

# Applying Reciprocity and Accommodation Theories to Supervisor/Subordinate Communication

James C. McCroskey and Virginia P. Richmond

**ABSTRACT** *Reciprocity and accommodation theories were applied to communication between supervisors and subordinates. It was reasoned that supervisors and subordinates informally (and not necessarily consciously) negotiate communication styles with each other which become significantly correlated over time. It was hypothesized that the supervisors' Socio-Communicative Style and the subordinates' Socio-Communicative Orientation would be positively correlated with each other and both would predict the subordinates' perceptions of the supervisors' credibility, attractiveness, and the subordinates' general attitude toward the supervisor and communicating with that supervisor. The results were consistent with the hypotheses.*

**KEY WORDS:** supervisor-subordinate communication, organizational communication, socio-communication orientation, socio-communicative style, source credibility, interpersonal attraction

Individuals exhibit trait differences in their style of communication (Norton, 1983). These trait orientations manifest themselves in behavior patterns which are relatively consistent across contexts. Recent writers have argued that these communication traits are heavily influenced by genetic factors which make them resistant to change (Beatty & McCroskey, 1998; Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998; Horvath, 1998; McCroskey, 1998). Research has provided strong empirical support for this argument (Horvath, 1995; Cole & McCroskey, 2000). While any given individual does not communicate in exactly the same ways in all contexts and with all other people, the strength of the genetic influence necessarily must establish an inverse relationship with the flexibility the individual has in adapting her/his communicative style while interacting with another—the stronger the genetic influence, the less flexibility in communication style the individual will have. Nevertheless, most theorizing about communication in relational development presumes individuals are able to adjust their communication in such ways as

---

James C. McCroskey (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) and Virginia P. Richmond (Ph.D., 1977, University of Nebraska) are Professors in the Communication Studies Department, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26505-0293

---

Copyright 2000, National Communication Association

apprehension and student state motivation to learn, affect for the instructor, affect for the course content, and cognitive learning. Teacher immediacy and clarity then are examined in terms of their potential association with lower levels of state receiver apprehension during the learning process. These analyses are preceded by reviews of receiver apprehension, teacher immediacy, and teacher clarity.

### Receiver Apprehension

Wheless (1975) introduced the receiver apprehension construct. He recognized that people are likely to experience anxiety when listening to messages as well as when sending messages. Receiver apprehension was conceptualized as "the fear of misinterpreting, inadequately processing, and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others" (Wheless, 1975, p. 263). Receivers may be anxious due to a perceived inability to interpret information effectively or assimilate all of the information to which they are listening. Furthermore, receivers may experience apprehension due to the psychological discomfort caused by the content of the messages they are receiving, or even the behavior of the person(s) sending them. Given existing research, findings that we spend more time receiving messages than sending them, and the fact that there are many ways in which receiving messages can elicit anxiety, receiver apprehension is a significant classroom problem worthy of the attention of instructional communication researchers (Chesebro & McCroskey, 1998b).

Research has identified a number of negative outcomes that are associated with receiver apprehension, including reduced listening effectiveness and information processing effectiveness (Preiss et al., 1990), as well as lower student scores on achievement tests (Scott & Wheless, 1977). Cumulatively, the research on receiver apprehension suggests that apprehensive receivers listen in different ways than non-apprehensive receivers. Findings that receiver apprehension is related to reduced information processing effectiveness are relevant to the instructional context. Students who experience anxiety when listening to their teachers may be less effective at processing information and therefore less likely to learn course material sufficiently. Students experiencing receiver apprehension also may be less likely to have positive affect towards their instructor and/or the course. They may associate their negative experiences with their instructor or the course material and therefore be less likely to have positive affective reactions to their learning experience. Therefore, we posed our first hypothesis:

H<sub>1</sub>: State receiver apprehension while learning is negatively related to affect for the instructor, the course content, and cognitive learning.

The relationship between student state receiver apprehension and student state motivation to learn is less clear. Ayres, Wilcox, and Ayres (1995) report that those who are motivated to remember all of the information in a presentation are likely to be apprehensive receivers. Those who are less motivated and therefore "don't care" if they learn the information are less likely to experience receiver apprehension. Chesebro and McCroskey (1998b) also identified this relationship between state receiver apprehension and motivation. However, receiver apprehension also could be related to reduced motivation to learn, in that apprehensive receivers may be

to converge with superiors more often than the opposite" (p. 117). For the purpose of our research, however, who initiates accommodation is less important than that accommodation appears to regularly occur within supervisor/subordinate relationships in organizations. This suggests that supervisors and/or subordinates must be able to control their (possibly genetically driven) communication traits in order to accommodate their counterpart in building a working relationship.

While support for these theories has been found by their proponents and others in a variety of research contexts, none of this work has looked directly at supervisor/subordinate communication. On the bases of reciprocity and accommodation theories, therefore, we proposed the following hypothesis:

- H1. Supervisors and subordinates adopt communication styles with each other which are significantly correlated.

This hypothesis presumes that there is sufficient flexibility in an individual's trait communication style to permit the person to engage in the behaviors predicted by reciprocity and accommodation theories. Before we provide more justification for our underlying presumption and advance other hypotheses, we need to examine communication style itself and the related genetic work.

### SCO and SCS

The conceptual approach to communication style which we have chosen to employ is a blend of Norton's (1983) communicator style approach and various highly similar approaches which have appeared under differing names: personal style (Merrill and Reid, 1981), social style (Lashbrook, 1974), and psychological androgyny (Bem, 1974). These three approaches all stem from Jungian psychology and depend on simplified measures similar to the Myers-Briggs personality inventory. The approach we employ here distinguishes between socio-communicative orientation (SCO) which is measured by self-report of the way an individual sees her or his own style, and socio-communicative style (SCS) which is measured by reports of another person (or other persons) reporting on the way he/she/they see the person's actual behavior (Richmond & Martin, 1998; Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994).

SCO and SCS involve two relatively uncorrelated dimensions, assertiveness and responsiveness, and can be measured by the Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure (ARM) developed by Richmond and McCroskey (1990) as well as a wide variety of proprietary instruments in wide use among organizational consultants. Assertiveness reflects a person's willingness to speak up for her- or himself in interaction and not letting others take advantage of her/him. Responsiveness involves being other-oriented, considering others' feelings, and listening to what others say. This is sometimes considered to be the "relational" aspect of SCO and SCS.

The genetic basis of Socio-Communicative Orientation, as measured by the ARM, has been examined. In recent work reported by Cole and McCroskey (2000) it was determined that the genetic bases of both dimensions were substantial. They were estimated to be approximately 56-57 percent for assertiveness and between 65 and 72 percent for responsiveness. While this suggests that both dimensions are largely genetically driven, it is clear that considerable room remains for reciprocity and/or accommodation to occur.

We believed that our first hypothesis was more likely to be supported on the responsiveness dimension than on the assertiveness dimension, even though responsiveness appears to be more genetically driven than assertiveness. First, in work reported by Kearney and McCroskey (1980) it was found that responsiveness and versatility (flexibility) were substantially correlated. Since a certain degree of versatility would need to be present for our first hypothesis to be correct in any case, it would be most likely that it would be correct for responsiveness. However, if our hypothesis were to be supported by the results on both assertiveness and responsiveness, we believed the relationship would be stronger for the responsiveness dimension. While responsiveness clearly has a socially desirable quality, and thus engaging in reciprocal behavior or converging through accommodation would be easier, assertiveness can have a less socially desirable quality. In fact, if a supervisor is assertive with her/his subordinate, it may even be considered inappropriate to respond assertively. Therefore reciprocity might be prevented or divergent accommodation (submissiveness) might be generated.

A final consideration must be addressed with regard to hypothesis 1. This hypothesis should only be expected to be demonstrably correct when SCO and SCS are measured within a specific context such as the supervisor-subordinate context. Previous research has provided no evidence of a correlation between self and other trait measures of SCO or SCS, nor should we expect any unless the measures are contextualized and employed to measure SCO and SCS within a specific relational context. Hence, we are hypothesizing a correlation between variables which specifically has not been found in previous research involving these variables. What we are hypothesizing here is that SCO and SCS within a specific context are sufficiently flexible that significant correlations can be generated through the processes described by reciprocity and accommodation theories. We do not believe that the general traits related to SCO and SCS are subject to such effects. We see the general traits as primarily genetically based (as noted previously). Hence, flexibility available for the organizational context, or any other context, should not represent more than around 30 percent for responsiveness or 45 percent for assertiveness.

### Outcomes of Reciprocated/Accommodated SCO/SCS

Above we have described what we believe happens in the relational development between supervisors and subordinates. Over time, some relationships become more positive and some become more negative. Our first hypothesis suggests that in both kinds of dyads the partners will become more alike in their communication behaviors. As a result we should expect that both the supervisors' SCO (as perceived and reported by their subordinates) and the subordinates' self-reports of their own SCS should be predictive of the subordinates' perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and interpersonal attractiveness, as well as the subordinate's general attitude toward the supervisor and communicating with that supervisor. Hence, the following hypotheses were advanced:

- H2. Supervisors' assertiveness will be positively correlated with subordinates' perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and attractiveness and the subordinates' general attitude toward the supervisor and communication with the supervisor.
- H3. Supervisors' responsiveness will be positively correlated with subordinates' perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and attractiveness and the subordi-

nates' general attitude toward the supervisor and communication with the supervisor.

- H4. Subordinates' assertiveness will be positively correlated with their perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and attractiveness and their general attitude toward the supervisor and communication with the supervisor.
- H5. Subordinates' responsiveness will be positively correlated with their perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and attractiveness and their general attitude toward the supervisor and communication with the supervisor.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 presume that positive perceptions of supervisors on the part of their subordinates are positively associated with perceptions of increased assertiveness and responsiveness on the part of supervisors. Previous research (Martin & Richmond, 1998) consistently has demonstrated such relationships in other contexts, although the relationships tend to be higher for responsiveness than for assertiveness. The question here was whether these same relationships apply within the supervisor/subordinate context.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 are exploratory hypotheses which probe the relationship between subordinates' own SCO and their perceptions of the image of their supervisors. While in other contexts which are more transitory, no meaningful relationships have been found, the concern here was whether they might exist in this particular type of on-going relationship. We believed that it was probable that if subordinates observed reciprocity/accommodation in the communication behavior of their supervisors, this might generate a generalized positive reaction to the supervisors which would manifest itself in other perceptions of those supervisors. Such relationships might also manifest themselves as a function of subordinates' positive images of their supervisors resulting in more reciprocity and accommodation on their part. Which of these explanations would be the correct interpretation of positive findings, of course, would not be able to be determined from the data available in the present investigation.

## Methods and Procedures

### Participants

A total of 213 full-time employees participated fully in this study. Twenty-seven individuals provided incomplete data and were not included in the study. Of these 107 identified themselves as male, and 106 indicated they were female. A total of 121 participants indicated they worked for a male supervisor and 92 indicated they worked for a female supervisor. Preliminary analyses indicated there was no significant effect for the interaction of gender of participant and gender of supervisor on any of the variables of concern in the study.

A total of 240 participants were recruited by adult volunteers (part-time students in a graduate program in corporate/organizational communication) in a wide variety of organizations, including corporate for-profit, non-profit service, state government, private small business, and federal government. No one type accounted for as much as 20 percent of the total sample and no more than 5 percent came from any single organization. The participants' length-of-service to their current employer ranged from five months to 31 years, with a mean length of service of 4 years, 7 months. Since none of the participants were "new hires," it was reasonable to assume that the theoretical processes advanced above would

have had sufficient time to be reflected in the communication and perceptions of all of the individuals studied.

### Measurement

**SCS and SCO.** The Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure (Richmond & McCroskey, 1990) was employed as the measure for the socio-communicative style (SCS) of the supervisors and the socio-communicative orientation (SCO) of the participants. The instructions for the instrument are different for the two purposes. In the present study, participants were asked to reference "the way your supervisor communicates with you at work" to estimate the supervisor's SCS, and "the way you communicate with your supervisor at work" to estimate the subordinate's SCO.

In previous research (Richmond & Martin, 1998) both the assertiveness and the responsiveness scores have been found to be highly reliable and uncorrelated with each other. In the present study, the Alpha estimates of the reliability of the assertiveness scale were .89 for the supervisors and .88 for the subordinates. The Alpha estimates for the responsiveness scale were .95 for the supervisors and .92 for the subordinates. The two dimensions were not significantly correlated for the supervisors ( $r = .05, p > .05$ ) or for the subordinates ( $r = .08, p > .05$ ).

**Source Credibility.** Three dimensions of source credibility (competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill) were measured by instruments developed by McCroskey (1966) and McCroskey and Teven (1999). The Alpha reliabilities for the three dimensions of credibility were: competence .91; trustworthiness, .94; and goodwill .96.

**Interpersonal Attraction.** Two dimensions of interpersonal attraction (social and task) were measured by use of instruments developed by McCroskey and McCain (1974). Four items were used for each of the two attraction dimensions. The Alpha reliabilities obtained were .88 for social attraction and .80 for task attraction.

**Attitude Toward Supervisor and Supervisor's Communication.** The Generalized Attitude Scale developed by McCroskey (McCroskey & Richmond, 1989) was used as a measure of both attitude toward the supervisor and attitude toward the supervisor's communication. This instrument is composed of six bipolar, seven-step scales. These scales have been found useful for measuring a wide variety of attitude targets. The Alpha reliability for this instrument in the current study was .95 for attitude toward the supervisor and .97 for attitude toward the supervisor's communication.

### Data Analyses

Descriptive data for all of the measures used in this study appear in Table 1. The primary tests of the hypotheses advanced in this study were based on simple correlations. Exploration of patterns not hypothesized was conducted by use of canonical correlation analyses.

### Results

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and ranges for each of the measures in the study. Table 2 reports the simple correlations between the SCO/SCS variables and the outcome variables related to hypotheses 2-5.

Based upon reciprocity and accommodation theories, our first hypothesis predicated that supervisors' socio-communicative style (as reported by their subordinates) would be correlated with the socio-communicative orientations of their subordinates. The obtained correlation for assertiveness was a meager  $r = .17$  ( $p < .01$ ). While supportive of our hypothesis, this relationship accounts for only 3 percent of shared variance between the two measures. In contrast, the obtained correlation for responsiveness was .45. Given the probable genetic bases of this personality orientation, the 20 percent shared variance this correlation signifies is very strong support for our first hypothesis.

The correlations reported in Table 2 provide substantial support for our hypotheses 2-5 which suggest associations between SCO and SCS and a variety of important perceptions subordinates have of supervisors. These associations, however, were much stronger for responsiveness (both that of the supervisor and that of the subordinate) than for assertiveness. Although none of the associations were negative, the observed positive relationships with assertiveness (either supervisor or subordinate) were weak to non-nonsignificant. The notable exceptions were the moderately strong associations between supervisor assertiveness and both perceived competence ( $r = .47$ ) and task attraction ( $r = .36$ ). Subordinate assertiveness produced no similar associations.

The observed correlations with responsiveness were all positive. Those with subordinate responsiveness can best be described as moderate ( $r = .35-.45$ ), indicating shared variance of from 12 to 20 percent. On the other hand, those with supervisor responsiveness can best be described as strong ( $r = .52-.88$ ), indicating shared variance of from 27 to 77 percent.

An examination of the pattern of correlations in Table 2 appears to indicate that responsiveness is most associated with social attraction, trustworthiness, and goodwill—but it also is substantially associated with competence and task attraction. However, supervisor assertiveness appears to be more substantially related with competence and task attraction than the other perception variables. To probe these relationships we conducted a canonical correlation analysis with the four

TABLE 1  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Measures

Measure	Mean	S.D.	Range
Supervisor Assertiveness	37.4	7.9	10-50
Supervisor Responsiveness	35.1	9.2	10-50
Subordinate Assertiveness	36.0	6.7	10-50
Subordinate Responsiveness	39.3	6.3	10-50
Social Attraction	14.2	4.2	4-20
Task Attraction	15.9	3.7	4-20
Competence	33.8	6.7	6-42
Trustworthiness	33.7	6.4	6-42
Goodwill	29.1	8.7	6-42
Attitude/Supervisor	32.5	3.4	6-42
Communicate w/Supervisor	31.9	3.1	3-42

TABLE 2  
Correlations Between SCS/SCO Measures and Supervisor Perception Variables

Perception Variable	Supervisor Assert.	Supervisor Respon.	Subordinate Assert.	Subordinate Respon.
Competence	.47	.52	.08*	.35
Trustworthiness	.17	.78	.15	.38
Goodwill	.06*	.88	.10*	.45
Social Attraction	.07*	.76	.16	.40
Task Attraction	.36	.54	.07*	.35
Attitude/Supervisor	.26	.79	.16	.39
Communication/Supervisor	.23	.73	.20	.42

\* $p > .05$ .

SCO/SCS variables as predictors of the five variables reflecting credibility and interpersonal attraction. This analysis produced two statistically significant canonical variates. The first of these had an adjusted canonical correlation of .89 [ $F(d.f. 20) 29.72, p < .0001$ ]. The only predictors with meaningful loadings on the variate were supervisor responsiveness (.998) and subordinate responsiveness (.498). The criterion variables with high loadings were social attraction (.849), trustworthiness (.873), and goodwill (.983). Loadings were substantial but somewhat lower for task attraction (.619) and competence (.578). The second canonical variate had an adjusted canonical correlation of .58 [ $F(d.f. 12) = 8.84, p < .0001$ ]. The only predictor with a meaningful loading on the variate was supervisor assertiveness (.977). The two criterion variables with meaningful loadings were competence (.756) and task attraction (.555).

The results of the canonical analysis were consistent with our speculative observations of the correlation matrix. Supervisor assertiveness (but not subordinate assertiveness) appears to make a substantial contribution to subordinates' task related perceptions. In contrast, both supervisor and subordinate responsiveness make substantial contributions to subordinates' task related perceptions as well as their more socially related perceptions (social attraction, trustworthiness, and goodwill).

In order to probe the simple correlation results more deeply, we conducted a canonical correlation analysis with the SCO/SCS variables as predictors of the two attitude variables (toward supervisor and toward communication with the supervisor). This analysis produced one significant canonical variate with an adjusted canonical correlation of .83 [ $F(d.f. 8) = 43.69, p < .0001$ ]. Supervisor responsiveness had the dominant loading on the variate (.962), while the other predictors had more moderate loadings (subordinate responsiveness, .493; supervisor assertiveness, .316; subordinate assertiveness, .205). Both of the criterion variables were loaded highly on the variate (attitude toward supervisor, .985; attitude toward communicating with supervisor, .913).

### Discussion

Our results were consistent with our hypotheses. The data indicated the presence of the theoretically expected correlations which would flow as a result of reciprocity and accommodation in the normal interaction of supervisors and subordinates. These results provide both a bright and a dark side. On the one side,



people who are responsive can anticipate generating more positive relationships as being the likely outcome of their behaviors. On the dark side, people who lack the ability or desire to be responsive must look forward to less positive working relationships. Many supervisors appear to have the flexibility to reciprocate, accommodate, and "give what they get" from their subordinates.

Previous research (particularly in non-intimate dyadic and instructional contexts) has failed to find correlations between participants' self-reported SCO and target others' SCS. In such contexts no correlations would be expected, unless they were produced by a response bias as a function of the similarity of the instruments completed at the same time. Brief interactions with non-intimates, such as students with teachers of large lecture classes, would not be expected to produce the outcomes predicted by reciprocity and accommodation theories. However, dyads who interact daily in an environment where it is in the interest of each to establish good communicative relationships with the other, it seemed to us, provide an optimal opportunity to test the applicability of these theories in the organizational context.

Our results reflect positively on both theories. However, they also point to limitations that should be considered. We probably should not expect the tendency to reciprocate or accommodate in all aspects of communicative behavior. Clearly, high responsiveness represents a category of behaviors which in most contexts would be considered positive. We should expect these theories to work best under these circumstances. On the other hand, assertiveness represents a category of behaviors which can be seen as either positive or negative—it depends. If I am a supervisor who wants her subordinate to do something and the subordinate is highly assertive in finding out how best to accomplish my desired mission, things are good. If, however, the subordinate is highly assertive about his desire to avoid that task, things are not so good. Thus, my likelihood of accommodation is lower, and my reciprocity, if any, might be negative. We believe the marginal but statistically significant results we observed for assertiveness is reflective of this concern.

If we look to things more extreme than normal assertiveness, we may find accommodation and reciprocity theories a bit more limited. We would expect, for example, if one person in a dyad is very verbally aggressive, the other person may move to accommodate divergently and/or reciprocate in ways in which would lead to increasingly negative interpersonal perceptions (in contrast to the increasingly positive ones observed in the present study). Whether these theories will be as predictive under such circumstances remains for future research to determine. At present, we can only be confident in suggesting to both supervisors and subordinates that if they engage in responsive communication behaviors toward the other it is likely they will experience reciprocity and accommodation from the other.

For those who are deeply involved in the study of interpersonal communication, this conclusion certainly does not represent a shockingly new insight. However, previous research has not found such effects in non-intimate dyads, particularly not in an applied context outside of intimate relationships. To establish that this effect is empirically verifiable with a study that drew data from a wide range of workers in a very wide variety of types of organizations does indeed have important implications. It is precisely this kind of evidence of potential outcomes which training administrators need to justify beginning and/or continu-

ing communication training in their employee training programs. Clearly, effective communication in the organizational context of supervisor and subordinate can make a major difference in the relationship between the two individuals, and most likely, in the desirability of the other outcomes of their interaction.

The results of the simple and canonical correlational analyses of the associations between SCO/SCS with credibility and attraction perceptions provided an interesting picture, one which makes sense but which has not been reported previously by either credibility or attraction researchers. While the simple correlations indicated that, as would be expected, perceptions of supervisor credibility and attraction generally were more associated with supervisor SCS than with subordinate SCO, it was also obvious that responsiveness seemed to be more associated with these perceptions than did assertiveness, particularly subordinate assertiveness. The one apparent anomaly was the relationship between perceived competence of the source with perceptions of assertiveness. While the correlation was nominally but not significantly lower for assertiveness ( $r = .47$ ) than responsiveness ( $r = .52$ ), it was not as dramatically lower as most of the other credibility and attraction dimensions.

The results of the canonical analysis of these four predictors (assertiveness and responsiveness of both superior and subordinate) and the five criterion variables (three dimensions of credibility and two dimensions of attraction) exposed the existence of two distinct perceptual domains which we have chosen to call the "affective" and the "evaluative" domains. Each of these was represented by its own canonical variate. The first and probably most important perceptual domain was the affective domain. This domain included perceptions of both supervisor and subordinate responsiveness predicting (or being predicted by) perceptions of social attraction, trustworthiness, and caring. These perceptions may all represent an affective domain of "liking" and "disliking" the other.

The second domain was the evaluative domain. This domain included perceptions of the supervisor's assertiveness (but not the subordinate's) along with perceptions of both credibility and task attraction. These perceptions may all represent evaluative (or attitudinal) continuum of "positive" at one extreme and "negative" at the other. Since responsiveness scores were also predictive of the competence and task attractiveness perceptions, it is clear that affect is involved here. Hence, this domain is not as "pure" as is the first.

It has been demonstrated in many studies subsequent to the original report of the assertiveness-responsiveness scale that the measures are both theoretically and statistically independent of each other. The manifestation of the separation in this study in terms of each being primarily associated with a different perceptual domain suggests an explanation for why our predictions for correlations between supervisor and subordinate assertiveness and responsiveness did not fare equally well. It appears that accommodation and reciprocity theories are better predictors of behaviors impacting the affective domain than they are for those impacting the evaluative domain. Of course, this interpretation is fully consistent with our interpretation of the less positive results for assertiveness noted in our earlier discussion.

Finally, we need to consider the limitations of the current research. We have attempted to avoid suggesting direct causation in this discussion. Since this research was purely correlational, no causation can be clearly established from the present data. While this is a limitation of this research, it is the limitation

associated with all purely correlational research. In some instances, that is a very severe limitation. In the present case, the theories being applied do not necessitate establishment of the direction of causation. Whether the supervisor, or the subordinate, initiates positive (or negative) communication, we may expect reciprocity and/or accommodation on the part of the other. Over time, the same positive or negative outcomes are likely regardless of who initiated the subsequently reciprocated or accommodated communication behavior.

A second limitation of this study is that data were collected only from subordinates. Ideally, data would be obtained from both supervisors and subordinates. We might find differences in the results from such data compared to the present data. Supervisors and subordinates may not perceive things in the same way. However, one of the keys to understanding communication is to understand its relationship with perception. While what one person perceives in an interaction may be different than what the other perceives, both will respond in the way they perceive things, not on the basis of some objective reality. There is no reason to anticipate that the theories of reciprocity or accommodation will work differently for supervisors than they do for subordinates when they are involved in continuing relationships.

### References

- Beatty, M. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). Interpersonal communication as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 41-67). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 197-219.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Cole, J. G., & McCroskey, J. C. (April, 2000). *Temperament and Socio-Communicative Orientation*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Eastern Communication Association, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Giles, H. J., Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Johnson, R. (1987). Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 10* (pp. 13-48). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). A norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 161-178.
- Horvath, C. W. (1995). Biological origins of communicator style. *Communication Quarterly*, 43, 394-407.
- Horvath, C. W. (1998). Biological origins of communicator style. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 69-94). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension, and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 4* (pp. 533-551). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Lashbrook, W. B. (1974). *Toward the measurement and processing of the social style profile*. Eden Prairie, MN: Wilson Learning Corporation.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1992). *Theories of human communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33, 55-72.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1998). *Why we communicate the ways we do: A communibiological perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- McCroskey, J. C., & McCain, T. A. (1974). The measurement of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs*, 41, 251-266.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1989). Bipolar scales. In P. Emmert & L. L. Barker, *Measurement of communication behavior* (pp. 154-167). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Tevan, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 90-103.

- Merrill, D. W., & Reid, R. H. (1981). *Personal styles and effective performance*. Radnor, PA: Chilton.
- Norton, R. (1983). *Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Richmond, V. P., & Martin, M. M. (1998). Socio-communicative style and socio-communicative orientation. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 133-148). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports*, *67*, 449-450.
- Thomas, C. E., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1994). The association between immediacy and socio-communicative style. *Communication Research Reports*, *11*, 107-114.

Received August 12, 1999

Accepted April 6, 2000