

JOB SATISFACTION AS A FUNCTION OF EMPLOYEES' COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION, SELF-ESTEEM, AND PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISORS

RAYMOND L. FALCIONE
University of Maryland

JAMES C. McCROSKEY
West Virginia University

JOHN A. DALY
Purdue University

The study indicated that subordinate satisfaction with immediate supervision is closely associated with perceptions of supervisor communication behavior, credibility, attractiveness, and attitude homophily, and to a lesser extent with oral communication apprehension and self-esteem. It was further suggested that while these variables are good predictors of satisfaction with immediate supervision, they may have little or no effect on other dimensions of job satisfaction.

While the assumption that "a happy employee is a productive employee" is an overgeneralization of the relationship between job satisfaction and employee productivity, the assumption is more likely true than false in many instances. While the primary goal of management is the enhancement of productivity—getting the job done—it has long been recognized that an important mediator of that goal may be the satisfaction level of the employees in the organization. Beyond the possible link between satisfaction and productivity, there has been considerable interest in employee satisfaction as a variable in and of itself (Korman, 1971). In fact, Locke (1976) estimates more than 3,300 studies on the subject of job satisfaction have been published to date.

The research program described in this paper sought to determine the role of a wide variety of variables on job satisfaction. Self-descriptions of *esteem* and *communication propensity*, as well as subordinate perceptions of supervisor *credibility*, *homophily*, *attraction*, and *communication behavior*, were related to five dimensions of job satisfaction. The overall intent was to explain a large percentage of the variation in job satisfaction as a function of these variables.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The Nature of Job Satisfaction

An individual's satisfaction with his or her job has been defined and operationalized in a number of different ways. For example, some have viewed satisfaction as a derivative of need or value attainment (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Locke, Lofquist & Dawis, 1969; Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960; Pelz & Andrews, 1966; Porter, 1962). Others, operating within an equity theory framework (Adams, 1965), have viewed satisfaction as the consequence of a comparison between perceived inputs and outputs (Pritchard, Dunnette, & Jensen, 1972). Similarly, expectancy-instrumentality-valence models have conceptualized satisfaction as a function of the individual's expected rewards owing to his behaviors on the job (Jensen, Dunnette, & Pritchard, 1973; Graen, Pritchard & DeLeo, 1973; Vroom, 1964). The approaches described so far tend to emphasize a cognitive approach to job satisfaction. The individual is assumed to be a rational, highly output oriented being who engages in logical comparisons, rankings, and orderings.

Alternatively, a number of other theorists have seen organizational satisfaction as being much more affective in nature. That is, the individual's level of satisfaction is essentially viewed as a reaction to a variety of salient likes and dislikes that may be specified along content dimensions. It is reasonable to assume that perceived job satisfaction is comprised of multiple dimensions (Locke, 1976; Quinn, 1974; Vroom, 1964). These dimensions constitute one's affect responses to various facets of the work environment. For example, these may include one's perceptions of his or her supervision, pay, promotion, co-workers, and the work itself. Considerable support exists for the viability of these as the primary dimensions of job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).

While the dimensions of job satisfaction appear fairly clear, the causal agents of satisfaction are far less so. Certainly, variables such as opportunity to participate in decision making (Daly, McCroskey, & Falcione, 1976a; Falcione, 1974a; Falcione, 1974c; Vroom, 1964), job enlargement (Argyris, 1964; 1965), job enrichment (Herzberg, 1966), working conditions (Barnowe et al., 1972), and the individual's perceptions of his or her success and the internal-external feedback one receives from his or her performance (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Herzberg, 1966; Locke, 1965), all have some effect. In addition, three other variables may play crucial roles in job satisfaction. These are the individual's self-esteem, his perceptions of his immediate superior, and his orientations toward communication.

The present study examined the above three correlates of job satisfactions from the vantage point of the employee. Our purpose was to generate a predictive model for employee satisfaction that would generalize across organizational types and provide information suggestive of intervention procedures which might be implemented within organizations and lead to increased employee satisfaction.

Communication Apprehension

Communication apprehension is a broad-based fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons. High levels of communication apprehension

have been found to result in withdrawal from and avoidance of communication with others (McCroskey, 1976). Two dimensions of communication apprehension have been isolated and found related to the work environment: oral (McCroskey, 1970, 1976) and written (Daly & Miller, 1975). The impact of communication apprehension on choice of employment (Daly & McCroskey, 1975; Daly & Shamo, 1976) and application for employment (Daly & Leth, 1976; Richmond, 1976) have been clearly established. In addition, employees with low levels of communication apprehension have been found to be retained in an organization almost 50 percent longer (with age held constant) than employees with high levels of apprehension (Scott, McCroskey, & Sheahan, 1976). The data relating to retention is particularly suggestive of a relationship between communication apprehension and employee satisfaction, hence the inclusion of apprehension in our model.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem has been referred to as *self-concept*, *self-evaluation*, *self-image*, *self-satisfaction*, and *self-acceptance*. As Wylie (1961) has noted, these terms "all refer to approximately the same variable." Whatever label is employed, the construct refers to the ways a person perceives her or himself and the evaluations the individual develops as a result of those perceptions. The self-esteem of individuals has often been found to be related to their perceptions of their environments and their behaviors (Wylie, 1961).

Within organizations, the individual's view of himself is bound to impact on job attitudes and perceptions. People with high self-esteem, for example, have been found to engage in more self-disclosure than those with lower self-esteem (McCroskey & Richmond, 1975). Korman (1968) argues that *high* self-esteem employees enjoy task success more than *low* self-esteem employees. Locke (1976) has predicted ways in which *high* self-esteem people would react in the work environment: (1) they would value challenging tasks; (2) pleasure derived from achievement would be more intense and enduring; (3) they would be more likely to want promotions for reasons of justice

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

rather than prestige and status; (4) they would not rely highly on prestige, approval, and verbal recognition as sources of self-assurance; (5) they would be less emotionally affected by criticism than low self-esteem persons; (6) they would experience fewer conflicts and feelings of anxiety in the work environment; and (7) they would be less defensive and would employ fewer defense mechanisms. Finally, Weiner et al. (1971) and Lewin (1963) found that low self-esteem people tend to disassociate themselves from failure by projecting it into others, often leading to dissatisfaction with the target person. In the work environment, this may often be his or her immediate supervisor. Because it was believed that a person's self-esteem would have an impact on the way he or she reacts to the environment, it was felt important that the construct be included in our model.

Perceived Supervisor Credibility

Source credibility has long been viewed by communication scholars as an extremely important variable in human interaction. However, little empirical investigation of the effect of credibility in organizational settings has been conducted. Research in a large medical research organization suggests that if a supervisor is not trusted by subordinates, or vice versa, the resulting communication between the parties will tend to be evasive or compliant. Such responses may lead to unwarranted or overestimated degrees of agreement being assumed (Mellinger, 1956). Read (1962) obtained similar findings in an industrial organization. Levels of distrust also appear to be compounded in organizations because of the inherent hierarchical status relationships in organizations (Porter & Roberts, 1976).

Perceived credibility does appear to affect satisfaction in organizations. Falcione (1973, 1974c, 1975) found a significant relationship between subordinate satisfaction and subordinate perceptions of their supervisors' credibility, particularly as it related to the character-sociability (safety) dimension. Because credibility is viewed as a particularly important component of source valence, particularly in an organizational environment, the construct was added to our model.

Perceived Supervisor Attractiveness

Employees in organizations are often attracted to their supervisors for different reasons. These relationships are called *functional* and *entity relationships* (Locke, 1976). Functional relationships between supervisor and subordinate are based on what services can be provided for each other. An employee may be attracted to his or her supervisor to the degree that he or she views the supervisor providing or helping to attain salient job values (Locke, 1970a, 1970b). These values are normally job-related, or are related to the rewards the employee can accrue for task performance.

The entity relationships of subordinate to supervisor are based on the bond between them for reasons rather than the services obtainable from the relationship. This attraction is a function of the social exchanges between the subordinate and supervisor (Rosen, 1969; Tosi, Chesser, & Campion, 1972).

Because *interpersonal attraction* has been found to be highly predictive of the amount of communication in which people engage (Berscheid & Walster, 1969), this was added to our model as an assumption underlying our inclusion of employee perceptions of supervisor attractiveness. The model was that attraction facilitates communication, which, in turn, may facilitate satisfaction.

Perceived Supervisor Homophily

Perceptions of fundamental similarity in attitudes, background, and values have been shown to profoundly affect relationships (Byrne, 1969; McCroskey, & Falcione, 1976b). The degree of *interpersonal homophily* has also been found in extensive previous research to be predictive of the amount and effectiveness of communication between people (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971). The inclusion of *homophily* in our model was based on the assumption that more—as well as more effective—communication between the subordinate and supervisor would lead to greater satisfaction.

Perceived Listening, Understandingness, and Communication Quality

These three variables were included in our model in an attempt to tap the role of the employee's perception of his or her communicative relationship with supervision. Our assumption was that an employee would be more satisfied if a positive communicative relationship with the supervisor was perceived (Locke, Cartledge, & Koepfel, 1968). While these three variables have been examined previously (Daly, 1975; Daly & Lashbrook, 1976), they have not been extensively studied in the organizational environment. However, similar constructs under a variety of labels such as *consideration* (Fleishman, 1957a, 1957b; Halin & Winer, 1975; Halin, 1957; Seeman, 1957), *maintenance* (Fiedler, 1966; Hunt, 1967; Hill, 1969), and *receptivity* (Daly, McCroskey, & Falcione, 1976a; Falcione, 1974a; Redding, 1970) dot the literature. Previous research has, for the most part, failed to clearly differentiate the various aspects of the supervisor-subordinate communicative relationship. Consequently, the three variables of *perceived listening*, *understandingness*, and *communication quality* were included in our model.

ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSED MODEL

Based on the above literature review, the model which we generated for this research included 22 variables: two dimensions of *employee communication apprehension*, five dimensions of *employee self-esteem*, five dimensions of *perceived supervisor credibility*, three dimensions of *perceived supervisor attractiveness*, four dimensions of *perceived homophily*, plus *perceived quality of the supervisor's listening*, *understandingness*, and *communication*.

Research Questions

Our primary concern in this study was the development and testing of a predictive model of employee satisfaction. This led us to address three research questions: (1) To what extent is each variable in the model associated with employee satisfaction? (2) To what extent can we predict employee

satisfaction by employing all of the variables in the model? (3) What is the most parsimonious combination of variables from our model for predicting employee satisfaction?

In order to obtain data relevant to these questions, information was collected from two highly divergent subject populations.

METHOD

Data Collection

The measures of *communication apprehension*, *self-esteem*, *supervisor credibility*, *attractiveness*, *homophily*, *listening ability*, *understandingness*, and *communication quality* noted above, were administered to 211 employees of a large federal research establishment and 189 elementary and secondary teachers from a variety of schools in three states. The age range in both samples was from 22 to 64. The majority of the federal employees were male; the majority of teachers were female.

Measurement

The following instruments were used to measure the variables in our model:

Job satisfaction: In order to measure job satisfaction on a variety of dimensions, the *Job Descriptive Index* (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) was administered. The JDI includes five scales pertaining to work, pay, promotions, co-workers, and supervision. These scales have been described by Vroom (1964) as the most carefully developed to date. They have been found to be reliable and have had factorial stability in previous studies (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).

Communication apprehension: The measures of communication apprehension employed for this study were the *Personal Report of Communication Apprehension* (PRCA; McCroskey, 1970) for the oral dimension and the *Writing Apprehension Test* (WAT; Daly & Miller, 1975) for the written dimension. Both of these measures have been found to have satisfactory reliability and validity in previous research.

Self-esteem: The measure of self-esteem employed in this study was the *McCroskey/Richmond Self-Esteem Index* (MRSEI; McCroskey & Richmond, 1975). The measure has been found to be highly reliable across a variety of subject populations, and to have concurrent validity with other measures of this construct (McCroskey, Richmond, Daly, & Falcione, 1976). The five dimensions of *self-esteem* measured by the MRSEI have been labeled *competence, character, sociability, composure, and extroversion*.

Perceived supervisor credibility: As noted earlier, previous research has found a relationship between the perceived credibility of the supervisor and employee satisfaction (Falcione, 1973, 1974c, 1975). Inclusion of the dimensions of *supervisor credibility* in our model permitted replication of that research and the testing of the strength of *credibility* as a predictive variable in comparison with other *employee perceptions of supervisors*.

The measure of supervisor credibility was a five-dimensional instrument drawn from the work of Falcione (1974b) and McCroskey, Jensen, and Valencia (1973). The five dimensions measured were *competence, character, sociability, composure, and extroversion*. Each dimension was measured by 4 seven-point bipolar scales. Previous research has indicated that the reliability of measurement for each dimension was satisfactory (above .80).

Perceived supervisor attractiveness: The measure of attractiveness was multidimensional (McCroskey & McCain 1974). The dimensions of *task, social, and physical attraction* were each measured by five *Likert-type* scales. The reliability of measurement for each dimension has been found to be satisfactory (above .80) in several previous studies.

Perceived supervisor homophily: The measure of *homophily* was that developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975). This instrument measures four dimensions of *homophily*—*attitude, background, appearance, and morality*. Each dimension is measured by seven-point bipolar scales. Four scales were employed for each dimension except *morality*. Two scales were employed for the

morality dimension.

Perceived listening, understandingness, and communication quality: Seven-point bipolar scales were used to measure these variables. The scales employed for *perceived listening ability* were *bored-alert, listens-doesn't listen, attentive-inattentive, and uninterested-interested*. The scales for *perceived understandingness* were *sensitive-insensitive, responsive-unresponsive, cold-warm, empathic-unempathic, and not understanding-understanding*. To measure the *perceived quality of the supervisor's communication*, the following scales were employed: *high quality-low quality, poor-excellent, correct-incorrect, worthless-worthwhile, and satisfactory-unsatisfactory*.

Data Analyses

The data from the two subject samples were analyzed separately. Preliminary analyses were concerned with the factorial stability and reliability of each of the measures, since some of the measures had not previously been employed with similar subject samples. Items for each measure or group of measures were subjected to factor analysis with oblique rotation (since several dimensions were known from previous research to be correlated), and internal (split-half) reliability estimates were computed. The results of these analyses (detailed results will not be reported here because of their volume) indicated that the dimensionality of each instrument was the same as was expected on the basis of previous research. Internal reliability for the variables ranged from a low of .84 (JDI pay dimension, *federal sample*) to a high of .95 (WAT, *teacher sample*). On the basis of these preliminary analyses, it was concluded that the data obtained from the various instruments were satisfactory for the purposes of the main analyses.

In order to provide information relevant to the first two research questions, two major analyses were performed. The first analysis assumed an underlying construct of *job satisfaction* as a linear combination of the five dimensions of the JDI. In this analysis a *canonical correlation* was computed between all of our predictor variables and the five dimension scores from the JDI. The results of this

TABLE 1
Correlations of Predictor and Criterion Variables
with Canonical Variable

	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample
<u>Predictor Variables</u>		
Communication Apprehension		
PRCA	-.24	-.28
WAT	-.12	-.07
Self-Esteem		
Sociability	.32	.01
Composure	.24	.16
Competence	.26	.10
Extroversion	.20	.21
Character	.26	.11
Supervisor Perceptions		
Sociability	.80	.76
Composure	.58	.60
Competence	.78	.76
Extroversion	.38	.49
Character	.79	.75
Attitude Homophily	.70	.70
Background Homophily	.17	.11
Morality Homophily	.42	.50
Appearance Homophily	.11	.01
Social Attraction	.71	.72
Physical Attraction	.48	.46
Task Attraction	.73	.81
Listening	.84	.84
Understandingness	.87	.85
Communication Quality	.37	.34
<u>Criterion Variables</u>		
Supervisor	.99	.99
Work	.43	.07
Pay	.03	.14
Promotions	.34	.20
Co-workers	.44	.11

Correlations .14 are significant at alpha .05.

analysis provided one overall canonical correlation between the two groups of variables and an indication of the degree to which each variable was correlated to the canonical variable generated by the analysis.

The second analysis assumed that the dimensions of the JDI were relatively independent. Thus, this analysis did not focus on an overall construct of *job satisfaction*; rather, the focus was on the five sub-

parts of that construct. In this analysis, simple correlations were computed between each predictor variable and each JDI dimension. Additionally, *multiple regression* analyses employing all of the predictor variables were performed on the scores for each JDI dimension.

In order to answer our third research question, stepwise multiple regression analyses were performed on the scores on each JDI dimension

employing all of our predictor variables. The backward stepwise procedure was employed. Two criteria were employed in selecting the best model: (1) all predictor variables in the model were required to be significant at the .10 alpha level, and (2) a model with fewer predictors was selected over other models if the reduction in explained variance was less than one percent.

The criterion for statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$ for all tests except those for beta weights of predictor variables noted above.

RESULTS

Canonical Analyses

The canonical correlation analyses for the data from the two samples yielded significant canonical correlations for the first variable generated in both data sets (*federal sample* $rc = .89$; chi-square = 433.15; $p < .0001$; *teacher sample* $rc = .88$; chi-square = 351.24; $p < .0001$). An examination of the correlations between the satisfaction variables and the canonical variable (see Table 1), indicates that supervisor satisfaction was the dominant contributor to the generated variable in both samples. Satisfaction with promotions was also significantly associated with the generated variable in both samples. Satisfaction with work and co-workers were associated with the canonical variable for the *federal sample* but not for the *teacher sample*. Satisfaction with pay was not correlated with the generated variable in either analysis.

Among the predictor variables, only WAT and *appearance homophily* failed to be significantly correlated with the canonical variables in both analyses. All other predictors were significantly correlated with the canonical variable in the *federal sample*. In the data from the *teacher sample*, *background homophily* and the *sociability*, *competence*, and *character dimensions* of *self-esteem* were not correlated significantly with the canonical variable.

While these results suggest some support for our assumption that overall satisfaction can be conceived of as a linear combination of the five JDI dimensions, that support is not strong. A predictive model based on the canonical correlation results would be primarily oriented toward supervisor sat-

isfaction and would not be particularly helpful in predicting the other satisfaction elements. Thus, the results of our other analyses will form the basis for the conclusions we will draw relating to our three research questions.

Correlation Analyses

The results of the correlational analyses for both samples are reported in Table 2. These results indicate that while the PRCA was a significant predictor of *supervisor satisfaction* in both samples, and of satisfaction with work in the *federal sample*, the WAT was not significantly correlated with any dimension of satisfaction in either sample.

The results relating to *self-esteem* also present a mixed picture. *Sociability* was a significant predictor of *satisfaction with work* for both samples, and of *satisfaction with supervisor*, *promotions*, and *co-workers* for the *federal sample*. *Composure* was significantly correlated with *supervisor satisfaction* for both samples, and with *work* and *co-workers* for the *federal sample*. While *competence* was not significantly correlated with any dimension of satisfaction for the *teacher sample*, it was correlated with *supervisor*, *work*, and *co-worker satisfaction* for the *federal sample*. *Extroversion* was significantly correlated with *supervisor* and *work satisfaction* for both samples, and with *co-worker satisfaction* for the *federal sample*. *Character* was significantly correlated with *supervisor* and *co-worker satisfaction* for the *federal sample*, but not correlated significantly with any satisfaction variable for the *teacher sample*.

Taken together, these results suggest a moderate relationship between *self-oriented perceptions* (*communication apprehension*, *self-esteem*, and *employee satisfaction*). In general, the relationship appears stronger for the *federal sample* than for the *teacher sample*, and to be most associated with *supervisor*, *work*, and *co-worker dimensions of satisfaction*.

The data concerning supervisor perceptions provide a somewhat clearer picture. While all of these perceptions, with the exceptions of *background* and *appearance homophily*, formed strong positive relationships with *supervisor satisfaction* for both samples, they all had low or nonsignificant relation-

Predictor Variable	Satisfaction Dimension									
	Supervisor		Work		Pay		Promotions		Co-workers	
	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample	Federal Sample	Teacher Sample
Communication Apprehension										
PRCA	-.19	-.23	-.29	-.08	.10	-.01	-.11	-.14	-.13	-.02
WAT	-.09	-.05	-.14	-.03	.03	.04	-.08	-.09	-.04	.01
Self-Esteem										
Sociability	.28	.00	.17	.23	-.14	-.08	.17	-.03	.27	.01
Composure	.21	.15	.16	.08	-.04	.03	.14	.11	.20	.13
Competence	.19	.09	.29	.12	.01	.01	.00	-.12	.35	.10
Extroversion	.16	.16	.25	.20	-.11	-.01	.13	.11	.22	-.05
Character	.21	.12	.12	.11	.14	.11	-.02	-.12	.29	.14
Supervisor Perceptions										
Sociability	.70	.67	.32	.11	-.05	.12	.18	.04	.27	.11
Composure	.51	.53	.23	-.03	.00	-.01	.18	.08	.20	.13
Competence	.68	.67	.37	-.01	-.04	.13	.32	.14	.35	.14
Extroversion	.33	.43	.22	.03	.01	.10	.27	.17	.22	.06
Character	.70	.66	.27	.05	.03	.12	.19	.08	.29	.10
Attitude Homophily	.63	.60	.21	.00	-.01	.12	.25	.14	.20	-.03
Background Homophily	.16	.09	.02	.08	.07	.06	.10	-.02	.13	-.03
Morality Homophily	.37	.44	.21	.11	.05	.02	.13	.01	.13	.06
Appearance Homophily	.11	.00	-.02	.00	-.08	.02	-.03	.06	.03	-.12
Social Attraction	.62	.62	.27	.15	.01	.13	.18	.20	.23	.04
Physical Attraction	.43	.39	.14	.09	-.05	.01	.07	.10	.14	-.01
Task Attraction	.65	.70	.24	.02	.05	.10	.28	.16	.25	.06
Listening	.75	.73	.32	.05	-.02	.06	.30	.12	.31	.10
Understandingness	.78	.74	.22	.08	.01	.10	.28	.15	.32	.09
Communication Quality	.78	.74	.32	.04	.05	.09	.30	.19	.30	.11

Correlations $> \pm .14$ are significant at alpha .05.

TABLE 3
Results of Multiple Regression Analyses

Criterion Variable	F-Ratio	Probability	R ²
Supervisor			
Federal Sample	29.37	<.0001	.77
Teacher Sample	24.27	<.0001	.76
Work			
Federal Sample	3.54	<.0001	.29
Teacher Sample	1.15	.30	.13
Pay			
Federal Sample	1.36	.14	.14
Teacher Sample	1.04	.41	.12
Promotions			
Federal Sample	2.02	<.01	.19
Teacher Sample	1.40	.12	.16
Co-workers			
Federal Sample	2.04	<.01	.19
Teacher Sample	.89	.61	.11

ships with the remaining dimensions for the *teacher sample*. A few moderate relationships between these perceptions and *work*, *promotion*, and *co-worker satisfaction* appeared for the *federal sample*.

Multiple Regression Analyses

The results of the multiple regression analyses are summarized in Table 3. For the *federal sample*, significant models were generated for all dimensions of satisfaction except *pay*. The only significant model generated for the *teacher sample* was that for *satisfaction with supervision*.

The models for *satisfaction with supervisor* for the two samples accounted for very similar (and high) percentages of variance (*federal* = 77%; *teachers* = 76%). Thus, it is clear that our model is capable of substantial prediction of at least one

dimension of satisfaction. Results on the other four dimensions, however, present a picture that is less encouraging, as well as less clear. On the *work dimension* of satisfaction, a significant and moderately powerful model was generated for the *federal sample* ($R^2 = .29$), but the model for the *teacher sample* was not significant and, had it been, would have accounted for much less variance ($R^2 = .13$). Differences in variance accounted for from the models of the two samples on the other three dimensions were much smaller, but large enough to cross the border of significance for the *federal sample* on the *promotion* and *co-worker dimensions*.

Caution should be exercised in drawing any conclusions from these results, however. Because of the large number of predictor variables employed and the redundancy of these variables (as evidenced by their substantial intercorrelations), the regression analyses provide an extremely conservative

Communication Yearbook I

TABLE 4
Models Generated by Stepwise Regression Procedures

Criterion Variable	Federal Models		Teacher Models	
	Predictor	Beta	Predictor	Beta
Supervisor	PRCA*	-.09	PRCA*	-.15
	MRSEI-Competence	.09	WAT	-.07
	MRSEI-Extroversion	-.09	MRSEI-Sociability	-.10
	Composure	.10	Sociability	.30
	Competence*	.24	Competence*	.18
	Extroversion	-.10	Communication Quality*	.12
	Character	.17	Social Attraction	.09
	Understandingness	.27	Task Attraction	.21
	Communication Quality*	.28	Attitude Homophily	.11
	Morality Homophily*	-.08	Morality Homophily*	.09
	Physical Attraction	.11	Appearance Homophily	-.07
	(F = 59.61, p <.0001, R ² = .77)		(F = 50.13, p <.0001, R ² = .76)	
Work	PRCA	-.21	MRSEI-Sociability	.18
	MRSEI-Competence	.18	MRSEI-Extroversion	.13
	Sociability	.29	Social Attraction	.22
	Composure	.13	Attitude Homophily	-.14
	Competence	.21	(F = 5.21, p <.001, R ² = .10)	
	Understandingness	-.25		
Pay	(F = 12.08, p <.0001, R ² = .26)			
	MRSEI-Sociability*	-.27	MRSEI-Sociability*	-.19
	MRSEI-Extroversion	-.11	MRSEI-Character*	.20
	MRSEI-Character*	.24	Extroversion	.12
	Communication Quality	.13	(F = 3.20, p <.05, R ² = .05)	
Promotions	Appearance Homophily	-.15		
	(F = 4.79, p <.001, R ² = .10)			
	MRSEI-Character	-.11	WAT	-.15
	Competence	.19	MRSEI-Competence	-.15
	Extroversion	.14	Sociability	-.20
Co-workers	Understandingness	.14	Communication Quality	.24
	(F = 8.26, p <.0001, R ² = .14)		Social Attraction	.19
			(F = 4.40, p <.05, R ² = .11)	
	Competence*	.24	Competence*	.13
Co-workers	Understandingness	.18	MRSEI-Character	.13
	(F = 17.32, p <.0001, R ² = .14)		(F = 3.57, p <.05, R ² = .04)	

*Predictor for both samples on same dimension.

statistical estimate of the ability of our general model's predictive power. As noted below, the stepwise regression procedure produced statistically significant models for all five satisfaction dimensions for both samples. Because the stepwise regression procedure excludes redundant predictor variables, the models generated are typically more powerful and better estimators of variance accountable than the multiple regression procedure reported here.

Stepwise Regression Analyses

Table 4 summarizes the models generated by the stepwise regression procedures, including the predictors retained, their standardized *beta weights*, the statistical test of each model, and the variance predictable (R^2) by each model. As noted in Table 4, statistically significant models were generated for both samples on all five dimensions of satisfaction. The number of predictor variables retained from the original 22 ranged from a high of 11 for both samples, for *supervisor satisfaction*, to a low of 2 for both samples, for *co-worker satisfaction*.

An examination of the models reported in Table 4 yields two important observations. First, there is little similarity among the models across the different dimensions of *employee satisfaction* or across the two samples on the same dimension. For example, although the models for *supervisor satisfaction* for both samples included 11 predictors, only 4 predictors appeared in both models (PRCA, *competence*, *communication quality*, and *morality homophily*); In addition, only the *composure dimension* of *self-esteem*, *listening*, and *background homophily* failed to appear in any model for either sample. Second, although the amount of variance predictable for the generated models for *supervisor* and *promotion satisfaction* were very similar for both samples, predictable variance on the other dimensions of satisfaction varied substantially across the two samples.

DISCUSSION

As noted early in this paper, our primary purpose was to generate a predictive model for employee satisfaction that would generalize across diverse types of organizations and provide information

suggestive of intervention procedures which might lead to improved employee satisfaction. That purpose was not fully accomplished. It is clear that our original model which included 22 predictor variables cannot be reduced to a small number that can be expected to be predictive of all five satisfaction dimensions across diverse subject populations. Rather, different subsets of the predictor variables are needed to obtain maximum predictive power for the various dimensions of satisfaction both within and across subject populations.

Although our primary goal was found to be unachievable, the present research yielded data of considerable value for understanding and predicting subordinate satisfaction in organizations. It is clear that both subordinate perceptions of their supervisors and the subordinate's own orientations and self-concepts are related to satisfaction.

Supervisor satisfaction appears to be most closely associated with *perceived communication behavior* (*perceived listening, understandingness, quality*), *credibility*, *attractiveness*, and *attitude homophily*, and to a lesser extent with *oral communication apprehension* and *self-esteem*. Thus, the supervisor's behaviors, particularly communication behaviors, might be expected to enhance or detract from subordinate satisfaction. However, it is also clear that certain employees—those with high oral communication apprehension and/or low self-esteem—are less likely to be satisfied with supervision regardless of the supervisor's behavior. These results suggest three possible alternatives for intervention that might be expected to enhance the level of subordinate satisfaction in any organization: (1) provide training in effective communication for supervisors, (2) provide programs designed to overcome high oral communication apprehension and/or low self-esteem of subordinates, and (3) reevaluate or avoid hiring individuals with high oral communication apprehension and/or low self-esteem.

Clearly, each of these alternatives has advantages and limitations, depending on the nature of the organization and financial limitations. Of particular significance, however, is that, based on the data from this study, we should expect that implementation of any of these intervention strategies should be expected to have either positive impact or no impact

other dimensions of satisfaction beyond the revision dimension. In no case would we expect enhancement of one dimension of satisfaction to lead to less satisfaction on another dimension.

REFERENCES

- AMS, J.S. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965, 267-299.
- BYRIS, C. *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- DEY, R.D. Task performance as a function of perceived effort-performance and performance-reward contingencies. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1972, 8, 423-433.
- ENOWE, J.T. et al. The relative importance of job facets as indicated by an empirically derived model of job satisfaction. Unpublished report, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1972.
- ESCHEID, E., & WALSTER, E.H. *Interpersonal Attraction*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- ERNE, D. Attitude and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1969, 36-89.
- FLY, J.A. Listening and interpersonal evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Kansas City, 1975.
- FLY, J.A., & LASHBROOK, W.B. Time pressure, vocal activity and interpersonal evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, 1976.
- FLY, J.A., & LETH, S. Communication apprehension and the personnel selection decision. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, 1976.
- FLY, J.A., & McCROSKEY, J.C. Occupational desirability and choice as a function of communication apprehension. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1975, 22, 309-313.
- FLY, J.A., McCROSKEY, J.C., & FALCIONE, R.L. Communication apprehension, supervisor communication receptivity and satisfaction with superiors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, 1976 (a).
- FLY, J.A., McCROSKEY, J.C., & FALCIONE, R.L. Homophily-Heterophily and the prediction of supervisor satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, 1976 (b).
- FLY, J.A., & MILLER, M.D. The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 1975, 9, 242-249.
- FLY, J.A., & SHAMO, W. Writing apprehension and occupational choice. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 1976 (in press).
- FALCIONE, R.L. The relationship of supervisor credibility to subordinate satisfaction. *Personnel Journal*, 1973, 52, 800-803.
- FALCIONE, R.L. Communication climate and satisfaction with immediate supervision. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 1974, 2, 13-20 (a).
- FALCIONE, R.L. The factor structure of source credibility scales for immediate superiors in the organizational context. *Central States Speech Journal* 1974, 25, 63-66 (b).
- FALCIONE, R.L. Credibility: Qualifier of subordinate participation. *Journal of Business Communication*, 1974, 11, 43-54 (c).
- FALCIONE, R.L. Subordinate satisfaction as a function of perceived supervisor credibility. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1975.
- FIEDLER, F.E. *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- FLEISHMAN, E.A. A leader behavior description for industry. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 103-119 (a).
- FLEISHMAN, E.A. The leadership opinion questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 120-133 (b).
- GRAEN, G. Instrumentality theory of work motivation: Some experimental results and suggested modifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph*, 1969, 53, 1-25.
- HACKMAN, J.R., & LAWLER, E.E. Employee reactions to job characteristics. (Monograph) *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1971, 55, 259-286.
- HALPIN, A.W. The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 52-64.
- HALPIN, A.W., & WINER, B.J. A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 39-51.
- HERZBERG, F. *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World, 1966.
- HILL, W. The validation and extension of Fiedler's theory of leadership effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1969, 33-47.
- HUNT, J.G. A test of the leadership contingency model in three organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1967, 2, 290-308.
- JORGENSEN, D.O., DUNNETTE, M.D., & PRITCHARD, R.D. Effects of the manipulation of a performance-reward contingency on behavior in a simulated work setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1973, 57, 271-280.
- KORMAN, A.K. Task success, task popularity, and self-esteem as influences on task liking. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1968, 52, 484-490.
- KORMAN, A.K. *Industrial and organizational psychology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- LOCKE, E.A. The relationship of task success to task liking and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1965, 49, 379-385.
- LOCKE, E.A., CARTLEDGE, N., & KOEPPPEL, J. Motivational effects of knowledge of results: A goal-setting phenomenon? *Psychological Bulletin*, 1968, 70, 474-485.
- LOCKE, E.A. What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1969, 4, 309-336.

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

- LOCKE, E.A. The supervisor as "motivator": His influence on employee performance and satisfaction. In B.M. Bass, R. Cooper, and J.A. Hass (Eds.), *Managing for accomplishment*. Lexington: 1970, 57-67 (a).
- LOCKE, E.A. Job satisfaction and job performance: A theoretical analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1970, 5, 484-500 (b).
- LOCKE, E.A. Nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1297-1349.
- LOFQUIST, L.H., & DAWIS, R.V. *Adjustment to work*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- MASLOW, A.H. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row, 1954 (2d ed., 1970).
- McCROSKEY, J.C. Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs*, 1970, 37, 269-277.
- McCROSKEY, J.C. Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, 1975.
- McCROSKEY, J.C., JENSEN, L., & VALENCIA, C. Measurement of the credibility of peers and spouses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, 1973.
- McCROSKEY, J.C., & McCAIN, T.A. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs*, 1974, 41, 261-266.
- McCROSKEY, J.C., & RICHMOND, V.P. Self credibility as an index of self-esteem. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, 1975.
- McCROSKEY, J.C., & RICHMOND, V.P. Communication apprehension as a predictor of self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly*, 1976 (in press).
- McCROSKEY, J.C., RICHMOND, V.P., & DALY, J.A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, 1975, 1, 323-332.
- McCROSKEY, J.C., DALY, J.A., RICHMOND, V.P., & FALCIONE, R.L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. *Human Communication Research* (in press).
- McGREGOR, D. *Human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- MELLINGER, G. Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, 52, 304-309.
- PELZ, D.C., & ANDREWS, F.M. *Scientists in organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- PORTER, L.W. Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1962, 46, 375-384.
- PORTER, L.W., & ROBERT, K.H. Communications. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, 1553-1589.
- PRITCHARD, R.D., & DeLEO, P.J. Experimental valence-instrumentality relationship in job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1973, 57, 264.
- PRITCHARD, R.D., DUNNETTE, M.D., & JOHNSON, D.O. Effects of perceptions of equity and inequity on performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1972, 56, Monograph No. 1, 75-94.
- QUINN, R. et al. Job satisfaction: Is there a trend? *Research Monograph No. 30*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.
- READ, W. Upward communication in industrial organizations. *Human Relations*, 1962, 15, 3-16.
- REDDING, W.C. Human communication behavior in organizations: Some fallacies revisited. In C.E. F.E.X. Dance (Eds.), *Perspectives on Communication*. Shorewood, Wis.: Helix Press, 99-112.
- RICHMOND, V.P. Communication apprehension in the job applicant screening process. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1976.
- ROGERS, E.M., & SHOEMAKER, F.F. *Communication innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1971.
- ROSEN, N.A. *Leadership change and work-group dynamics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- SCOTT, M.D., McCROSKEY, J.C., & SHEAHAN, M.P. Development of a self-report measure of communication apprehension in organizational settings. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Portland, 1976.
- SEEMAN, M.A. A comparison of general and specific behavior descriptions. In R.M. Stogdill and A. Bass (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Research Monograph No. 88, 1957, 86-100.
- SMITH, P.C., KENDALL, L.M., & HULIN, C.L. *Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Rand McNally, 1969.
- TOSI, H.L., CHESSER, R.J., & CARROL, S.J. A model of certain aspects of the superior-subordinate relationship. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, 1972.
- VROOM, V.H. *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- WEINER, B. et al. *Perceiving the causes of success and failure*. New York: General Learning Press, 1971.
- WYLIE, R. *The self-concept: A critical survey of research literature*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.