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Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between the assertiveness levels and self-concept, self-concept educational objectives and career decision making of African graduate students at Atlanta University.

Significance of the Study

The study is significant in that the findings have the potential for sensitizing non-African investigators to the effects of cultural differences. It is anticipated that the outcome of this investigation will provide specific contributions to the areas of counseling, guidance and student personnel services.

Hypotheses

The seven null hypotheses were tested. The first two indicated that there is no statistically significant difference (a) between the self-concept of high and low assertive students, and (b) between the career decision making of high and low assertive students. The last five indicated that there is no statistically significant difference (a) between the educational objectives of high and low assertive students, (b) between choices of majors at the undergraduate or graduate levels of high and low assertive students, (c) between change of majors for the
high and low assertive students, (d) between the change of majors resulting from the awareness of existing fields of studies of high and low assertive students, and (e) between the conflict expectation of result of changes in major of high and low assertive subjects.

Method and Procedure

The research design was inferential, involving sets of scores from a sample population. Forty-eight students were selected by a stratified random sampling approach involving the administration of the College Self-Expression Scale. The groups for this study were administered the following instruments: (1) Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, (2) Career Decision Scale, and (3) the researcher's questionnaire measuring educational objectives.

Conclusion

The findings derived from an analysis of the data produced by this study seem to warrant the following conclusions:

1. A majority of African male graduate students showed a high level of assertiveness.

2. Those African graduate students that exhibit high levels of assertiveness also possessed high self concepts.

3. African graduate students in general tended to be undecided when making a career decision.

4. The majority of African graduate students possessed the motivation for higher education.
5. The high assertive African graduate students made their choice of major mostly at the undergraduate levels.

6. The majority of African graduate students with low assertive levels tended to change their major more often.

7. A greater number of African graduate students that changed their major did not change because of better awareness of the diversities of the educational fields.

8. A greater number of the African graduate students that had changed their major course of studies, expressed an anticipation of conflict between their desired course of study and that anticipated by their sponsors in their home countries.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The advent of industrialization has had a noticeable impact on the traditional cultural pattern of most African countries. The quest for knowledge has made it necessary for many individuals to travel abroad to acquire different experiences seen as valuable parts of their desire to keep pace with developing world technology.

The researcher, as an African and graduate student, has observed that many of his fellow countrymen experience culture patterns that are incompatible with those of their own country. This incompatibility sometimes results in frustration, confusion and social withdrawal for these students. A substantial number of these students is not sufficiently aware of their personal rights, especially during their college years.

Many of these students, when confronted with situations involving other people who are violating their rights, tend to respond either in a passive or aggressive manner rather than in a more socially appropriate manner that will achieve the desired results.

 Assertion is a hypothetical construct that has different meanings when viewed in a cross-cultural perspective. As a personality trait, assertiveness seems culturally
induced. Alberti and Emmons state that,

> It is important to note that assertiveness is person and situation-specific, not universal. Culture or ethnic background, for example, may create an entirely different set of personal circumstances, which change the nature of 'appropriateness' in assertive behavior.¹

Assertiveness, when viewed as a personal attribute, is admired and encouraged in dominant American culture; but not in traditional African culture.

When thoroughly scrutinized, there may also be a sharp contrast between the cultural pattern experienced in the family, educational setting and personal freedom in American and traditional African culture. These differences may be seen in parent-child relationships, student-teacher relationships, and family desire--individual decision-making processes.

In traditional African culture, family structure is hierarchical as well as male-dominated. Age takes precedence over youth. Decisions are usually made with little or no input from the young. Passive acceptance of decisions made by the family, elders or an authority figure is unquestionably accepted by the offspring. This unquestionable acceptance tends to influence the African individual's self-concept, pursuit of an educational objective and career choices at home and abroad. An

attempt to be openly assertive may be regarded as insulting or aggressive.

Donald Cheek concluded that,

Social-cultural context must be taken into account in classifying behavior as assertive or non-assertive. A culture which regards honoring one's elders as one of its ultimate values may view certain individual requests as being clearly out of line and aggressive (regardless of the behavior, response, or intent). ¹

There are many African students studying abroad. Most of them have spent many years in pursuit of their educational goals. Acculturation may not be viewed as total abandonment of one's traditional culture. A noticeable change may exist in the assertiveness and non-assertiveness levels of these students upon the attainment of their baccalaureate degrees. The research question, as conceptualized by the investigator, is: To what extent are self-concept, educational objectives and career decision-making influenced by an African graduate student's assertiveness level.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the difference and correlation between the assertiveness level, self-concept, educational objectives, and career decision-making of African graduate students at Atlanta University.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were operationally tested in implementing the study. The .05 level of significance served as the criterion for rejecting the following null hypotheses:

1\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between the means of the self-concept levels of high and low assertive students.

2\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between mean levels of career decision-making of high and low assertive students.

3\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between the educational objective levels of high and low assertive students.

4\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between the choices of major at the undergraduate and graduate levels of high and low assertive students.

5\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between change in major and level of assertiveness of high and low assertive students.

6\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between change of major and better awareness of existing fields of studies, for high and low assertive students.

7\(H_0\): There is no statistically significant difference between the change of major and conflict expectation from the sponsors of high and low assertive students.
Significance of Study

It is expected that the results of this study will contribute to the existing body of research on African students' behaviors and will also increase the sensitivity of non-African investigators to the effects of cultural differences. It is anticipated that the outcomes of this investigation will provide specific contributions to the areas of counseling, guidance and student personnel service as follows:

1. Provide basic information that can be used in designing workshops to deal with assertiveness among African and other international student populations on college and university campuses.

2. Provide information to assist Black American students in understanding assertive behavior and some of the components of interpersonal relationships relating to African students.

3. Enhance interpersonal relationships across cultural lines.

4. Contribute to the body of knowledge relative to the personal conflicts of international students in general and African students in particular.

Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were made in carrying out this study:

1. that traditional African culture has not changed much and assertiveness is still not regarded as part of the culture.
2. that the influence of family and significant other groups still affects the decision making of the African graduate student.

3. that the level of assertiveness of African students was lower than that of students in Western cultures.

4. that the influences of assertiveness on self-concept, educational objectives and career decision making adequately represent African students in general.

5. that the attainment of a baccalaureate degree may have had an impact on the assertiveness level of African students.

Evolution of the Problem

Many Africans in positions of responsibility obtained much of their education as a result of the financial sacrifice made by their parents, relatives, government, villagers, and townsmen. This financial sacrifice influences the individual's decision-making process and career choice to a considerable extent. Importantly, traditional African culture stresses responsibility to the group.

For the African, the growth of individualism is probably the most prominent of social changes that has been brought about from contrast with Western culture. However, for him, the individual personality is rather remote. Since acculturation does not lead to a total deviation from the original culture, African students, despite the number of years spent abroad, still exhibit, to some extent, their traditional cultural ways of life.
The concept of self expression creates confusion for many African students for whom the Western style of individualism may be viewed as rewarding in the context of individual freedom. Chinua Achebe narrated the conflict between a young man and his townsmen. The young man was sent overseas to study law to help in settling a land dispute between his townsmen and a nearby village. However, the man arrived home, not with a law degree, but an English degree. To the young man, he was being assertive in making his personal choice of education and career goal, but to those in his African traditional culture, he had failed for not conforming.¹

Many African students face this dilemma when studying abroad. Specifically, while certain factors inherent in African culture influence behavior relative to assertiveness and decision making, there are, at the same time, conflicting patterns operating in American culture which tend to promote views of Africans as docile. This, in turn, may result in the development of a negative self-concept, on the part of the student, and further stereotyping on the part of others.

Oftentimes, an African student may react in an irrational manner, sometimes appearing overly aggressive,

while assuming that he is being appropriately assertive. To be accepted means to conform to the alien culture and many Africans choose not to do this. Consequently, many have dropped out of Western schools, changed from school to school, and constantly changed their career goals. Many institutions lack adequate facilities and personnel to assist African students in dealing with assertiveness.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms have been operationally defined as they were used in the study.

1. **Career Decision Scale**—total scores made on the Career Decision Scale.
2. **Educational objectives**—an indication of educational major and its intended level of accomplishment.
3. **Level of assertiveness**—total score made on the College Self-Expression Scale.
4. **Relationship**—the correlations between variables.
5. **High level of assertiveness**—scores above one-half standard deviation on the normal curve.
6. **Low level of assertiveness**—scores below one-half standard deviation on the normal curve.

**Limitations**

The following limitations were inherent in this study:

1. All subjects were African graduate male students in Atlanta University. Any generalizations made from findings should be limited to similar populations and similar settings.
2. When working with the personality of human subjects, time and situational factors should be taken into consideration.

3. Since assertiveness is a learned behavior, it was recognized that the assertiveness level can change over time.

5. Since some of the instruments employed in this study are of a self-report nature, the accuracy of the data will, of necessity, reflect the honesty and recollection of the respondents.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

This survey of related literature will be inconclusive if certain variables, that influence an individual's behavior, are overlooked. The etiology of the influencing factors cannot be determined if the inter-relationships of the different factors are ignored.

In reviewing the literature concerning the impact of assertiveness, it should be remembered that assertiveness is a hypothetical construct which has an observable behavioral attribute as its main point of focus. This attribute can be seen as a form of expressive and adaptive components.

In comparing expressive and adaptive components, Allport states:

The expressive portion of conduct results, from deep-lying determinants, functioning, as a rule, unconsciously and without effort. The adaptive portion, on the other hand, is a more limited system, circumscribed by the purpose of the moment, closely dependent upon the stimulus and upon voluntary effort or upon habits of skill. The reason for a present act of conduct is to be sought in the present desire and intentions of the individual (though these in turn may arise from deep-lying personal traits and interests);
but the style of execution is always guided directly and without interference by deep lasting personal dispositions.

To have a broad conceptualization of both the subjects and the variables, this survey of related literature is discussed under the following headings: 1) Traditional African culture, socio-cultural perspective and the advent of technology; 2) Acculturation and modes of interaction of African students in the U.S.; 3) Concept of assertiveness; 4) Self-concept; 5) Educational objectives; and 6) Career decision-making.

Traditional African Culture, Socio-Cultural Perspectives and the Advent of Technology

In order to understand the traditional African culture, child-rearing practices and the influence of the family will be emphasized. An influence, at a certain time which has a long-lasting effect on the individual writing about the African family system, Mbiti observed that the family in Africa is broad-based and includes uncles, aunts, distant cousins and even the departed relatives whom he designated as the "living dead." The "living dead" is considered alive in the memories of the living, though he/she is accepted to be dead, he/she is believed to be still interested in the affairs of the family to which he/she had belonged in his/her physical life. 

Nkosi, in 1976,

---


concluded that the African extended family is often seen by its members as a large cocoon which develops the individual in the soft warmth of fraternal love and care and which develops in them a network of social duties and responsibilities as well as material expectations and communal safeguards.\footnote{L. Nkosi, "The Extended African Family," \textit{African Women} 5 (July/August 1976): 50-51.}

In 1934, Brooks and Vandenbosch observed that, in the task of child rearing, the extended African family sanctions are imposed which induce discipline, obedience to authority, respect for elders, and respect for the law of the land.\footnote{E. Brooks and A. Vandenbosch, \textit{The City of God and the City of Man in Africa} (Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1964), pp. 120-125.}

Bloom concluded, in his 1976 study, that Africans are, traditionally, their brothers' keepers; and, in a way, that they are much weaker in the Urban West and that this intense community life, with a relatively close circle, enriches a sensitivity of group sentiments and group orientation.\footnote{Leonard Bloom, "Psychology and Higher Education in Africa: Problems and Impressions," \textit{African Social Research} 22 (December 1976): 131-140.} Bantlett, in 1970, referred to this group sensitivity in his pioneering Psychology and Primitive Culture as "primitive social comradeship." He went further to comment that there are few Africans who would deny that there are individual differences among Africans, as among other peoples, but it is more difficult to contract out emotionally from a small,
closed community than from a large, open one. He further observed that it was still more difficult to express an individualistic point of view with a community in which the affective pressure of kin makes it difficult to stand apart from one's society as an observer.

In consideration of the impact of technology on the African tradition, Kingley noted that the cultural values and orientations exert selective influences on specific cognitive and perceptual skills transmitted to individuals through socialization processes, and these may differ in some rather fundamental ways between Western and African traditional societies which are of direct relevance to issues of technology.

Bruner, in his discussion of the evolution of educability, contends that there are accelerating trends towards the cognitive isolation of one generation from the next because of the educational differences between them that arise from changing socio-technological needs. That, in the West, changing socio-technologies are seen to have market research history and the speed and the impermeability of the self-sealing of the generations has occasioned alarm.

---


Bloom, in 1976, observed a similar process to be happening in much contemporary Africa, where the varieties of self-sealing included the more from the less educated, urban from rural, industrialized from non-industrialized, and those who retain traditional religious beliefs from those who have adopted other belief and value systems.¹

Kelvin, in 1971, argued that the fundamental purpose of socialization is to shape behavior so that individuals are predictable to other individuals in specific situations.²

Bloom, in 1982, studied the socialization and dependency among the Igbo people of East-Central Nigeria. A sample of 91, divided into a more and a less educated subsample, was asked to give its views about socialization practices relating to dependence. He found that the more educated favored earlier independence, and less punitive and less conformity-producing modes of training and discipline. He concluded that, in a rapidly changing society like Nigeria, where the traditional practices of socialization are challenged by new norms, one will expect to find inconsistencies in socialization. While, on the other hand, there is the theme of approval of conformity to traditional norms and


the persistence of traditional authoritarian socialization policies; on the other, there is an inconsistent approval of practice to encourage the child to escape from traditional control into independence in a modern economic world.¹

Olukayode, in 1982, reported that the highly educated individual in Africa is more like his American upper middle-class counterpart in his general view of life and in his being less subjected to the influence of the extended family. He contended that, in contrast, the illiterate and those with minimal formal education are, in general, deeply steeped in traditional African culture characterized by strong reliance on the extended family and belief in a supernatural phenomenon. He went further to express the notion that most educated Africans share many of the attitudes and values of upper middle-class Europeans and Americans, but that they are still under considerable influence of the extended family, and share, although less intensely, many of the traditional beliefs of their less educated fellow Africans.²

Problems and Needs

One of the earliest studies on the problems of African students, as a whole, was the Survey of African Students Studying in the United States. They were estimated at 250.


The objective of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the individual student's problems and needs. The study seems to have a pitfall of generalizing the findings from a relatively small sample that was widely dispersed. One of the variables overlooked in the study was the institutes where the students had been enrolled.¹

Furthermore, Davis et al. conducted a survey of African students. The sample included 999 African students. The initial problems were found to be communication, food and adjusting to a new way of life. Even though finances were a problem, he could not find any relationship between finance and grades. Discrimination was experienced by 77 percent since in his study, the self-report, by the students, was a relation of the problems of other foreign students and not the American students, or the perception of their problems, per se.²

Wetzel, in 1974, also studied the academic needs of African students at the University of Illinois. The items for the instrument were developed from statements of concern regarding the needs and problems of the students being studied. One of his findings was that neither environmental orientation nor length of academic or professional experience


was a factor contributing to variability in attitudes of African students toward the items of need. He concluded that programs of study, pursued by African students at the University of Illinois, are often not applicable to African situations.¹

In 1975, Han examined the goals and problems of foreign graduate students from the Far East at the University of Southern California. The subjects were 118 foreign graduate students enrolled in the Spring semester at the University in 1974. This information was gathered through a questionnaire. He found that the important goals of foreign students included acquiring skills and knowledge in their major fields and improving career opportunities at home. He also found out that foreign graduate students from the Far East encounter some major problems with the English language, classroom discussions, writing term papers and making American friends.²

Acculturation and the Modes of Interaction

Malik, in 1981, through a variety of methods, made a comparison of twenty African and twenty American graduate


²Eui Pyung Han, "A Study of Goals and Problems of Foreign Students from the Far East at the University of Southern California" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1975), p. 19.
students in the United States on three psychological dimensions, namely, tolerance or openness to new experiences, internal control and modernity.

The problem of the study was to determine the manner and extent to which educated Africans, as non-Westerners, acquired the three traits. He found that educated Africans are modernized, not in terms of the relevant values, but in terms of a single manifestation of those values, namely, materialism.¹

The effects of selected cultural and environmental factors on the social and academic adjustment of African students in the United States' universities were observed by Ekaiko in 1981. The subjects were 161 African students in Michigan universities. He found the following: (1) communication affects the academic adjustment of African students, (2) climate seems to affect either the social or the academic adjustments of African students, (3) communication, climate and housing, all combined seem to have a significant effect only on the academic adjustment and not on the social adjustment of African students, (4) alienation from the American culture due to African students' association with their fellow countrymen and other foreign

students, and (5) an upward pattern exists in the academic adjustment of African students.¹

Another study, to explore the patterns of communication activities and personal adjustment among American and foreign students, was conducted by Snipies, in 1969. He worked with 1,112 students at Indiana University. He obtained scores on sixteen personality factors using the Sixteen Personality Factor Test (16PF) Forms A and B. He also used a communication questionnaire, prepared by him, for data on the amount of time devoted to printed and broadcast media, social-personal and social-nonpersonal communications. There was no significant pattern emerging between adjustment and communication behavior for the group studied.²

Tuso, in 1981, surveyed the experience of African graduate students at Michigan State University. Some of his findings, in a questionnaire answered by 96 African graduate students, include the following: (1) that the adviser and the graduate students played key roles in the development of the individualized academic program; (2) that the students expressed difficulties with quizzes and
d


objective questions; (3) that the students expressed some amount of difficulties in written theses and dissertations; and (4) that the quality of interaction between the Africans and advisers in academic-related matters was high, but more moderate with other professors.¹

Another study, in 1975, was that of Essien, who compared the social relations of male Nigerian students with those of Black and White male students. The data for the study were collected from 160 male Nigerian students. The instrument used was the Essien Cultural Understanding Questionnaire (ECUQ). He found that the majority of the subjects did not interact adequately with Americans in various social situations, but the subjects interacted more with black Americans than with the white Americans.²

Koo, in 1961, investigated the attitudes of American students toward foreign students. Some of his findings, in a questionnaire answered by 212 students of Michigan State, include the following: (1) that the American students at Michigan State University did not avoid foreign students and they sought opportunity to know them, and (2) that


American students usually become more interested in some specific foreign countries after knowing students from these countries.¹

Another study was done by Khimulu, in 1981, who investigated the social and academic adjustment to the United States' experience of East African students who were pursuing academic programs. The data for the study were collected from 108 East African students in colleges and universities in San Diego, Los Angeles and San Francisco, using a survey questionnaire method.

Some of the findings include the following: (1) that the major non-academic problems were: food and eating habits, communication expenses, and the American lifestyle; (2) that the lack of African cultural understanding by most professors and American students and taking multiple choice exams were the major academic problems; (3) that most students gained both education and general experiences in the United States, and matured intellectually and socially; (4) that most of the students preferred their African way of life even after they had been in the U.S.A. for some time; and (5) that most of the students looked to their professors as models because of the professors' prestige and their

¹Mary Koo, "American Students’ Contact With and Attitudes Towards Foreign Students" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962), p. 129.
willingness to help students in class and outside the class.¹

Concept of Assertiveness

In 1978, Alberti and Emmons stated

Behavior which enables a person to act in his own best interest, to stand up for her or himself without undue anxiety to express honest feelings comfortably or to exercise personal rights without denying the rights of others we call assertive behavior.²

Some writers claim that, special assertive behavior is composed of identifiable verbal and nonverbal components (Alberti and Emmons;³ Eisler, Miller and Hesson;⁴ Rathers and Ruppert⁵).

In 1979, Furnham suggested that the concept of assertiveness is culture bound and particularly North Americans. That, in many other cultures, asserting oneself


³Ibid.


in the way that is normative is neither encouraged nor tolerated. Humility, subservience and tolerance are valued above assertiveness in many other cultures, especially for women. Furthermore, the assertiveness is not necessarily a sign of inadequacy or anxiety though it may be in some instances. To test his assumption, he conducted a study to determine the possible difference of assertiveness in three cultures and the multi-dimensionality of the concept of assertiveness in each culture.

He formed two hypotheses (1) that there would be significant differences in assertiveness in the two groups. That the African nurses would have less assertiveness than Indian nurses because of the role of women in their societies, and (2) that factor analysis will reveal not only that the assertiveness measure was multidimensional but that each different factor was an indication of difficulty with different situations. The Wolfe Lazarus assertiveness scale was administered to three groups of nurses (N = 108)—African, Indian and European, who were matched in terms of age, sex, education, occupation and language competence.

The result supported the hypothesis. Europeans expressed less difficulties in assertiveness, Indians were least assertive and Africans between the two. It was also found that a number of different factors emerged in each group. He concluded that lack of assertiveness might not be a sign of mental disorder rather a successful way of coping, or an imposed interpersonal communication style;
there is the multidimensionality of the concept of assertiveness which is linked to situation-specific nature of assertiveness; and that normal adults (as well as psychiatric patients and students) should be used as subjects in the study on assertiveness.¹

Eisler and others, in 1975, investigated the situational determinant of assertiveness behavior. The subjects were sixty psychiatric patients. The Wolfe-Lazarus assertiveness scale was administered to the patients after watching videotape. He found that unfamiliar individuals, particularly in positive contexts, elicited greater assertiveness than familiar persons which may be a function of the sociocultural characteristics of the patients. The results also supported a stimulus-specific theory which stated that an individual who is assertive in one interpersonal contest may not be assertive in a different interpersonal environment.²

Kelly and others, in 1982, conducted a study on the interpersonal reactions to assertive and unassertive styles when handling social conflict situations. Two hundred and seventeen students observed videotapes which showed a model handling several social conflict situations in either an assertive or an unassertive man. Subjects completed a 26 item adjective checklist to evaluate the personality of the

model they observed. Results indicated that (1) assertive models were viewed as skilled and able in their handling of the portrayed social conflict situations, and (2) they were rated less unfavorable than unassertive models on fourteen adjectives assessing likeability.\(^1\)

A personal characteristic of interest is the race of the assertive individual. Cheek, in 1976, suggested that blacks who behave in an assertive manner will elicit more negative reactions than would a white individual who acted in the same manner.\(^2\)

Mkhize, in 1982, suggested that it is apparent in traditional African culture, that authority is closely linked to age and sex, and communications is frequently ritualized in a pattern unfamiliar to white therapists. He further pointed out that assertive training can be undertaken with relatively traditional black clients; but should always be geared to channels appropriate in that community.\(^3\)


In 1968, Gordon and Gergen, noted that there were more than 2,000 publications on self-concept and this, largely Western, research has since continued at a vigorous pace. Authoritys in this area have offered many definitions of self-concept. Each has been so different that a strain of similarity cannot be noticeable.

The first American psychologist acknowledged as having attempted to define and construct a theory on self-concept was William James. James' view is that:

A man's self, in its widest possible sense, is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his beliefs and his psychic powers, but his cloths (sic) and his house, his wife, and his children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his hands and horses and yacht and bank account... The self in this wide sense is composed of three parts: (1) its constituents, (2) the feelings and emotions they arouse... self-feelings, and (3) the actions to which they prompt, self-seeking and self-preservation.  

It would appear that, for James, a person's self-concept could be enhanced proportionately to his material possessions as well as to his cultural heritage. James' definition also suggests a process of socialization. Such a process would require seeing one's image in the eyes of others.

In 1959, Cooley called this the "Looking Glass Self."

---


Each to each a looking-glass
Reflects the other that doth pass.
A self idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification.¹

The present study was undertaken in the belief that "the other person" to whom Cooley refers should be someone who is really significant simply because he may be a member of the dominant society.

The psychologist, Helge Ludholm, viewed the self as an object of awareness which changed as the individual interacted with other human beings in the pursuit of his life goals. He made a distinction between the objective self and the subjective self by defining the subjective self as what a person thinks himself to be, as the self known to the individual, and the objective self as the self as known directly through acquaintances and relationships with others.²

Snygg and Combs label the total self, as experienced by the individual, the "phenomenal self." This phenomenal self is the self as observed, experienced, and judged by the individual himself. This is the self of which he is aware.

The sum total of all these awarenesses or perceptions in his image of himself—his self-concept.\(^1\)

Rogers described the self-concept as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which is admissible to awareness. This is composed of such elements as the perception of one's characteristics and abilities, the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and as associated with experiences and objects, and goals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence.\(^2\)

Super, in 1963, concluded that the self-concept is a product of the interaction of inherited aptitudes, neural endocrine makeup, opportunity to play various roles and evaluations of the extent to which the results of the role playing meet with the approval of superiors. He recognized a self-concept system which he sees as a constellation, more or less well organized, all of self-concepts.\(^3\)

**Development of Self Concept**

The self-concept arises through the individual's interactions with other members of society—parents, teachers and other representatives of society's institutions. Mead,

---


\(^3\) Donald Super, Career Development: Self-Concept Theory (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963), p. 29.
in 1934, noted that the child learns to assume the roles and attitudes of others with whom he interacts, a posture having significance not only for how he responds to others, but also for how to react to himself. The continuity of the self derives from the collection of attitudes of the society, or "generalized others", as Mead calls it. The individual's sense of self is developed, molded and controlled by his assuming the attitudes and definitions of others toward him.¹

According to Kinch, "the individual's conception of himself emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual."²

Smith comments that "The process of emergence of an individual's self concept is a slow one. From interactions with others and from his total perceptual field of experience, the individual gradually begins to differentiate a portion called the self."³

A study by Fu and others, in 1980, was conducted to examine the self-concept of Euro-American, Afro-American and Mexican-American preadolescent girls from middle- and lower-income families. It was hypothesized that the achievement


³Elsie Smith, Counseling the Culturally Different Black Youth (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Co., 1973), p. 42.
in actualizing role taking abilities, may induce modifications in a child's self-concept, for self-concept is dependent upon one's own feelings, perceptions and recognition of how one has been dealt with by others.¹

A Self-concept Self-Report Scale was administered to 432 preadolescent girls from six southern states (Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia). It was found that both ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds exert varying degrees of influence on self-concept ratings. The middle-income girls scored significantly higher than the low-income ones. The middle-income Europeans scored significantly higher in the self-concept ratings than their Mexican-American counterparts. No significant differences were reported between the ratings of the lower-income girls from the three ethnic groups. It was concluded that the differences may be due to the socio-cultural environment rather than accessibility of opportunities with each group.²

In 1981, Jegede and Bamgboye conducted a study designed to assess the contribution of several factors to the development of self-concept. A 52 item general questionnaire was administered to 375 boys and 380 girls from randomly selected schools in Oyo State in Nigeria. The questionnaire covered demographical data, health, and other characteristics.


²The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, p. 9.
They found that (1) biological factors were important in the development of self-concept, (2) social factors were seen as important correlations to self-concept, (3) urban residence may have a more positive association with self-concept than rural residence because, generally, poor living conditions are found in the areas of Nigeria, (4) that intellectual maturity is positively correlated to self-concept, and (5) that age and sex contribute to variation in self-concept.\(^1\)

Jegede, in 1982, conducted a study to determine the contribution of a variety of pertinent psychological, social, biological and physical variables to self-concept development by using a cross-section approach. The Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale and a 47 item general questionnaire were administered in class to 1380 (552 girls and 828 boys) secondary school students in Ibanda, Nigeria. The following are the findings from the study: (1) there is a non-linear association between age and self-concept, (2) that ages 16 and 17 are the periods of disturbance in self-concept, (3) sex difference may be due to the position of women in the society, (4) students from non-elite schools had higher self-concept scores than students from elite schools, (5) having friends increases one's positive self-evaluation thereby producing higher self-concept scores, (6) students

with low self-concept are likely to have difficulty with class work and coping with others, (7) poor health interfered with self-concept, (8) self-concept bears a relationship to the onset of the menarche among girls, and (9) biological factors are of much importance of self-concept formation.¹

In 1976, Demoze tried to determine the commonalities and differences of self-concept and personality characteristics of foreign students to their regions of origins. An Adjective Checklist (ACL) was administered to a sample of 500 foreign students enrolled at ten colleges and universities in the state of Wisconsin. Some findings include: (1) the African student appeared to describe himself as being more self-confident and more socially oriented and less individualistic; (2) the Europeans, near and Middle Eastern, South and Central American students were also found to show similar profiles, and (3) the Far Eastern student was found to perceive himself as being more individualistic and indifferent in his relationship with others.²

Backman et al. manipulated ratings given to subjects. Their study suggests one certain determinant of self-evaluation, as well as some factors that may be relevant in


deciding which individuals became significant others who affect self evaluation. Subjects were college students who rated themselves on personality items. They were told how close friends and relatives would rate them on the same items. They filled out personality measurement scales, which they were told would be scored for them by a "professional psychologist" to give them objective information. The "objective information" actually included attempts to alter their self-concept on certain personality items. The major results were that subjects changed their self-ranking as a result of the manipulated reports and that they change the low consensus needs (those which the friends do not agree on) more than they change the high consensus needs. These findings are particularly significant to this study, for they suggest that individuals are more likely to change their opinions of self to coincide with the opinions of others.¹

Festinger developed a theory about attitudes and their changes from which have come some interesting studies whose findings have been applied to self-concept changes. He maintains that when inconsistent perceptions are held by a person, either about himself or about his environment, he is placed in a state of tension which he calls

"psychological dissonance." McCandless, in commenting on this theory states:

This is an uncomfortable state of affairs, which an individual attempts to alleviate or dissipate by bringing his cognitions closer together (reducing the ratio of inconsistent to consistent cognitions). Plausible evidence has been reviewed which indicates that individuals with high self-ideal discrepancies are uncomfortable people who may be struggling to get their self-concepts and ideal self-concepts more in line with each other; and that improvement in self-concept is regarded, at least by some, as an indication of increased personal comfort and happiness. Certainly, much of counseling and psychotherapy has a goal improvement in self-concept, reduction in self-ideal discrepancy, and reduction of confusion and conflict in self-concept.2

A study by Fitts and Bell provides evidence of the stability of the self-concept. Profile patterns on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for Black nursing students were compared over time intervals up to eighteen months. Individual students showed changes during this critical period in their lives, but the profile configurations which were unique to each individual were highly consistent.3

---


Fitts states, "The person's environment is constantly shifting and changing, but the self-concept is relatively stable."¹

Measuring the Self-Concept

If we attempt to measure what a person sees when he looks at himself we must consider at least two variables. The specific content of the self is one variable. The value or esteem which he places on his perception is another variable. Lecky emphasizes consistency over time, or stability.² Erickson made the assumption that self-definition is accomplished in two ways: affirmation of what one is and denial or rejection of what one is not.³ Toffler, in taking a look at the future and the accelerating pace in our lives, speaks of "serial selves"—the series of different selves which we develop and discard in adaptation to a rapidly changing world.⁴

In discussing measurement of the self-concept, McCandless points out that for any idea to be useful in science, the idea must have an objective referent, that is, there must be a way of measuring it. There have been many instruments


designed to measure the self-concept. Wylie reports two hundred up to 1959. All of the measurements include the idea of desirability and the undesirability which may be evaluated according to some abstract social norms or in terms of the evaluations of the subjects themselves. In most measures of the self-concept, several terms, for example, traits, values, or characteristics are presented to the subjects. In some instances, adjectives are listed and the subjects are asked to estimate the degree to which each term applies to them. Ratings may be from "very much like me" to "not at all like me."\(^1\)

One method of measurement uses paired but opposite adjectives, such as warm and outgoing versus cool and self-contained. Using another method research workers may simply ask their subjects to respond to the question "Who am I?" While still another method is to have subjects do a "Q-sort." This is a matter of giving an examinee a large number of statements or adjectives on separate slips of paper and asking him to sort these slips on a scale. He must distribute them according to a quota system from those least like him to those most like him. Even responses to some projective techniques, such as the Thematic Apperception Test, may be used as measurement of the self-concept.

---

McCandless evaluates all these measures of the self-concept as having demonstrated moderate stability over time, in general.¹

**Educational Objectives**

Educational objectives have been defined as the number of years of college or university training a respondent plans to complete or expects to achieve at some future date. Although this variable has received some attention in the literature, the focus has not included African graduate students. Current education in Africa is often geared towards instilling skill and technical know-how.

Busia, in 1969, indicated that there has been a tendency to see development solely in materialistic terms, in roads, harbours, buildings, factories and other things. He further observed that these factors often obscure the fact that the aim of securing these things is to create the environmental conditions which will give every individual the best chance of developing his talent and personality to the fullest extent possible, so that he may be as good a human being and citizen as he can be.²

**Career Decision Making**

Saltzman, in 1976, contended that the majority of foreign students return to their home countries after

---


completing their degrees. Unfortunately, although these students are obtaining unique and enriching educational experiences in different cultures, they are rarely provided with the proper information and guidance in career development. He cited the following as the problems: (a) the lack of adequate information on employment opportunities in the home country, (b) the difficulty in determining the academic advisor's sensitivity to international concerns, (c) the lack of congruence between course work and desired work experience, (d) the difficulty of self-expression in unfamiliar cultures, and (e) lack of professionally trained career counselors.¹

Summary of Literature

In summarizing the related literature there are certain points that are noteworthy and presented under the traditional African culture, socio-cultural perspectives and advent of technology.

Mbiti--African family is broad-based and includes uncles, aunts, distant cousins and even dead relatives.

Nkosi--Extended family is seen as a large cocoon which develops the individual in a network of social duties and responsibilities.

Brooks and Vandenbosch--Through the medium of extended family sacrifices are imposed which induce discipline, obedience to

authority, respect for elders, and respect for the law of the land.

Bloom—Africans are traditionally their brothers' keepers in a way that is much weaker in the urban West and this intense country life, with a relatively close family, enriches a sensitivity of group sentiment and group orientation.

Bantlet—Few Africans would deny the existence of individual differences; it was more difficult to express an individual point of view with a community in which the affective pressure of kin makes it difficult to stand apart from one's society as an observer.

Kingsley—Cultural values and orientations exert selective influences on specific cognitive and perceptual skills transmitted to individuals through the socialization processes.

Kelvin—The fundamental purpose of socialization is to shape behavior so that individuals are predictable to other individuals in specific situations.

Bloom—The more educated favored earlier independence, and less primitive and less conformity producing modes of training and discipline. There is a theme of approval of conformity to traditional norms and the persistence of traditional authoritarian socialization polices; there is an inconsistent approval of practice to encourage the child to escape from traditional control into independence in a modern economic world.

Olukayode—Highly educated individuals in Africa are more like their American upper middle class counterpart in general view of life and in their being less subjected to the influence of the extended family.

Problems and Needs

Davis—The initial problems of African students were found to be communication,
food and adjusting to a new way of life. No trouble in the establishment of relationship between finance and grade. Discrimination was experienced.

Wetzel--Programs of study, pursued by African students are often not applicable to African situations.

Acculturation and Modes of Interaction

Malik--The educated Africans are modernized, not in terms of relevant values like tolerance, internal control and modernity but, in terms of a simple manifestation of those values, namely, materialism.

Ekiako--Found the following:
1) Communication affects the academic adjustment of African students.
2) Climate and housing seem to affect either the social or the academic adjustment of African students.
3) Alienation from American culture and association with other countrymen and other foreign students affect the academic adjustment.
4) An upward pattern exists in academic adjustment of African students.

Essien--Majority of male Nigerian students did not interact adequately with Americans in various social situations, but the students interacted more with black Americans than with the white Americans.

Concept of Assertiveness

Alberti and Emmons--Behavior which enables a person to act in his best interests, to stand up for her or himself without undue anxiety to express honest feelings comfortably or to exercise personal rights without denying the rights of others is called assertive behavior.
Furnham--Concept of assertiveness is culture bound and particularly North American. Lack of assertiveness might not be a sign of mental disorder rather a successful way of coping, or an imposed interpersonal communication style.

Eisler--Stimulus specific theory states that an individual who is assertive in one interpersonal context may not be assertive in a different interpersonal environment.

Cheek--Blacks who behave in an assertive manner will elicit more negative reactions than would a white individual who acted in a similar manner.

Mkhize--In traditional African culture, authority is closely linked to age and sex, and communications is frequently ritualized in a pattern unfamiliar to white therapists.

Self-Concept

Self-concept has been defined and the developmental processes noted. Some of the significant points in self-concepts include:

Jegede and Bambgboye--Factors in the development of self-concept include: (1) biological factors, (2) social factors, (3) urban residence, (4) intellectual maturity, (5) age, and (6) sex.

Jegede--Contributed a variety of pertinent psychological, social, biological and physical variables to self concept.

Demoze--The African student appeared to describe himself as being more self-confident and more socially oriented and less individualistic.

Festinger--When inconsistent perceptions are held by a person, either about himself or about his environment, he is placed in a state of tension called psychological dissonance.
Educational Objectives

Current education in Africa is often geared towards instilling skill and technical know-how.

Busia—Indicated that there has been a tendency to see development solely in materialistic terms, in roads, harbours, buildings, factories and other things.

Career Decision Making

Saltzman—Cited the following as the results of problems of African students and career: a) the lack of adequate information on employment opportunities in the home country, b) difficulty in determining the academic advisor's sensitivity to international concerns, c) lack of congruence between course work and desired work experience, d) difficulty of self-expression in unfamiliar culture, and e) lack of professionally trained career counselors.

There have been research studies done on most of the variables in this study, however, these studies have been carried out mostly by Western researchers and on Western populations. Less research has been done on African graduate students, per se.
CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This section contains a discussion of the research design, subjects, selection procedures, setting, instruments, implementation procedure, and method of analysis of the results.

Research Design

The research for this study included both normative survey and descriptive research methodologies. Seven hypotheses were tested in carrying out this investigation. Hypotheses one and two were concerned with determining the differences between the means of two variables. Hypotheses three, seven, eight, nine, and ten were concerned with determining the degree of independence of discretely categorized data; and hypotheses four, five and six were concerned with determining the correlation between variables.

Subjects

The subjects consisted of 48 male African graduate students enrolled at Atlanta University during the 1983-84 school term. The pool of 150 African students, from which the research subjects were drawn was representative of the

**Setting**

The Atlanta University is a private, co-educational university comprising five graduate and professional schools engaged in teaching and research at the frontiers of the arts, humanities, social, and natural sciences. The Atlanta University was founded in 1865 and is the oldest graduate institution in the nation serving a predominantly African-American student body. The heritage of the University is rich, providing a foundation on which today's scholars, teachers, and students are building.

The Atlanta University, as a graduate institution, is the intellectual hub of a major consortium of independent institutions and boards created in 1929. The consortium includes a graduate School of Arts and Sciences; professional Schools of Business Administration, Library and Information Studies, Education, and Social Work; six denominational schools in the graduate center for religion and theology; four undergraduate liberal arts colleges: Morris Brown (co-ed), Morehouse (men), Clark (co-ed), and Spelman (women), and a School of Medicine.

The Atlanta University is located in one of the nation's great cities. Atlanta's present position as the center of commerce in the Southeast can be attributed to several factors: the people, the business and financial environment, location, transportation, communication, and quality of life.
Selection Procedure

A current list of names, addresses and countries of origin of the African graduate students enrolled at Atlanta University during the 1983-84 school term was obtained from the Registrar's Office of Atlanta University. A written request for participation in the study was sent to all male African graduate students. The male students were selected for the study because (1) the proportion of male to female African graduate students was three-to-one. (2) Some of the women students are married to the male African students. (3) In a traditional African culture, the male is the dominant figure in the society; therefore, making the man more active and the woman more passive. Thus, a study of this sort might be contaminated as a result of (1) unequal number of participation of both sexes, (2) the influence of the spouse's presence during testing, and (3) the effect of the gender role played by the sexes in their traditional African culture.

One hundred and seventeen students participated in the subject selection process which utilized the College Self Expression Scale: A measure of assertiveness. Twelve students gave insufficient data for analysis, seven students presented individual scores higher than the eighty-nineth percentile of the total obtainable score, thus they were excluded. The responses of ninety-eight subjects were analyzed to reveal the level of assertiveness of each subject (see Appendix).

The statistical analysis utilized consisted of the mean and the standard deviation which were used to categorize the
students as high and low assertive (table 1). Those students whose scores were within one-half standard deviation above the mean were regarded as the "high assertive" and those with scores of one-half standard deviation below the mean were regarded as "low assertive" subjects. A total of twenty-seven subjects revealed a score of one-half standard deviation above the mean and twenty-one subjects revealed a score of one-half standard deviation below the mean. A total of forty-eight students were selected as the representative subjects for this study. The Fisher t-test of significance was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means of groups of subjects.

Instrument

The College Self-Expression Scale: A Measure of Levels of Assertiveness (CSES). The College Self-Expression Scale was developed and researched for validity by Galassi et al., in 1974, to measure assertiveness in college students.¹ This instrument is a fifty-item self-report inventory designed to assess assertiveness and self-denial in a number of interpersonal contexts. These contexts include family, strangers, business relations, authority figures, and like-opposite sex peers. The scale items were derived, in part, or modified

from work by Lazarus,\textsuperscript{1} Wolpe,\textsuperscript{2} and Wolpe and Lazarus.\textsuperscript{3} There are twenty-one positively worded items and twenty-nine negatively worded items. The total score is obtained by summing all positively worded items and reverse scoring all negatively worded items utilizing a modified version of the Likert format (0-4). Low scores are indicative of generalized non-assertive response patterns.

The scale attempts to assess three areas of assertiveness: positive, negative, and self-denial. Positive assertiveness involves expressing feelings of admiration, affection, agreement, approval, and love. Negative assertion involves the expression of justifiable feelings of anger, annoyance, disagreement, and dissatisfaction. Self-denial includes excessive interpersonal anxiety, exaggerated concern for the feelings of others and over apologizing.

Normative data were collected from students in introductory psychology classes, upper division and beginning graduate students enrolled in personality theory, introductory testing classes at Western Virginia University, and elementary and secondary student teachers at Fairmont State College.

Test-retest reliability data were collected for the first two samples over a two-week period. Pearson product-


moment correlation coefficients were computed for each group on total scores for the two tests. The coefficients were 0.89 and 0.90, respectively, for the two samples.

Recently, several paper and pencil self-report assertiveness scales have been developed for the purposes of screening individuals who might benefit from assertive training and measurement of change following treatment (Bates and Zimmerman\(^1\); Galassi, DeLo, Galassi and Bastien\(^2\); McFall and Lillesand\(^3\); Rathus\(^4\); Wolpe and Lazarus).\(^5\) Validity data are limited for most of these instruments, and only a few (Eisler, Hessen and Miller\(^6\); McFall and Twentyman\(^7\)) have been validated against behavioral performance. The importance of such validation procedures has been stressed. If paper and pencil


instruments are intended to reflect actual frequency and/or quality of assertive performance, then, validation studies which relate behavioral performance to scores on these instruments are imperative.

One such study was made using 518 undergraduates at the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill, in 1974. This study was concerned with validation of a self-report measure of assertiveness against behavioral performance criteria. Low, moderate, and high scores, on the College Self-Expression Scale, role played five short situations which required assertive behaviors. Planned nonorthogonal multivariate comparisons revealed significant differences between the log group and the combined moderate and high groups and the low and high groups, respectively, on a linear combination of four dependent variables—assertive content, eye contact, subjective anxiety, and response latency. Univariate comparisons indicated statistically significant differences between the low and high groups on assertive content and eye contact and between the low group and the combined moderate and high groups on eye contact. Differences on the anxiety measure approached statistical significance.

Inter-rater reliability coefficients (Pearson product-moment correlations) were computed for the three behavioral variables. The coefficients were 0.95 and 0.85 for response latency and eye contact, respectively. The average inter-rater reliability for assertive content over the five scenes was 0.94 (Fisher $Z_r$ transformation with a range of 0.86 to 0.98).
Construct validity was established for the College Self-Expression Scale (CSES) by correlating the scores of college students on the scale with their scores on the twenty-four scales of the Adjective Check List. The College Self-Expression Scale correlated positively and statistically significantly with the following Adjective Check List Scales: Number checked, Defensiveness, Favorable, Self-Confidence, Achievement, Dominance, Intraception, Heterosexuality, Exhibition, Autonomy, and Change.

Statistically significant negative correlations were obtained with the Unfavorable, Succorance, Abasement, Deference and Counseling Readiness Scales. These results are consistent with non-assertiveness and indicate an inadequate and negative self-evaluation, feelings of inferiority, a tendency to sustain subordinate roles in relationships with others, a tendency to be over-solicitous of emotional support from others, and excessive interpersonal anxiety.¹

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) was selected for its capacity to obtain the self-concept data needed for this investigation and for its demonstrated reliability and validity as a measure of self-concept.

This instrument is comprised of 100 self-description statements. The items are organized into a five-point Likert-

type scale ranging from "completely false" to "completely true." Through their choice of responses, subjects depict the image they have of themselves.

The TSCS is self-administering and is suitable for group or individual use with subjects who are at least twelve years old and have a sixth grade reading level. Completion time for the TSCS ranges from ten to twenty minutes with a mean time of approximately thirteen minutes.¹

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is available in two forms: a Counseling Form and a Clinical and Research Form. Both forms use the same test items. The Clinical and Research Form is more complex in scoring, analysis and interpretation and, hence, requires a skilled examiner. In contrast, according to Suinn, the Counseling Form requires a relatively lower level of sophistication in psychometrics on the part of the administrator.² The Counseling Form will provide the data, as well as the analysis and interpretation potential needed for this investigation.

Four sets of scores make up the Counseling Form of the TSCS: the Self-criticism score, the Positive scores, the Variability score, and the Distribution score.

The Self-Criticism score is composed of ten items taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Low

scores indicate defensiveness, high scores generally indicate a normal healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism, and extremely high scores indicate a lack of defenses. Low self-criticism scores are also an indicator that positive scores have been artificially elevated by the subject.\(^1\)

Positive scores are drawn from a two-dimensional, three by five phenomenological system. Each of the ninety positive score items is analyzed in terms of two dimensions. Three Row Scores represent one dimension, an interval frame of reference. Five column scores represent the other dimension, an external frame of reference. Cells are created by the intersection of the rows and columns.

The internal dimension consists of three primary statements: (1) This is what I am (identity), (2) This is how I feel about myself (self-satisfaction), and (3) This is what I do (behavior).

The external dimension relates the three internal categories of identity, self-satisfaction, and behavior to five perceptions of self: physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self and social self. Thus, each item and each cell contributes to two different scores, one on the internal dimension (rows) and one on the external dimension (columns).

Positive scores which can be obtained from the Counseling Form of the TSCS are:

\(^1\)Fitts, Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: Manual, p. 9.
1. Total P score. According to Fitts, this is the most important single score on the Counseling Form. It reflects the subject's overall level of self-esteem.¹

2. Identity score. The subject describes his/her basic identity--"What I am."

3. Self-satisfaction score. The subject describes how he feels about the self he perceives.

4. Behavior score. This score is a measure of the subject's perception of his own behavior.

5. Physical self score. This score represents how the subject views his/her body, state of health, physical appearance, skills and sexuality.

6. Moral-ethical self score. This score is a self-description of the subject from a moral-ethical point of view, i.e., moral worth, relationship to God, feeling of being good or bad.

7. Personal self score. This score measures the subject's sense of personal worth, feelings of adequacy, and evaluation of personality.

8. Family self score. This score measures the subject's feelings of adequacy, worth, and value as a member of a family.

9. Social self score. This score measures the subject's sense of adequacy and worth in regards to interaction with others in general.

Variability scores provide a measure of the amount of inconsistency from one area of self-perception to another. High scores indicate frequency inconsistency whereas extremely low scores indicate rigidity.

The Distribution score may be interpreted as a measure

¹Ibid.
of certainty about the way an individual sees himself. High scores indicate that a person is very definite and certain in the way he/she describes himself/herself. Low scores indicate the opposite.

**Norms.** Norms for the scale were established using a standardization group of 626 subjects. The standardization group included people from a variety of geographic areas representing all social, economic, intellectual, and educational planes. The group contained both black and white subjects who ranged in age from twelve to sixty-eight and were approximately equally divided on the basis of sex.

Fitts noted that overrepresentation occurs in the norms in the number of college students, whites, and subjects age twelve to thirty. Fitts also notes, however, that further expansion of the norm group is unnecessary for two reasons: (1) samples from other populations differ very little from the norms, provided samples include seventy-five or more subjects, and (2) effects of demographic variables on the scores of the TSCS are negligible.\(^1\)

**Reliability of the TSCS.** Test-retest reliability coefficients of scores on both the Counseling Form and the Clinical and Research Form range between .67 and .92. Fitts points out that Congdon obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the Total Positive Score, using a modified version of the TSCS. The author of the TSCS also states that similarities of profile

\(^1\)Ibid.
patterns have been found in repeated measures over a long period of time, thus providing further evidence of the reliability of scores on the Tennessee Concept Scale.

Validity of the TSCS. Four validation procedures: content validity, discrimination between groups, correlation with other personality measures, and personality changes under the particular conditions are used in the Manual, Tennessee Self Concept Scale to examine validity of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.¹

Content validity of the TSCS was insured by retaining potential items in the scale only if there was unanimous agreement by a panel of judges that they were classified correctly, according to the two-dimensional, 3x5 classification system.

Discrimination between groups also serves as a process of validation. Fitts reviewed studies in which he used the TSCS to differentiate between psychiatric patients and non-patients and between average persons and psychologically integrated persons. Results in each of these studies were obtained in the predicted direction. Fitts cites a number of studies in which correlation of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale with other personality measures was used to confirm validity.

A correlation of .68 between the TSCS Total Positive Score and Izard's Self Rating Positive Affect Scale was reported by Wayne in 1963.² In a 1957 study, Queen reported obtaining a

¹Ibid.
²Richard C. Wayne; Catherine G. Mates; and Laura Whiten, "Personality Traits and Attitudes of Adolescent Girls with
favorable correlation between scores on the TSCS and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Survey. Based on data collected, Fitts observed that extremely high and extremely low scores on the TSCS correlate with Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Certain life experiences, Fitts contends, affect the way in which a person views himself. Positive experiences, such as psychotherapy, would be expected to raise self-concept, stress or failure to lower it. In the Manual, Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the author gives accounts of several studies in which the TSCS was used to predict changes in self-concept from pretest to posttest. Fitts, in 1964, found that psychotherapy brought about significant changes in a treatment group on eighteen of twenty-two variables. In an unpublished study by the author of the TSCS, the scale was used to predict changes through group psychotherapy. Sixty of the eighty-eight predictions were correct five months later. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale reflected these changes in predicted ways, thus constituting evidence for validity of the instrument.

In independent reviews, Bentler found that several scores from the TSCS have remarkably high correlations with other personality measures. The Taylor Anxiety Score, for


2Fitts, The Tennessee Self Concept Scale, p. 9.
example, correlates .70 with the total positive score. Correlations from .50 to .70 were not uncommon with the Cornell Medical Index and the unpublished Inventory of Feelings. Construct validity of the TSCS was investigated by Vacchiano and Strauss. They found that the scale does provide the five proposed measures of self, physical, moral-ethical, personal, family, and social when factors are considered together, thus lending support to the validity of the test.¹

Career Decision Scale

Career Decision Scale (CDS) was developed by Osipow et al.² The scale was based on interview experience with undergraduate students and developed to represent sixteen independent types of indecisions. Basic to this development was the idea that interventions could be based on the different aspects of career indecision measured by the scale. A factor analysis of the items indicated the presence of four factors which accounted for 81 percent of the total variance. These factors were interpreted as: (1) need for structure, (2) perceived external barriers, (3) positive choice conflict, and (4) personal conflict.


²S. H. Osipow et al., Career Decision Scale, 3rd ed. (Columbus, Ohio: Marathon Consulting and Press, 1976).
Hartman et al., in 1979, adapted the scale for use with graduate students. Few changes were made on the original scale to increase the face validity for graduate students. Only 2 percent of the graduate students involved in the study suggested that the adapted scale was more appropriate for undergraduate students. Responses to the items on the scale were made on a scale of 4 (exactly like me) to (not at all like me). Approximately 100 graduate students participated in the study. The study suggested that the characteristics of the adapted decision scale for the graduate student sample in education are similar to the characteristics of the unadapted instrument for the undergraduate sample. Differences between the scope and type of career indecision between graduate and undergraduate students have suggested differential intervention aimed at each of these populations. 1

The researcher has selected this instrument because investigation based on the scale has indicated that a problem presumed to be a significant undergraduate concern, namely, career indecision, may also be a significant concern for graduate students.

The use of an instrument such as the adapted career decision scale may facilitate work by counseling centers

with undecided graduate students. It would seem possible that using the adapted indecision scale in early assessment of counseling may suggest that graduate students presenting other problems may be experiencing frustration in their lives because they feel very little direction in their graduate studies.

Analysis of Data

Collection of Data

The data were collected in the following sequence:

1. About the beginning of Spring, 1984, written request was made to the Registrar's Office for the release of the names and addresses of male African students at Atlanta University.

2. The instruments were administered to the subjects.

Statistical Treatment of Data

1. The Fisher t test for independent sample was used to determine the significance of the differences between means in hypotheses one, two and three. If a statistically significant difference was found between the means of the two groups, the researcher concluded that assertiveness had an affect, and the null hypotheses was rejected.

2. The chi-square $X^2$ was used to determine the differences between the observed and the expected frequencies in hypotheses four through seven. If there was a significant difference, the null hypotheses were rejected.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains a presentation of the statistical analysis and discussion of research findings, produced by this study.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis combined two statistical procedures: The Fisher t test for independent samples was used to determine the statistical significance of differences between means. The Chi-square for contingency was used to determine the homogeneity of these groups of subjects relative to null hypotheses, one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven.

The .05 level of significance was used as the decision rule for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

Group Differences Between Self-Concept with Assertive Levels

The first hypothesis was concerned with mean differences in self-concept levels, between assertive groups.

$H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the means of the self-concept levels of high and low assertive students
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The results of the statistical analysis, utilizing a mean difference and a t test in testing null hypothesis one, are presented in table 1.

**TABLE 1**

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF TOTAL POSITIVE AND SELF-CRITICISM PERFORMANCE OF LOW AND HIGH ASSERTIVE STUDENTS ON THE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Total Positive Groups</th>
<th>Self-Criticism Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Subjects</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Means</td>
<td>370.9629</td>
<td>330.7619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
<td>19.2603</td>
<td>18.1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Errors of the Means</td>
<td>3.7772</td>
<td>4.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences Between the Means</td>
<td>40.201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Errors of Differences Between the Means</td>
<td>5.549</td>
<td>1.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Ratios</td>
<td>7.244**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.**
The most salient information in table 1 shows that, for the total positive data, the mean for the high assertive group was much higher than that of the low assertive group (a difference of 40.201). The t-ratio was 7.244. This difference was statistically significant beyond the .01 level. For the Self-Criticism data, the mean of the low assertive group was higher than that of the high assertive group (a difference of -2.004). This difference was statistically insignificant.

Group Differences Between Career Decision and Level of Assertiveness

The second null hypothesis was concerned with the differences in career decision-making ability of high and low assertive students.

2H_0: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean levels of career decision making of high and low assertive students.

The results of the statistical analysis, using the mean difference and the t test in testing null hypothesis two, are presented in table 2.

The data in table 2 show a difference of .582 between these two means. The t-value was .998, which is statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

The analysis of the Career indecision items (3-18) revealed a standard deviation of 4.745 for the high assertive group and a 4.976 standard deviation for the low assertive group. With a mean difference of -2.243 the t ratio gave an
obtained value of -1.547. The null hypothesis was accepted at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE 2
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PERFORMANCE OF HIGH AND LOW ASSERTIVE GROUPS ON THE CAREER DECISION SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items and Groups</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career Certainty</td>
<td>Career Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>6.962</td>
<td>6.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>1.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Errors of Means</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences Between the Means</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>-2.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Errors of Differences Between Means</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-Ratios</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>-1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df=46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Differences) of Educational Objectives and Levels of Assertiveness

This section was concerned with hypothesis three. This hypothesis was concerned with the level at which the subjects intended to further their education.
3H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the educational objective levels of high and low assertive students.

Chi square was used to test the null hypothesis relative to the information in table 3.

### TABLE 3

**ANALYSIS OF ASSERTIVENESS AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{df} = 2 \quad x^2 = 5.098 \]

The Chi square was 5.098 for the data in table 3. With two degrees of freedom, this finding was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

4H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the choices of majors at the undergraduate and graduate levels of high and low assertive students.

The result of the statistical analysis using chi square to test hypothesis four is presented on table four.
**TABLE 4**

Differences Between Assertiveness and the Choice of Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Assertive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Assertive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{df} = 1 \quad X^2 = 6.030 \quad P < .05 \]

Table IV contains the statistical analysis of the personal decision on the choices of major at the undergraduate and at the graduate levels of high and low assertive groups. The Chi square of 6.030, with one degree of freedom, was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

**Difference Between Changes in Major and Levels of Assertiveness**

5H₀: There will be no statistically significant difference between change in major and level of assertiveness.

The statistical analysis utilizing chi-square in testing null hypothesis five is presented in Table V.

Table V contains the statistical findings relative to change of major and level of assertiveness. The chi-square of 4.896, with one degree of freedom, was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.
TABLE 5
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LEVEL OF ASSERTIVENESS
AND CHANGE OF MAJOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 1  
Total  28  20  48

\[ x^2 = 4.896 \quad p < .05 \]

Difference Between Level Change
of Major and Awareness of
Existing Fields of Study

6H0: There is no statistically significant
difference between change of major and
better awareness of existing fields of
studies for high and low assertive
students.

The summary of the statistical analysis employing chi-
square in testing null hypothesis six is presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6
CHANGE OF MAJOR AND AWARENESS OF
EXISTING FIELDS OF STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  25  23  48

\[ df = 1 \]

\[ x^2 = .382 \]
Table 6 includes the statistical findings relevant to change of major and awareness of existing fields of studies of high and low assertive students. The chi-square of .382, with one degree of freedom, was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

Conflict Expectation and Change of Major of High and Low Assertive Students

$H_0$: There is no statistically significant difference between the change of major and conflict expectation from the sponsor of high and low assertive students.

The statistical results employing the chi-square in analyzing null hypothesis seven are presented in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Assertive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.899$

Table 7 contains the statistical findings relative to change of major and conflict expectation from sponsor. The chi-square of .899, with one degree of freedom, was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.
Findings

The analysis of the data produced by testing the hypotheses of this study seemed to warrant the following findings below.

1H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the means of the self-concept level of high and low assertive students.

There was a statistically significant difference between the mean level of high and low assertive students in the general performance of the students. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected.

There was a statistically insignificant difference between the mean levels of high and low assertive students' ability to accept criticism. The hypothesis was accepted.

2H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean levels of career decision making of high and low assertive students.

Based on the career certainty and the career uncertainty items that are the derivatives of the career decision making, there was a statistically insignificant difference between the means of the high and low assertive students on the career decision making. The hypothesis was accepted.

3H₀: There is no statistically significant difference between the educational objective levels of high and low assertive students.

There was a statistically insignificant difference between the high and low assertive groups. The hypothesis was accepted.
There is no statistically significant difference between the choices of major at the undergraduate and graduate levels of high and low assertive students.

The statistical information revealed a statistically significant difference which necessitated the rejection of the hypothesis.

There is no statistically significant difference between change in major and level of assertiveness.

There was a statistically significant difference between the response frequencies of high and low assertive groups. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There is no statistically significant difference between change of major and better awareness of existing fields of studies for high and low assertive students.

The above hypothesis was accepted because there was a statistically insignificant difference between the high and low assertive groups of students.

There is no statistically significant difference between the change of major and conflict expectation from the sponsor of high and low assertive students.

The study revealed a statistically insignificant difference between the groups' responses, thus the hypothesis was accepted.

Summary of Findings

The findings derived from a statistical analysis of the results of this study produced the findings shown in table eight.
TABLE 8
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Positive (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t = 7.244**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Criticism (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t = 1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Certainty (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t = .998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Uncertainty (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t = 1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness/Educational Objective (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 5.098^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness/Choice of Major (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 6.030^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive/Major Change (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = 6.030^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Existing Field of Study/Change of Major (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = .382$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Expectation/Change of Major (high assertive vs. low assertive)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2 = .899$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant at .05.
**Statistically significant at .01.

The total positive score is the most important score on the counseling form in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The
scores may be categorized under three headings indicating (1) this is that I am, (2) this is how I feel about myself, and (3) this is what I do. The score reflects the person's perception of his/her overall self-esteem.

The mean for the high assertive group was much higher than that of the low assertive group. The data revealed a mean difference of 40.201. The t-ratio was 7.244. This difference indicated a statistically significant difference beyond the .01 level of significance.

The maximum individual self-criticism score was 50. High scores on the subscale indicated a normal, healthy, openness and capacity for self-criticism. The low score indicated defensiveness. Extremely high scores, above the 99%ile, may indicate a lack of defensiveness. The data on the self-criticism scale provided information indicating that the mean of the low assertive group was higher than that of the high assertive group with a difference of -2.004. This difference was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

The career certainty represents a two-item response. With a possible score of eight points, the higher the scores, the more certain the individual is concerning career choice. The data showed a difference of .582 between the obtained means. The t-value was .998 which was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was, therefore, accepted.

The career uncertainty represents a sixteen-item response with a total possible score of sixty-four points.
The higher the obtained score, the more uncertain the individual is concerning career choice. With a mean difference of -2.243 the t-value was 1.547, revealing a statistically insignificant finding at the .05 level of significance, for the high and low assertive groups.

Regarding Educational Objective and Assertive Level, the educational objective represents a self rating of the extent to which the individual intends to further his education based on his level of assertiveness. The chi-square analysis revealed a statistical finding of 5.098. With two degrees of freedom, this finding was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance, indicating that there was a statistically significant difference between the high and low assertive groups' responses.

The choice of major was designed as an indication of the individual's decision of the choice of a major at the undergraduate and the graduate levels of the high assertive and the low assertive groups. An analysis of the responses produced a chi-square of 6.030, with one degree of freedom. This was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance, thus indicating the existence of a statistically significant difference between the responses of the high and low assertive groups.

A chi-square test was employed to determine the tendency of change between the high and the low assertive groups. The chi-square of 6.030, with one degree of freedom, revealed a statistically significant difference between the high and the low assertive groups.
An analysis was made of the groups' awareness of the existing fields of study that might lead to changes of majors for the high and the low assertive groups. The chi-square of .382, with one degree of freedom, was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

The analysis of changes of majors and conflict expectations of both the high and the low assertive groups provided a chi-square of .899, with one degree of freedom. This was statistically insignificant at the .05 level of significance.

Discussion

The research findings are discussed relative to the literature reviewed for this study.

The discussion focused on four areas: (1) levels of assertiveness, (2) self-concept and assertive levels, (3) career decisions and assertive levels, and (4) aspects of education and levels of assertiveness.

Assertive Levels of African Graduate Students

The literature indicated that assertiveness is a situation specific phenomenon. It further revealed that African culture stresses social orientation rather than individualism which is pertinent to Western culture. It was also pointed out that many Western educated Africans tended to exhibit a noticeable form of assertiveness as defined by the Western culture.

One may conclude that the findings of this study conformed with the literature in suggesting that assertiveness
is learned. When the subjects were categorized as high and low assertive subjects, there was a statistically significant difference in the level of assertiveness for the high assertive on the total positive part, thus, aligning the literature findings that situation and time can have an impact on the level of assertiveness.

Difference Between Assertiveness and Self-Concept

The research findings revealed a statistically significant difference in the self-concept of high and low assertive subjects. The literature also revealed that the way individuals perceive themselves reflects their mode of interaction with others because the ability they communicate is related to self-esteem.

Campbell and Martinez-Perez confirmed this point of view. Also they postulated the notion that one would expect that low self-esteem students, presumably because of their communication apprehension, would be more likely to avoid situations requiring communication; and, hence, feel more alienated than high esteem students.

Fitts and Hamner reviewed several studies in which the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale had been used. They concluded thusly:

Often, with a stable measure like the TSCS, the effects of experiences, treatment procedures

---


etc. do not produce immediate changes in Self-Concepts. It appears that interven¬
ving time may be required for the self concept to be reorganized for new behavior to be incorporated into self-perception.

The African graduate students who displayed high levels of assertiveness possessed high levels of self-concept of themselves. This notion confirms the notion expressed by Fitts and Hamner and other writers.

Career Decision-Making Ability: Assertiveness
Level of Groups of African Graduate Students

The relationship between levels of assertiveness and career certainty/career uncertainty showed no difference in career certainty and career uncertainty for both. For the high and low assertive groups, when observed collectively, the findings in the literature pointed toward a negative rela¬
tionship between the variables for both groups. Specifically, this indicates that while the high assertive individual ex¬
hibit certain amounts of certainty concerning career choices, they do not differ greatly when compared with the low asser¬
tive subjects. One may conclude that as the assertive level of African students change, there still exist certain factors that influence their career decision choices.

Educational Aspects and Levels of Assertiveness

This section of the discussion focuses on the follow¬
ing variables as it reflects on the assertive levels of African graduate students' educational objectives, choice of major
at the undergraduate and graduate levels, change of major, awareness of different fields of study, and conflict expectation due to change of major. Although chi-square was used to test the homogeneity of these groups, relationships can be inferred in cases where a chi-square test produces statistically insignificant results.

The literature, reviewed by this researcher, did not address itself directly to the variables of the previously mentioned educational aspects and their relationship to levels of assertiveness. However, there were some information which indirectly indicated association between the variables.

There was no strongly acceptable difference between the educational objective of high and low assertive students. The high assertive groups of students tended to have made up their minds concerning their majors at the undergraduate level more than the low assertive students. The researcher found that the low assertive student tended to change their majors more often than the high assertive students. There was no statistically significant difference in the change of major for the high and low assertive students. The findings pertaining to the expectation of conflict from sponsors, as a result of change in majors, reveal that both the high assertive and low assertive groups of students expected some antagonistic attitude from the sponsors as a result of their change of their declared major course of study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents an overall summary of this study, followed by the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between the assertiveness levels and self-concept, educational objectives and career decision making of African graduate students at Atlanta University.

Significance of the Study

The study is significant in several ways. The result of this study may contribute to the existing body of research on African students' behaviors and may also increase the sensitivity of non-African investigators to the effects of cultural differences. It is anticipated that the outcome of this investigation will provide specific contributions to the areas of counseling, guidance and student personnel services.

Hypotheses

Seven null hypotheses were tested. The first two indicated that there will be no statistically significant difference
(a) between the self-concept of high and low assertive students, and (b) between the career decision making of high and low assertive groups of students. The last five indicated that there will be no statistically significant difference (a) between the educational objectives of high and low assertive students, (b) between choices of majors of the undergraduate or graduate levels of high and low assertive groups of students, (c) between changes of majors for the high and low groups of assertive students, (d) between the changes of majors resulting from the awareness of existing fields of studies for the high and low assertive groups of students, and (e) between the conflict expectation as a result of changes in majors of the high and low assertive students.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were operationally defined as they were used in the study.

1. Career decision making--total scores made on the Career Decision Scale.

2. Educational objectives--an indication of educational major and its intended level of accomplishment.

3. Level of assertiveness--total score made on the College Self-Expression Scale.

4. Relationship--the correlations between variables.

5. High level of assertiveness--scores above one-half standard deviation on the normal curve.

6. Low level of assertiveness--scores below one-half standard deviation on the normal curve.
Related Literature

Three general groups of factors have typically been identified in the literature as related to assertiveness. The initial consideration has been given to the concept of assertiveness.

Some studies have shown the relationship between culture, socio-cultural perspectives, acculturation and interactive modes and the concept of assertiveness. These include studies by Mbiti, 1 Brooks, 2 Bloom, 3 Kingsley, 4 Kelvin, 5 Bloom, 6 Davis, 7 and Malik. 8

The role of self concept as it relates to assertiveness directly or indirectly has been investigated by a number of persons. Most of the researchers have indicated

a positive relationship between self-concept and assertiveness. It has been found that most students with high self-concepts usually possess a noticeable level of assertiveness as reported by some of the following researchers: Olukayode,\(^1\) Fu, Korstund and Hinkler,\(^2\) Bangboyé\(^3\) and Demoze.\(^4\)

The relationship between the levels of assertiveness and career decision making showed a negative correlation in this study. It was then concluded that several factors combined to affect the career decision-making ability of the students. Several studies have supported the fact that lack of adequate counseling and students infrastructural condition contributed to the inability of the students to make firm career commitments. Such studies included those of Busia,\(^5\) Festinger,\(^6\) and Saltzman.\(^7\)

---


Educational aspects incorporated topics which included, change of major educational objectives and conflict expectation as each related to assertiveness. The study provided a ground to assume that students who possess a high level of assertiveness have a distinct motivation for higher education, making an earlier choice of major and changing their major less than those with low assertiveness level. Most students are also seen to have changed their major not because of their awareness of existing fields of study and most students showed a concern for the conflict of their interest and that of their sponsors. The findings of researchers support the result of this educational aspect cumulatively. Such are studies by Busia, Kimulu, and Tuso.

Even though there is innumerable research on the related variables, it is the researcher's opinion that most of the variables are interrelated in support of the research finding as it related to previous research by different researchers.

---


Research Design

The research design utilized correlational and differential test techniques in the collection of data from a battery of test from (1) a single population, and (2) two samples of subjects derived from the single population. The sets of scores were obtained from the measures from (a) College Self-Expression Scale, (b) Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, (c) Career Decision Scale, (d) Researcher's questionnaire based on educational variables.

Statistical Procedure

The Fisher t test was used to determine the difference between the level of group performance. The chi-square was used to determine the differences between the observed and expected frequencies. Rho was used to determine the relationships between variables.

A summary of the statistical analysis revealed different relationships at the .05 significant level and the degrees of freedom for each variable. There were statistically significant differences between the high and low assertiveness and choices of majors at the graduate and the undergraduate levels, and choices of majors and levels of assertiveness.

At the .05 level of significance, statistically significant differences were found between: Career uncertainty/career certainty and assertiveness levels; educational objective and assertiveness levels; changes of majors and assertiveness levels; and conflict expectation/changes of
majors and levels of assertiveness. Based on this finding, null hypotheses two, three, five and seven were accepted and one, four and six were rejected.

Findings

An analysis of the information derived from this study produced the findings listed below.

1. There was a statistically significant difference between the self-concept of high and low assertive students.

2. There was no statistically significant difference in the ability to accept self-criticism between the high and low assertive students.

3. There was no statistically significant difference between the career certainty of high and low assertive students.

4. There was no statistically significant difference between the career uncertainty of the high and low assertive students.

5. There was a statistically significant difference between the educational objectives of the high and low assertive students.

6. There was a statistically significant difference between the choices of major at the undergraduate levels and the graduate levels of high and low assertive students.

7. There was a statistically significant difference between the change of major of high and low assertive students.

8. There was no statistically significant difference between change of major and better awareness of the existing fields of study for both the high and low assertive students.

9. There was no statistically significant difference between change of major and
conflict expectation from the sponsor of high and low assertive students.

**Conclusions**

The findings derived from an analysis of the data produced by this study seem to warrant the following conclusions:

1. A majority of African male graduate students showed a high level of assertiveness.

2. Those African graduate students that exhibited high level of assertiveness also possessed high self-concept of themselves.

3. African graduate students tended to be undecided in making a career decision.

4. A majority of African graduate students possessed the motivation for higher education.

5. The high assertive African graduate students made their career choices mostly at the undergraduate levels.

6. A majority of African graduate students with low level of assertiveness tended to change their majors more often.

7. A greater number of African graduate students that changed their majors did not change because of better exposure to the diversities of the educational fields.

8. A greater number of African graduate students that had changed their major course of studies, expressed an anticipation of conflict between their desired course of study and the anticipated course of study desired by their sponsors in their home countries.
Implications

The following implications seem to be inherent in the conclusions drawn from the findings produced by this study.

1. African male graduate students seem to express more less constructive assertive behavior due to (1) acculturation, (2) adjustment.

2. It seems that these African graduate male students may appreciate a career but are unable to work toward attaining the desired career because (1) they recognize the deficiencies of the comparable career environment in their home countries, (2) the socio-economic and political situation in their home countries will affect the implementation of the desired career.

3. It seems these students possessed the zeal to further their education in the highest possible level but are hampered by (1) financial situation, (2) inadequate guidance in school.

Recommendations

The implications inferred from the conclusions drawn from the results of this study seem to warrant the following recommendation.

1. Further research should be carried out in the following areas:
   a. To more thoroughly investigate the effect of some of the variables.
   b. Use be made of larger number of students from more than one institution of higher learning and different settings.
   c. Use be made of undergraduate and graduate students for comparative purposes with application of one or more of the variables.
P.O. Box 129
Atlanta University
Atlanta, GA 30314
December 19, 1984

Dear Registrar/Foreign Student Advisor:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Psychological Services at Atlanta University. I am interested in conducting a study with the African students enrolled in Atlanta University.

Your assistance in providing me with the current list of names, addresses and countries of origin of these students would be very much appreciated.

Meaningful suggestions resulting from this study would be made available to you if you are interested.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Mang N. Ndukwe

Dr. Robert Smathers, Chairman
Dissertation Committee
Department of Psychological Services

Dr. Coye Williams, Co-Chairman
Dissertation Committee
Department of Psychological Services

Dr. Rudolph Green, Acting Chairman
Department of Psychological Services/Dissertation Committee Member
Dear Fellow African Student:

My name is Hang Nwokeka Ndukwe. I am a citizen of Nigeria and presently a graduate student in the Department of Psychological Services at Atlanta University.

I have started a research study for a doctoral dissertation. The title of the study is "The Efficacy of Assertiveness Levels of African Students on Their Self-Concepts, Educational Objectives and Career Decision Making." It is my earnest hope that the findings of this study can be useful in making the African students' modes of interaction, self-awareness and educational experience in the Atlanta University much more accessible and meaningful.

You have been selected as one of the students in my sample.

The instruments involved in this study includes the following:

1. The College Self-Expression Scale: A Measure of Assertiveness
2. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale
3. Career Decision Scale
4. African Students Opinionnaire on Educational Objectives

These instruments will not take too much of your time to respond to.

I am asking you to please indicate by placing an X on one of the lines provided to determine when you will be available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information derived from these instruments will be kept strictly confidential and absolutely no names of students will be used in the
completed study. Please mail this today.

Thank you.

Participant

Name

Address

Phone Number

Sincerely,

Mang N. Ndukwe
Student

Dr. Robert Smothers
Dissertation Advisor

MNN/RS:sb
December 19, 1984

Dear African Student:

A few days ago, I forwarded to you a letter requesting your cooperation by indicating when you will be available to participate as one of my research samples for my proposed study.

I will be grateful if you could take some of your time to respond. If you did not receive the letter, or if it has been misplaced, I will be glad to send you another to explain the content of the initial letter.

Please ignore this letter if the first one has already been forwarded or mark X in the box provided for more information.

(Not received □)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Mang N. Ndukwe
Department of Psychological Services
Atlanta University

MNN: sb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th></th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 107.762  Mean = 137.851
S.D. = 3.284    S.D. = 11.741
### CAREER DECISION SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items 1-2</th>
<th>Items 3-18</th>
<th>Items 1-2</th>
<th>Items 3-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 22.518  Mean = 6.3809  Mean = 24.761  
S.D. = 4.745   S.D. = 1.203   S.D. = 4.976
TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
<th></th>
<th>High Assertive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>Self-Criticism</td>
<td>Total Positive</td>
<td>Self-Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 330.761  Mean = 32.5238  Mean = 370.963  Mean = 30.518
TOTAL RAW SCORE ON THE COLLEGE
SELF EXPRESSION SCALE

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \sum x = 12050 \]
THE COLLEGE SELF-EXPRESSION SCALE

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

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

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

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

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

5. Are you inclined to be over-apologetic?

6. If you were studying and if your roommate were making too much noise, would you ask him to stop?

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

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

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

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

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

12. Are you overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0 Almost Always</th>
<th>1 Usually</th>
<th>2 Sometimes</th>
<th>3 Seldom</th>
<th>4 Never or Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. If you have a close friend whom your parents dislike and constantly criticize, would you inform your parents that you disagree with them and tell them of your friend's assets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favor for you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If food which is not to your satisfaction is served in a restaurant, would you complain about it to the waiter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If your roommate without your permission eats food that he knows you have been saving, can you express your displeasure to him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If a salesman has gone to considerable trouble to show you some merchandise which is not quite suitable, do you have difficulty in saying no?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you keep your opinions to yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If friends visit when you want to study, do you ask them to return at a more convenient time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you able to express love and affection to people for whom you care?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If you were in a small seminar and the professor made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If a person of the opposite sex whom you have been wanting to meet smiles or directs attention to you at a party, would you take the initiative in beginning a conversation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If someone you respect expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, would you venture to state your own point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Almost Always of Always</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never or Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you go out of your way to avoid trouble with other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend is wearing a new outfit which you like, do you tell that person so?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If after leaving a store you realize that you have been short-changed, do you go back and request the correct amount?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a person is blatantly unfair, do you fail to say something about it to him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a person is blatantly unfair, do you fail to say something about it to him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your parents want you to come home for a weekend but you have made important plans, would you tell them of your preference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a person is blatantly unfair, do you fail to say something about it to him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you express anger or annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. When a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you, do you call his attention to the matter?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

44. Are you reluctant to speak to an attractive acquaintance of the opposite sex?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never or Rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

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

49. Do you express your feelings to others?

50. Do you avoid asking questions in class for fear of feeling self-conscious?
AFRICAN STUDENT OPINIONNAIRE ON EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

INSTRUCTIONS: This section can be answered quickly with a check, or a word or two where appropriate. Please answer all questions.

1. Name of School or College where currently enrolled:


2. Undergraduate School:


3. Undergraduate: Major:

Minor:

4. Graduate School: Major

Concentration

5. What extent do you intend to further your education:
   Masters
   Specialist
   Doctorate

6. National Origin:

7. Do you anticipate a conflict between your change of major and sponsors expectation.
   Yes ____
   No ____

8. If your intended major has changed, were these changes linked to your being:
   (a) More assertive Yes ____ No ____
   (b) Better awareness of existing fields of studies.
      Yes ____ No ____
INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill in these boxes later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item. Read each statement carefully, then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked time started and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked time finished.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely False</th>
<th>Mostly False</th>
<th>Partly False and Partly True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Completely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will find these response numbers repeated at the top of each page to help you remember them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Complete False</th>
<th>Mostly False</th>
<th>Partly False and Partly True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Completely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>2. I like to look nice and neat all the time</td>
<td>4. I am full of aches and pains</td>
<td>6. I am a sick person</td>
<td>20. I am a religious person</td>
<td>22. I am a moral failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. I am neither too fat nor too thin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. I like my looks just the way they are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11. I would like to change some parts of my body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29. I ought to go to church more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43. I am satisfied to be just what I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45. I am just as nice as I should be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47. I despise myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>61. I am satisfied with my family relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>63. I understand my family as well as I should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>65. I should trust my family more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>79. I am as sociable as I want to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>81. I try to please others, but don't overdo it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>95. I do not like everyone I know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am neither too tall nor too short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don't feel as well as I should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I should have more sex appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I am as religious as I want to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I wish I could be more trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I shouldn't tell so many lies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I am as smart as I want to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I am not the person I would like to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I am too sensitive to things my family says</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I should love my family more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the way I treat other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I should be more polite to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>I ought to get along better with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>I gossip a little at times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>At times I feel like swearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I take good care of myself physically</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. I try to be careful about my appearance</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. I often act like I am “all thumbs”</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. I try to change when I know I’m doing things that are wrong</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35. I sometimes do very bad things</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49. I can always take care of myself in any situation</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. I take the blame for things without getting mad</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53. I do things without thinking about them first</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67. I try to play fair with my friends and family</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69. I take a real interest in my family</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71. I give in to my parents (Use past tense if parents are not living)</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85. I try to understand the other fellow’s point of view</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87. I get along well with other people</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89. I do not forgive others easily</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99. I would rather win than lose in a game</td>
<td>Completely False, Mostly False, Partly False and Partly True, Mostly True, Completely True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel good most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I do poorly in sports and games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am a poor sleeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I do what is right most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I have trouble doing the things that are right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I solve my problems quite easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I change my mind a lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I try to run away from my problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>I do my share of work at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>I quarrel with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>I do not act like my family thinks I should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>I see good points in all the people I meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>I do not feel at ease with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>I find it hard to talk with strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This questionnaire contains some statements that people commonly make about their educational and occupational plans. Some of the statements may apply to you; others may not. Please read through them and indicate how closely each item describes you in your thinking about a career or an educational choice by circling the appropriate number on the answer sheet.

If you are excited about going to work and feel no hesitation about it you would circle "4" as it is circled in the example on the next page to indicate the description was exactly the way you feel. If the item is very close, but not exactly the way you feel—for example, you're generally excited about going to work after you graduate, but are experiencing some minor concerns about it—you would circle the number "3". You would circle "2" if the item described you in some ways, but in general it was more unlike than like your feelings; for example, if you were generally more concerned than excited about work after graduation. Finally, you would circle "1" if the item did not describe your feelings at all; that is, you were experiencing a great deal of concern and no excitement about graduation and work.
An example is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Self-Description Item</th>
<th>Sample Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am excited about graduating and going to work.</td>
<td>Exactly like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you change your answer, please be sure that all previous marks are completely erased. Please give only one response to each item and respond to all items.

CIRCLE ANSWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like Me</th>
<th>Not Like Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I have decided on a career and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice. 4 3 2 1

2. I have decided on a major and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice. 4 3 2 1

3. If I had the skills or the opportunity, I know I would be a ________ but this choice is really not possible for me. I haven’t given much consideration to any other alternatives, however. 4 3 2 1

4. Several careers have equal appeal to me. I’m having a difficult time deciding among them. 4 3 2 1

5. I know I will have to go to work eventually, but none of the careers I know about appeal to me. 4 3 2 1
REMEMBER — 4 is exactly like me, 3 is very much like me, 2 is only slightly like me, and 1 is not at all like me.

6. I'd like to be a ________________, but I'd be going against the wishes of someone who is important to me if I did so. Because of this, it's difficult for me to make a career decision right now. I hope I can find a way to please them and myself.

7. Until now, I haven't given much thought to choosing a career. I feel lost when I think about it because I haven't had many experiences in making decisions on my own and I don't have enough information to make a career decision right now.

8. I feel discouraged because everything about choosing a career seems so "ify" and uncertain; I feel discouraged, so much so that I'd like to put off making a decision for the time being.

9. I thought I knew what I wanted for a career, but recently I found out that it wouldn't be possible for me to pursue it. Now I've got to start looking for other possible careers.

10. I want to be absolutely certain that my career choice is the "right" one, but none of the careers I know about seem ideal for me.

11. Having to make a career decision bothers me. I'd like to make a decision quickly and get it over with. I wish I could take a test that would tell me what kind of career I should pursue.

12. I know what I'd like to major in, but I don't know what careers it can lead to that would satisfy me.
REMEMBER — 4 is exactly like me, 3 is very much like me, 2 is only slightly like me, and 1 is not at all like me.

13. I can’t make a career choice right now because I don’t know what my abilities are. 4 3 2 1

14. I don’t know what my interests are. A few things “turn me on” but I’m not certain that they are related in any way to my career possibilities. 4 3 2 1

15. So many things interest me and I know I have the ability to do well regardless of what career I choose. It’s hard for me to find just one thing that I would want as a career. 4 3 2 1

16. I have decided on a career, but I’m not certain how to go about implementing my choice. What do I need to do to become a ________________ anyway? 4 3 2 1

17. I need more information about what different occupations are like before I can make a career decision. 4 3 2 1

18. I think I know what to major in, but feel I need some additional support for it as a choice for myself. 4 3 2 1

19. None of the above items describe me. The following would describe me better: (write your response below).
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