and stories to describe a point. They like to talk about personal achievements and like to be noticed. They also try to comment on others to study the impact. At times just to be in focus, they use words are instances with which others are not aware. Precisely, Exhibition is a need pattern which inclinates the individual to be noticed either due to words or the to deed. This tendency, within limit, would be beneficial for the individual to develop assertive tendency in more than one ways. That is why such individuals will try to exhibit their performance by putting their maximum effort (assertiveness) to give good results (to achieve their goals) without harming others. It is not out of place to mention that there are number of instances in which individual desires for getting noticed and attaining name and fame has adversely affected the entire personality of the individual. Exhibition in a way related to Achievement need pattern which is intensely related to Assertive tendency.

(v) Autonomy Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On Autonomy need pattern, the Above Average and Below Average scorers have obtained different mean values i.e. $31.66 \pm 1.36$ and $26.99 \pm 1.32$ respectively. The obtained mean difference was found statistically significant at respectable level of confidence ($t = 12.45 > .01$). Obtained data is confirming the hypothesis.
It is evident from Table - 5.6 that Above Average scorer on Autonomy need pattern were found more assertive than Below Average scorers because they are described as doing what one desires, they make their own decisions, and act without regard to others' thought, they like waiting for others, they find difficulty in following roles, regulations and time limits, they freely express their views about other people, coworkers and superiors, they want to make their own decisions and do conventional things, their decisions and activities do not consider the feelings of those who might be affected, they like to criticise their coworkers and authorities and wish to be free from responsibilities and obligations.

These are the qualities of those individuals who have high score on Autonomy Need pattern, that is why, they were found more assertive while low scorers dislike being made responsible become the cause low assertive tendency among college students.

(vi) Affiliation need pattern and Assertiveness

At the Affiliation need pattern, students belonging to Above Average and Below Average groups appeared to be different on Assertiveness Scale. The respective Mean Assertiveness Score for Above Average and Below Average group of respondent was 30.633 ± 1.079 and 26.76 ± 1.43 respectively (Table - 5.6 Fig.- 5.5). The obtained Mean difference between these two group was found statistically significant (t = 19.76 > .01). So, the present data confirm the hypothesis.
Affiliation is a universal motive, a desire to be associated with or to be in association of another person or persons. The need of affiliation prompts to make friends, joins group and prefer to do things alongwith others rather than doing it alone.

Affiliation between two persons or group of persons, forms the basis in the unanimity of thoughts. Associations, social organizations, clubs are the representation of such need, where some like minded people, having similar thoughts on any matter of social/personal concern come together. However, at times, affiliation is a means to broaden social circle or enhance social reputation and recognition.

Atkinson et.al. (1954) refers it as "a need for social acceptance, interaction, approval and a positive affective relationship with an other person." Mc Clelland (1961) has described that the person having high affiliation tendency, incline towards making close relationships, and they get upset if such relationships are hindered due to any factor. High affiliation needs indicate a person who likes to do things with friends. High scorers dislike being alone or left out. That is why respondents belonging to Above average groups were found more assertive i.e. emotionally honest, direct, self enhancing, expressive and try to achieve the desired goals while the respondents belonging to Below Average groups do not like large groups resulting in non-assertive tendency i.e. emotionally dishonest, self-denying, inhibited and never try to achieve the desired goal
Consequently, they were found irritated, pity and disgusted. Fear, anxiety, and insecurity, have been identified as the resultants of failure of such relations.

Review of literature on Assertiveness emphasizes social support to be a factor which may be closely linked with affiliation need pattern. This may be in the form of close association with any family member, friends, colleagues or even supervisor. Thus, an affiliation or social support with any one of these may help in enhancing assertiveness (Rabin et. al. 2000, Thompson et. al. 2001). This establishes a close link between Affiliation need and Assertive tendency.

(vii) Intraception need pattern and Assertiveness

On the Intraception Need Pattern, Mean Assertiveness Scores of Above Average and Below Average groups were found 29.33 ± 1.364 and 25.60 ± 1.30 respectively. (Table- 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained t value was found statistically significant at respectable level of confidence (t = 11.39 > .01). The result of this investigation confirms the hypothesis.

A close inspection of Table - 5.5 Fig. - 5.6 indicate that respondents belonging to Above Average group on Intraception Need Pattern were found more assertive than Below Average group of students because respondents scoring high on Intraception need pattern have a tendency to analyze the motives, behaviour and feelings of other persons. They observe others
and try to judge the feelings and responses of any individual in a particular situation. They also try to place themselves in other persons' situation and feels the sufferings and pleasures. Since High Intrception scorers tend to analyze the motives of other persons, put themselves in another's shoes and analyze the behaviour of others. High scorers will worry what other thinks. That is why High scorers on Intrception Need pattern were found more assertive than Low scorers. Below average scorers were found comparatively less assertive because they dislike overanalysis and affect, indirect, inhibited, pity, disgusted and allows others to choose for him/her.

The above average scorers on this need pattern, exhibit higher assertiveness as compared to Below Average scorers. This clearly indicates that showing concern for others and understanding the feelings of others gives a satisfaction to the students there by enhancing assertiveness tendency among them. When the identification with other persons increases to an extent and the person help the other person, then it could take positive turn, resulting in increased assertiveness.

**(viii) Succorance Need pattern and Assertiveness**

Mean assertiveness scores of Above Average and Below Average scorers on Succorance Need Pattern showed quite variation. The Below Average scorers were found comparatively more assertive ($M = 28.7 \pm 1.63$) than Above Average scorers ($M = 27.16 \pm 1.41$)
(Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5) and the obtained difference between these two groups was also found statistically significant at respectable level of confidence (t = 3.95 > .01).

Below Average scorers on Succordance Need pattern were found more assertive because they dislike others making a fuss over them, they do not want to get help in times of trouble, get sympathy for others and have others understand their problems (Brown, Chance & Payne 1995). They stand up for their interpersonal rights in such a way that the rights of the other person are not violated. Since they were honest, direct, and able to express their thoughts, feelings and opinions, that is why they were found more assertive than Above Average scorers. Above Average scorers were found less assertive because they wish and seek help from others. They like to get affection from others and support when depressed. They wish that others may support their point of view in their personal and emotional issues. They wish to get noticed and draw full attention when hurt, either physically or emotionally.

However, it is not possible always to get emotional support and sympathy from others. It largely depends on other persons perception of events or things. It is not possible to get reaction on any instance as per one's own desire. This is when the internal conflict arises. Individual starts delineating and thinking that no body is there to share his pain and anguish. This thought of one's being alone, can further act as a precursor of stress, resulting in lesser assertiveness.
(ix) Dominance Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On Dominance Need Pattern, the respective Mean Assertiveness Scores of Above Average and Below Average respondents was $31.93 \pm 1.364$ and $25.53 \pm 1.08$ respectively (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained mean difference 6.40 was found statistically significant at .01 level of significance ($t = 6.08 > .01$). The obtained result is actually supporting the hypothesis.

"High Dominance scorers suggests a person who will try to settle other's arguments, be a leader, and argue for one's point of view. High scorers dislike those persons who defy them" (Brown, Chance & Pyne 1995). High scorers possess dominating tendency tends to be in charge of every body and everything around, starts directing others in their work, and during the whole process, knowledgly or unknowledgly burdens himself he is required to put extra effort and time which may at times lead to the depletion of his own physical, mental and emotional energy reserves. These are the main characteristics of a assertive person. While low scorers on Dominance Need pattern dislike being thurst into control resulting in less assertiveness. Thus, it can be established that Dominance Need pattern and Assertiveness tendency are related factors.
(x) Abasement Need Pattern and Assertiveness

The Above Average scorers, on this need pattern, exhibited a comparatively low Mean Assertiveness score (M = 25.83 ± 1.46) than Below Average scorers (M = 29.73 ± 1.50) (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained mean difference between these groups was found statistically significant at respectable level of significance (t = 10.25 > .01). The result of this investigation confirms the above mentioned hypothesis.

Above average scorers were found comparatively less assertive because they tend to feel guilty on something wrong. At times, they seem to enjoy the pain and misery being suffered. They feel a need for punishment for wrong doing and feel better in they giving in. They feel lots of guilt and are upset by mistakes. They have a self-blaming attitude and like to avoid conflicts and fights and feel the need for confession. They often feel depressed due to inability in handling situations. "They develop a feeling of inferiority to others in most respect and are timid in presence of superiors" (Staub & Pearlnam 2000). That is why they were found less assertive.

(xi) Nurturance Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On Nurturance Need Pattern, Above Average Scorers (M = 28.06 ± 1.34) were found comparatively more assertive than Below Average Scorers (M = 27.4 ± 2.13) but the obtained mean difference was
not found statistically significant \((t = 1.35 > .05)\) (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained result partially support the hypothesis of this study.

A comparative behavioural characteristics of Above Average and Below Average scorers indicate that individuals with high Nurturance tendency are always willing to help friends or others when in trouble. They wish to care for others in trouble. They have positive feelings, kindness and sympathy for the less fortunate or unprivileged persons. "They have tendency to forgive others, do favours and be generous to all" (Brown, Chance & Pyne 1995). They have great deal of affection for others and sympathy for those who wish to confide with any personal problems. Above Average scorers are upset by rejection while Below Average scorers dislike being forced to help someone.

Nurturance is a psychogenic need, which is some what directly related to assertiveness. The individuals having high nurturance tendency are likely to have much more concern not only for their friends, family and acquaintances, but also for clients whom they are to serve. The emotional intensity of involvement with people pushes them for over work that is why, Above Average respondents were found more assertive.

**(xii) Change Need Pattern and Assertiveness**

On this need pattern, the Mean Assertiveness scores of Above Anerage scorers \((M = 31.80 \pm 1.55)\) was greater on Assertiveness Scale
than the Below Average scorers (M = 26.4 ± 1.64). The obtained difference 5.40 was found statistically significant at .01 level of significance (t = 13.17 ± .01) (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The present result confirm and support the hypothesis of this investigation.

Individuals with high inclination for change always look for new and different things. On personal level they love to travel, meet new people and even change their daily routine. They want to experiment new things. Their search for novelty may lead them to change their living place or even country. They keep on their changing jobs and like to eat at different place. They keep pace with the changing fashion and style. That is why the respondents belonging to Above Average group on change need pattern were found more assertive than the respondents of Below Average group.

A student with higher inclination for change is quite likely to affect the assertive tendency of college students. Inclination for change can lead to attraction, motivation and attachment from work, which ultimately results, into high assertive tendency.

(xiii) Endurance Need Pattern and Assertiveness

The mean Assertiveness scores of Above average and Below average groups was 30.57 ± 1.89 and 27.13 ± 1.76 respectively (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained mean difference was found statistically
significant at respectable level of significance (t = 7.31 > .01). The result of this investigation conforming the hypothesis.

Persons with high endurance stick to their job untill finished. They work hard at a job, a puzzle or a problem till finished. Leaving a job unfinished makes them restless (Brown, Chance & Payne 1995). They like to do any work single-handedly, can stay at work for long hours without any distraction. They do not like to be interrupted at work. That is why they were found more assertive. While Below Average scorers are upset by having to work long hours requiring continious effort.

Endurance as a pschogenic need is much likely to affect an individual in student life. Assertive tendency develops in high pressure environment. An individuals tendency to work for a cause till accomplishment can lead to high assertive tendency among respondents. Thus, it can be established that Endurance and Assertive tendency are closely related to each other.

(xiv) Heterosexuality Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On Hetersexuality Need Pattern, the Mean Assertiveness scores of Above Average and Below Average scorers (30.00 ± 1.43) and 26.33 ± 1.75 respectively indicating high assertive tendency among Above Average respondents (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). The obtained mean difference was found statistically significant at .01 level of significance (t = 8.95 > .01). Obtained laboratry support is confirming the hypothesis.
Heterosexuality is a psychogenic need which reflects the inclination of an individual to go out with the members of opposite sex, engage in social activities, feel attraction and have friendships with opposite sex. Such persons also seek physical appraisal by an individual of opposite sex. "High scorers are upset by being ignored and being unpopular" (Brown, Chance & Pyne 1995). They feel ease and comfort when working with members of opposite sex. This is the reason that Above Average group was found more assertive than below average group because Below Average scorers are upset by too much attention. That is why Above Average scorer was found more assertive.

Heterosexuality as a factor is related to high scorers. Too much inclination or orientation towards opposite sex is a psychogenic need, which is very innate. It mostly resider as a hidden desire in individuals that helps in the development of assertive tendency. Extreme inclination, at times can lead to high assertiveness.

(xv) Aggression Need Pattern and Assertiveness

On Aggression need, the mean Assertiveness score of Above Average and Below Average respondents was 25.63 ± 1.07 and 25.9 ± 1.44 respectively (Table - 5.6 Fig. - 5.5). Both groups have obtained almost equal mean scores. That is why obtained mean difference was not found statistically significant at any respectable level of significance (t = 00.82 < .05).
The data obtained on Assertiveness Scale by Above Average and Below Average scorers partially contradicts the hypothesis of this study.

Finally, "Aggression subtest assesses the tendency to attack contrary viewpoints, tells others about what he thinks of them and tells others off when disagreeing with them" (Brown, Chanace & Pyne 1995). Meaning thereby that high scorers are upset by people who disagree or act with differing values. Such individuals try to take the revenge of any result or harm done to them, after any period of time. They get angry easily and blame others when things go wrong such persons like reading news or text related to violence. "While low scorers are intimidated by conflict and often are nonassertive" (Brown, Chance & Pyne 1995). That is why the respondents belonging to Below average group on Aggression need pattern were found non-assertive.

Psychologists have explained Aggression in different terms. Dollard et al. has called it as under action whose reaction can be fatal for the other person. Aggression has been studied in reference to a number of psychological variables, like age (Rosenberg 1977; Rahman & Rafat 1976), behaviour (Lawrey et.al. 1947), punishment from parents (Mc Cord et.al. 1961), socioeconomic status (Flack 1959; Sand et.al. 1973), low mental status (Swatantra 1971), and certain depressive symptoms like anxiety, worry, frustration and emotional unstability (Bandura 1971).
Thus, it may be concluded that being associated with a number of socio-psychological variables, Aggression is linked with Assertiveness also. An aggressive individual is likely to have difference of opinion and conflict with other persons or the prevailing situations in achieving the goal. This dissatisfaction and non-coherence with others is likely to develop assertive tendency among the respondents.

Thus, it may be concluded that is Psychogenic Needs are associated with an individual, in a direct or indirect manner, and affects the Assertive tendency of college students.

(iii) Attitude toward Risk Taking and Assertiveness

_Hypothesis_

*Variation in attitude towards risk taking would cause variation in assertiveness.*

It is evident from Table - 5.7 and Fig. - 5.6 that High, Moderate and Non-Risk Taking groups have obtained different mean scores i.e. $36.00 \pm 1.707$, $32.4 \pm 1.76$ and $28.5 \pm 1.61$ respectively and the obtained t values between these three groups were also found statistically significant at respectable level of significance (Table 5.9). Thus, our result confirms our hypothesis.
Many of the researches have been conducted with regard to the phenomenon of risk taking, little emphasis has been given on the characteristics of the risk taker. It seems that personality of the risk takers has gone in the background. It does mean that light has not been thrown on the side but it needs due attention. Consequently, the present study was designed to investigate what characteristics one has developed is more important to be explored for understanding the impact of risk taking on behavioural characteristics (assertiveness) of college students. It was expected that characteristics of High, Moderate and Nonrisktakers would cause variation in their assertive tendencies. Thus, the study was designed to observe the influence of attitude towards risk taking on assertive tendency of collegiates.

The result can be explained in terms assertiveness that positive relationship was found between these two variables of psychological importance i.e. attitude towards risk taking and assertiveness because High, Moderate and Non-risk Taking group of respondents have obtained 36.00, 32.4 and 28.5 mean values respectively on Assertiveness scale (Table - 5.7 Fig. - 5.6).

A major finding of the study was that assertive tendency varied significantly between High, Moderate and Non-takers. High Risk Takers were found comparatively more assertive than Non Risk Takers because they perceive their role as one of willingness, to be bold and daring, and thus while taking decision being inforced by interaction with other they are
suppored to take more risks. It may be concluded that risk taking has systematic influence over assertiveness. This expectation has been highly confirmed in the present study.

The present study reveals the fact that assertive tendency was dependent of risk taking predisposition. The finding showed that the two variable namely, risk taking and assertiveness are dependent.


Risk taking behaviour is a voluntary participation in behaviours that contain, or at least seen to contain, significant degree of risk. People adopt different approaches to risk, their "risk orientation" and these are three different risk taking types, namely, risk avoiders' (who avoid activities due to risk), "risk reducers" (who participate in high risk activities in spite of the risks involved and the "risk optimizers", (who participate in high risk taking activities partly because of risk involved). The figure below illestrates how risk orientation and level of perceived risk may interact to determine the overall acceptability.
In theory people may move between different approaches to risk, although existing evidence suggests that risk taking is a personality trait, and as such people's attitudes to risk are predicted to be reasonably stable over time.
A considerable amount of research supports the idea that individuals who take risks tend to be high in the assertive tendency a constituent of the personality traits.

A number of studies have suggested that people who participate in high risk activities tend to be high in the Sensation Seeking trait, which supports the hypothesis that people take risks because they want to have new and exciting experiences (Llewellyn 2003).