

Assertiveness and its Relationship with Self Esteem: An Empirical Study of Senior Managers in a Sri Lankan Bank

H.H.D.P.J. Opatha¹, H.H.D.N.P. Opatha²

^{1,2} Department of Human Resource Management, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka.

ABSTRACT:

A systematic empirical study was carried out with regard to assertiveness and self-esteem owing to little research done, contextual gap and intellectual curiosity. Objectives of the study were (1) to explore and describe the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study; (2) to explore and describe the degree of self-esteem of senior managers in the organization under study; and (3) to investigate whether the degree of self-esteem of senior managers relates positively and significantly to the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study. An alternative hypothesis about the relationship between the two constructs was formulated based on some observations, logical beliefs of the researchers, empirical evidences and the two general theories, i.e. The Successful Performance Model and The Failure-Based Model both of which were developed by Harris and Hartman (2006)[1]. 129 senior managers who are middle managers working in a large highly successful bank were utilized as respondents. The instruments utilized to measure the two constructs were good in terms of content validity and internal reliability. The empirical findings revealed that Sri Lankan senior managers in the bank under study possess high assertiveness, high self-esteem, and degree of self-esteem and degree of assertiveness are positively and significantly related.

Keywords: Assertiveness, Self Esteem, Senior Managers

1. INTRODUCTION

Bad or poor management is a major reason for low productivity (Akuratiyagamage and Opatha, 2004) [2], which is a serious concern of every organization, and poor leadership is a major cause of poor management. Lack of assertiveness of a leader leads to produce a leadership that is poor. Assertiveness is a critical phenomenon in organizational behaviour literature and human relations literature as well and is generally considered as a competence to be possessed by a manager to succeed in leading. It is a special skill in dealing with conflicts (Lussier, 2010)[3], a type of communication (Harris and Hartman, 2006)[1], and a leadership trait (Opatha, 2015)[4]. DuBrin (2009)[5] considers assertiveness as one of the nine key leadership traits. Assertiveness is instrumental for leaders to perform many tasks and achieve goals such as confronting group members about their mistakes, demanding higher performance and setting high expectations. When using assertive behaviour, one can stand her/his ground without being rude or discourteous (Hodgetts and Hegar, 2005)[6] and this behaviour is needed for the purpose of handling conflicts and leading others and protecting human rights. Also, assertiveness can be used by a manager to make legitimate demands on higher management, such as asking for equipment needed by the group. Unavailability of necessary materials, equipment and other things to perform the job successfully is a cause of a grievance (Opatha, 2009) [7] which is a discontent or dissatisfaction arising from a feeling or a belief of injustice felt by the employee (Opatha, 1994) [8]. Assertiveness is useful for solving leader's grievances and grievances of followers. As assertiveness is necessary for successful leadership and management it creates a need of investigating correlates and determinants or contributing factors of assertiveness. In this study it is argued that Self Esteem (SE) is a factor that is related to assertiveness positively.

SE is another critical phenomenon in organizational behaviour and human relations literature. It is a guiding force in lives of people (Reece, Brandt, and Howie, 2008)[9]. It is a major work-related aspect of personality and a core self-evaluation (Greenberg and Baron, 2008)[10].

Little research has been done with regard to relationship between assertiveness and SE. In particular a gap exists in the empirical knowledge of degree of assertiveness of senior managers who work in banking sector in Sri Lanka indicating a contextual gap in research at industry level too. Furthermore, an intellectual curiosity exists to know about the degree of SE of senior level managers, particularly those who could advance in their career paths to a significant extent and whether their SE had been a significant correlate of their assertiveness.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES

Following questions were formulated as the research questions in this study to be answered through a systematic attempt:

1. What is the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study?
2. What is the degree of self-esteem of senior managers in the organization under study?
3. Does self-esteem of senior managers in the organization relate positively and significantly to their assertiveness?

An explorative and descriptive part and an explanatory part as well are included in this study. The explorative and descriptive part of this study attempts to answer the first question and second question mentioned above while the explanatory part of the study attempts to answer the third question. Following objectives of the study were established by being consistent with the above mentioned research questions.

- I. To explore and describe the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study.
- II. To explore and describe the degree of self-esteem of senior managers in the organization under study.
- III. To investigate whether the degree of self-esteem of senior managers relates positively and significantly to the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study.

3. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE CONSTRUCTS

3.1 Assertiveness

Assertiveness is somewhere between passivity and aggression; it involves sharing one's feelings in a clear, positive and courteous way; the person is not so polite that people misunderstand his/her message, and he/she is not so rude that people feel attacked; and in assertive situations, both parties win (Throop and Castellucci, 2006)[11]. Assertiveness is a desirable behavioral trait closely related to communicative competence, and it is the capacity to make requests; to actively disagree; to express positive or negative personal right and feelings; to initiate, maintain, or disengage from conversations; and to stand up for oneself without another (Pagaduan-Apostol, 2017) [12]. Assertiveness is a widely recognized leadership trait and it is being forthright in expressing demands, opinions, feelings, and attitudes (DuBrin, 2009)[5]. According to DuBrin (2009) [5], assertiveness is a trait in leading and it involves clearly and strongly showing what one thinks and feels. Assertiveness is the process of expressing thoughts and feelings while asking for what one wants in an appropriate way (Lussier, 2010)[3]. Being assertive is generally the most productive behaviour according to him. To be assertive differs significantly from being aggressive (expressing demands in an overly pushy, obnoxious, and abrasive manner) or passive (or non-assertive: suppressing own ideas, attitudes, feelings and thoughts (DuBrin, 2009)[5]. Newstrom (2007) [13] writes:

"Assertive people are direct, honest, and expressive. They feel confident, gain self-respect, and make others valued. By contrast, aggressive people may humiliate others, and unassertive people elicit either pity or scorn from others. Both alternatives to assertiveness typically are less effective for achieving a desired goal during a conflict."

Following working definition which is also labeled as nominal definition was developed for the construct, i.e. assertiveness:

"Assertiveness is the extent to which the employee shows and expresses clearly and strongly his/her feelings, demands, opinions, and attitudes to others without creating conflicts with others. It is being neither aggressive nor non-assertive/passive."

3.2 Self Esteem

According to Catt and Miller (1991)[14] a person's self-concept reflects how that person views about himself or herself and SE refers to the evaluation a person makes about him or her self-concept. SE is an individual's general feeling of self-worth (Nelson and Quick, 1997)[15]. If the person's evaluation about him/her self-concept is positive that person has a positive SE, if the person's evaluation about him/her self-concept is negative that person has a negative SE (Opatha, 2015)[4]. SE is the overall evaluation people make about themselves, whether positive or negative (DuBrin, 2009)[5]. According to Robbins and Judge (2013)[16], SE is individuals' degree of liking or disliking themselves and the degree to which they think they are worthy or unworthy as a person. SE refers to the way one thinks, feels and values him/herself as a person according to Borders Carers Centre[17]. Following working definition or nominal definition was developed for the construct, i.e. SE:

"Self esteem is the extent to which the employee has a feeling of self-worth. It is the extent of evaluation one gives to his/her self-concept."

4. INSTRUMENTATION OF THE CONSTRUCTS

4.1 Assertiveness

The first construct of this study is assertiveness and in order to measure it, the instrument developed by Opatha (2015) [4] was utilized because it was the only instrument available in Sri Lankan context. It was also assumed that Sri Lankan managers selected for the study would understand it better. The level of the instrument was interval and the summated rating received on a 10-item, 5-point Likert scale of assertiveness was the relevant operational definition. There are ten indicators (Opatha, 2015)[4] which are:

1. Degree of asking for favors
2. Degree of demanding to correct mistakes
3. Degree of expressing anger in a non-hurting way
4. Degree of telling another person to stop his or her disturbance
5. Degree of speaking at a meeting
6. Degree of insisting on partner to do his or her fair share of chores
7. Degree of returning a defective good purchased
8. Degree of difficulty in expressing love and affection toward another person
9. Degree of avoiding a person after arguments
10. Degree of expressing injustice done by another

With regard to each of the indicators mentioned above, usual behaviours (actions) of the respondents were solicited on a 5-point Likert scale, and the act of transforming into a different variable (with new values from 1 to 5) was done after calculating the composite indexing. The transforming was done by using the following scale:

Points

- 10 – 18 Very non-assertive
- 19 – 26 Non-assertive
- 27 – 34 Indifferent
- 35 – 42 Assertive
- 43 – 50 Very assertive

4.2 Self Esteem

The instrument developed by Opatha (2015) [4] was decided to use for the purpose of measuring SE as it was simple, short and easy to understand for Sri Lankan managers. The operational definition was: the summated rating received on a 10-item, 5-point Likert scale and the relevant ten indicators (Opatha, 2015)[4] were:

1. Degree of success compared with peers at school
2. Degree of success compared with peers at work
3. Degree of whole satisfaction about the life
4. Number of weaknesses
5. Comparisons of weaknesses with strengths
6. Degree of ability of doing things done by most of others
7. Degree of superiority over others in the same profession
8. Degree of failing when many events in the life are considered
9. Degree of respect about self
10. Number of awards and recognitions received for achievements and contributions

Self ratings of the respondents with regard to the ten indicators were solicited on a 5-point Likert scale, and after composing the composite indexing, the transforming into a different variable (with new values from 1 to 5) was done by using the following scale:

Points

10 – 18 Very low self esteem

19 – 26 Low self esteem

27 – 34 Moderate self esteem

35 – 42 High self esteem

43 – 50 Very high self esteem

4.3 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

A major type of validity which is a property of an instrument is content validity that is an essential type of validity which is the extent to which the instrument measures what it intends to measure (Sekaran, 1992[18]; Opatha, 2003[19]; Sekaran and Bougie, 2013[20]). Two instruments developed to measure both assertiveness and SE contained an adequate degree of content validity because one question item was developed for each of the indicators mentioned above. One internal consistency method is the split-half technique that is accomplished by splitting a multi-item scale in half, and then correlating the summated results of the scores in the first half with those in the second half (Davis and Cosenza, 1985)[21]. The split half reliability coefficient of the instrument used to measure assertiveness was .330 which was significant at the 0.01 level. Since the test is halved, the reliability estimate is of only half of the test, and therefore the following Spearman Brown Prophecy formula is applied in order to estimate the reliability of the complete test (Monappa and Saiyadain, 1991)[22].

$$r_1 = \frac{2r_{\frac{1}{2}}}{1+r_{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

Here r_1 is the estimated reliability of the total test, and $r_{\frac{1}{2}}$ is the degree of relationship calculated from the basis of the two halves. Observed correlation between the two halves of the assertiveness test is .33, hence the reliability of the full instrument is .49.62 (almost .5). Values between 0.40 and 0.70 are interpreted as moderate correlation; substantial relationship (Guilford as in Monappa and Saiyadain, 1991)[22]. Thus it is possible to mention that internal reliability of the assertiveness instrument is adequate. Also the split half reliability coefficient was calculated for the instrument measuring SE and the relevant coefficient between part 1 and part 2 (by using odd numbers for part 1 and even numbers for part 2) was .579 which was significant at the 0.01 level. The reliability of the full instrument is .73. Values between 0.70 and 0.90 are interpreted as high correlation; marked relationship (Guilford as in Monappa and Saiyadain, 1991)[22]. Thus the internal reliability of the SE instrument is high.

5. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A person with high self esteem exhibits characteristics such as having a positive feeling about self, understanding that there are self strengths and self weaknesses, believing to have a higher number of strengths than a number of weaknesses, believing that strengths are more important than weaknesses, believing that he/she is an important person, and inspiring others to have confidence in him or her (Opatha, 2015)[4]. Consequently a person with a high SE tends to have a high level of assertiveness. It is argued that a person with a high SE can show and express clearly and strongly his/her feelings, demands, opinions and attitudes to others. A person with low SE finds it difficult to show and express clearly and strongly his/her feelings, demands, opinions and attitudes to others. It indicates that high SE leads to high assertiveness. Thus SE and assertiveness are positively related. A manager with high SE will become more assertive and vice versa. Assertiveness training had the potential to improve self esteem among Japanese hospital nurses (Shimizu, Kubota, Mishima, and Nagata, 2004) [23]. Assertiveness behaviour and self esteem are positively and significantly correlated (Maheshwari and Gill, 2015) [24]. A significant positive correlation ($r_s=0.64$) was found between the assertive behaviour and self-esteem of the adolescents (Shanmugam and Kathyayini, 2017) [25]. According to a research done by Ozşaker (2012) [26], it was found that there is a significant stronger relationship between assertiveness and self-esteem among athletic adolescents compared to the sedentary adolescents ($p < 0.05$).

In addition to being able to be independent when needed, the high self-esteemed person usually knows when to call upon others for help and does so without hesitation (Harris and Hartman, 2006)[1]. A general theory that can be adopted to justify the positive relationship between SE and assertiveness is the Successful Performance Model proposed by Harris and Hartman (2006)[1]. According to the model, the one who has experienced success has a high perception of self and others, and this perception results in an open, positive set of attitudes and actions. Derived theorization is that high SE results in high assertiveness.

Another general theory is The Failure-Based Model developed by Harris and Hartman (2006)[1] according to which the one who has experienced failure has rejection of self and lack of identification between self and others, and results are aggression, belligerence, and withdrawal. Derived theorization is that low SE results in aggression or withdrawal, not assertiveness.

Thus based on the above observations, logical beliefs of the researchers, empirical evidence, and the two general theories it is possible to formulate an alternative hypothesis which is stated below. Relevant null hypothesis follows the alternative hypothesis.

Alternative Hypothesis: Self-esteem of senior managers relates significantly and positively to their assertiveness.

Null Hypothesis: Self-esteem of senior managers does not relate significantly to their assertiveness.

Theoretical framework is depicted in Figure 1.



Fig. 1: Theoretical Framework

6. METHOD

In order to find answers for the three research questions a systematic survey was carried out. The survey was composed of a self-administered questionnaire that contained the two instruments used to measure the two constructs, i.e. SE and assertiveness. As mentioned earlier the instruments that were utilized for this study were the instruments developed by Opatha (2015)[4].

6.1 Respondents

In a way this study was a survey-based case study as the data collection was done from a group of managers who were permanent members of a bank which was a very large bank in Sri Lanka. One bank was selected because the objectives of the study could be achieved by taking only one bank and the selected organization was an organization for which one of the authors in this research paper served as a resource person. Many awards of excellence have been received by the bank locally and internationally for its continued success. As a matter of fact it has been one of the largest banks, one of the commercially highly successful banks, and also is one of the biggest organizations in the country. By considering the principle of parsimony, without taking all managers as the respondents for the study one type of middle managers was considered for the study. The number of middle managers with official job title Senior Manager who had been working in the bank was about 130 and from almost all of them data were collected. The bank requires senior managers to have the potential to assume responsibilities of higher jobs including Chief Manager, Assistant General Manager, Deputy General Manager, and General Manager, and also Senior Manager is a middle manager in the management hierarchy of the bank and jobs titled Management Trainee, Junior Executive, Executive, Senior Executive, Assistant Manager and Manager are the ones that are lower than Senior Manager. Thus, Senior Managers were, are, and will be considered as key managerial employees for the success of the bank and its progress of success. 129 senior managers were actual respondents and respondent ratio is almost 100.

6.2 Study Design Decisions

One design decision was about unit of analysis and it was for this study was individual level: Senior Manager. The data for the study were collected only at one point of time, not at different points of time, and therefore its time horizon of the study was cross sectional. The researchers interfered with the study with the normal flow of events. This study was a relational study, not a causal study. Hence there were no manipulation and control of variables resulting in that the extent of researcher interference was minimal. The study setting was no contrived owing to the reason that no artificial setting was created for data collection.

7. FINDINGS

7.1 Assertiveness of Sri Lankan Managers under Study

The first research question of the study is: What is the degree of assertiveness of senior managers in the organization under study? As mentioned above in collecting data 129 senior managers in the selected bank responded and Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of the dependent variable of the study, i.e. assertiveness.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Assertiveness

Mean	3.63
Standard Deviation	.53
Minimum	2
Maximum	5
Range	3

According to the Table that gives the relevant measure of central tendency, i.e the mean, it was 3.63 which results in a finding with regard to assertiveness that majority of senior managers in the bank under the study are individuals with high assertiveness. The standard deviation offers an index of the spread of a distribution or the variability in the data (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013)[20] and it was .53 which is less than 1. Hence the dispersion is not much and most of the managers are centered around the mean. Table 2 provides frequencies of assertiveness.

Table 2: Frequencies of Assertiveness

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 3	52	40.3	40.3	40.3
4	74	57.4	57.4	97.7
5	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	129	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 presents only three rows: the first row that is for the composite response moderate assertiveness (coded in the data with the value 3), the second row that is for the composite response high assertiveness (coded in the data with the value 4),

and the third row for the composite response very high assertiveness (coded with the value 5). There were 52 senior managers who possess moderate assertiveness and the percentage of such managers is 40.3. 74 senior managers possess high assertiveness and as a percentage it is 57.4 which is the highest frequency. Only 3 senior managers were in 'Very high assertiveness' level and there were no senior managers with neither very low assertiveness nor low assertiveness.

7.2 Self Esteem of Sri Lankan Managers under Study

The second research question of the study is: What is the degree of self esteem of senior managers in the organization under study? It was possible to collect data from 129 senior managers in the selected bank and following Table 3 presents the relevant descriptive statistics of the independent variable of this study, i.e. self esteem.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Self Esteem

Mean	3.80
Standard Deviation	.63
Minimum	2
Maximum	5
Range	3

Table 3 gives the measure of central tendency, i.e. the mean of SE of senior managers under the study and it was 3.80. It indicates that majority of senior managers in the bank under the study are individuals with high self esteem. The standard deviation is less than 1 (.63), and therefore the dispersion is not much. Frequencies are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Frequencies of Self Esteem

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
3	35	27.1	27.1	28.7
4	78	60.5	60.5	89.1
5	14	10.9	10.9	100.0
Total	129	100.0	100.0	

As shown in Table 4, the first row is for the composite response Low self esteem (coded in the data with the value 2), and the second row is for the composite response Moderate self esteem (coded in the data with the value 3), third row is for the composite response High self esteem (coded with the value 4), and the fourth row is for the composite response very high self esteem (coded with the value 5). Only 2 senior managers have low SE (1.6 as a percentage). 35 (27.1%) senior managers have moderate SE. 78 senior managers have high SE and the percentage of such managers is 60.5. Only 14 senior managers are having very high SE and it is only 10.9 as a percentage. Thus, it is possible to get a finding that the Sri Lankan managers under study are having high degree of SE.

7.3 Relationship between Self Esteem and Assertiveness

The third research question of the study is: Does self esteem of senior managers in the organization relate significantly and positively to their assertiveness? Based on the observations of noted authors, general theory, i.e. the Successful Performance Model (Harris and Hartman, 2006), and the researchers' logical beliefs an alternative hypothesis was formulated and it was: Self esteem of senior managers relates significantly and positively to their job involvement. In order to test the validity of the alternative hypothesis the Pearson Correlation Technique was applied as it was the appropriate technique (the hypothesis is about relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable whose levels of measurement are interval) (Norusis, 1997)[27]. Desired level of significance was 0.05 and one-tailed test was applied as the formulated alternative hypothesis had been directional. Table 5 presents the results of the Pearson Correlation Test.

Table 5: Correlation Between Self Esteem and Assertiveness

Pearson correlation	.176
Significant (one-tail test)	.046
N	129

According to the Table Pearson correlation coefficient is .176 which is positive indicating that both variables are positively related. In order to find out this found positive relationship is statistically significant or not, the observed significant value was considered. It was .046 which is smaller than the desired level of significance (0.05). Hence the found correlation

coefficient is statistically significant. Thus, it is possible to reject the null hypothesis (there is no relationship between self esteem of senior managers and their assertiveness) and accept the alternative hypothesis (self esteem of senior managers relates positively and significantly their assertiveness). At 95% confident level, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is statistical evidence to claim that self esteem of senior managers relates positively and significantly their assertiveness.

8. DISCUSSION

Descriptively it was found that majority of senior managers under study had a high assertiveness. Furthermore, another descriptive finding was that majority of senior managers under study had a high level of self esteem. It is good to empirically find that senior managers in the bank are having a right personality trait, i.e. self esteem and a right leadership quality, i.e. assertiveness in high degree. However, there is still room for them to improve their self esteem and assertiveness. It is not easy to enhance self esteem particularly within a short time as it is mainly dependent upon successes acquired by particular managers. When a manager has many achievements and success it is more likely that he or she has a very high self esteem. Generally it is difficult to develop self esteem within managers in a short time and by training managers to engage in actions such as giving himself/herself credits for making good decisions, viewing problems as challenges, being willing to change, being future oriented, and obtaining knowledge and skills to improve.

Being assertive gives manager a better chance of getting what he or she really wants. It was hypothesized that self esteem of senior managers relates positively and significantly to their assertiveness. It was found that both variables were positively and statistically related. Higher the self esteem of the manager is higher the degree assertiveness he or she will have. The found relationship between SE and assertiveness is not high or moderate, though it was significant. This might be owing to a reason that there are some factors or variables which have more impact on assertiveness. These factors may include assertive training received by the particular manager, general leadership training received by the particular manager, personal character of the manager, and nature of other people.

9. CONCLUSION

Two important variables, i.e. SE and assertiveness were considered in this study. SE of majority of senior managers in the bank under the study is high. Furthermore, assertiveness of majority of senior managers in the bank under the study is high. Self esteem of senior managers positively and significantly related to their assertiveness. It is possible to expect a high assertiveness from senior managers if they possess a high self esteem. It is recommended that future studies be done with regard to other types of managers in the bank and even other banks not considered for this study to establish the positive and significant relationship between SE and assertiveness.

10. REFERENCES

1. O.J. Harris, and S.J. Hartman, *organizational behaviour* (New York: The Haworth Press Inc., 2006).
2. V.M. Akuratiyagamage, and H.H.D.N.P. Opatha, Grievances of middle managers: an empirical investigation into perceptions of commercial bank managers in Sri Lanka, *Journal of management Research*, 4 (2), 2004, 99-112.
3. R.N. Lussier, *human relations in organizations: applications and skill building* (Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin, 2010).
4. H.H.D.N.P. Opatha, *organizational behavior: The Human Side of Work* (Colombo: Department of HRM, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, 2015).
5. A.J. DuBrin, *human relations: interpersonal, job-oriented skills* (Ney Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2009).
6. R.M. Hodgetts, and K.W. Hegar, *modern human relations at work* (Ohio: Thomson South-Western, 2005).
7. H.H.D.N.P. Opatha, *human resource management: personnel* (Colombo: Department of HRM, University of Sri Jayewardenepura, 2009).
8. H.H.D.N.P. Opatha, Employee grievance settlement procedure: a case study of two corporations, *Management Review*, 1 (2), 1994, 53-60.

9. B.L. Reece, R. Brandt, and K. Howie, *effective human relations: interpersonal and organizational applications* (Mason: South-Western Learning, 2008).
10. J. Greenberg, and R.A. Baron, *behavior in organizations* (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008).
11. R.K. Throop, and M.B. Castellucci, *personal excellence* (New York: Thomson, Delmar Learning, 2006).
12. E.S. Pagaduan-Apostol, Assertiveness, Self-Esteem, and Academic Performance in Speech and Oral Communication of Filipino Junior Secondary Teacher Education Students, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(3), 2017, 36-42.
13. J.W. Newstrom, *Organizational Behavior: human behavior at work*(New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd, 2007).
14. S.E. Catt, and D.S. Miller, *supervision* (Boston: IRWIN, 1991).
15. D.L. Nelson, and J.C. Quick, *organizational behavior: foundations, realities, and challenges* (New York: West Publishing Company, 1997).
16. S.P. Robbins, and T.A. Judge, *organizational behaviour* (Boston: PEARSON, 2013).
17. Borders Carers Centre, Available at: www.borderscarerscentre.co.uk
18. U. Sekaran, *research methods for business: a skill building approach* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1992).
19. H.H.D.N.P. Opatha, *research methods for hrm*(Colombo: Author Publication, 2003).
20. U. Sekaran, and Bougie, *research methods for business: a skill building approach* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 2013).
21. D. Davis, and R.M. Cosenza, *business research for decision making* (Boston: PWS-KENT Publishing Company, 1985).
22. Monappa, and M. Saiyadain, *personnel management* (New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, 1991).
23. T. Shimizu, S. Kubota, N. Mishima, and S. Nagata, Relationship between Self-Esteem and Assertiveness training among Japanese Hospital Nurses, *Journal of Occupational Health*, 46, 2004, 296-298.
24. S.K. Maheshwari, and K.K. Gill, Relationship of Assertiveness and Self Esteem Among Nurses, *International Journal of Health Sciences & Research*, 5(6), 2015, 440-449.
25. Shanmugam, and B.V. Kathyayini, Assertiveness and Self-Esteem in Indian Adolescents, *Galore International Journal of Health Sciences and Research*, 2, 2017, 8-13.
26. M. Özşaker, Assertiveness and self-esteem in Turkish adolescents: a study on athletes and nonathletes, *De Gruyter*, 2012, 1-5.
27. M.J. Norusis, *spss 7.5 guide to data analysis* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1997).