

The Relationship of Supervisor Use of Power and Affinity-Seeking Strategies with Subordinate Satisfaction

Virginia P. Richmond, James C. McCroskey, and Leonard M. Davis

Subordinate perceptions of supervisor communication of power (control) strategies and supervisor communication of affinity-seeking strategies were found to correlate with subordinate satisfaction. Supervisor use of power strategies such as Deferred Reward from Behavior, Self-Esteem, and Supervisor Feedback were positively correlated with subordinate satisfaction. Punishment from Supervisor, Punishment from Others, Guilt, Supervisor/Subordinate Relationship-Negative, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Legitimate-Supervisor Authority, Personal Responsibility, and Debt were negatively correlated with subordinate satisfaction. The results also revealed many affinity-seeking strategies were positively associated with subordinate satisfaction. Present Interesting Self and Assume Control, when overused by supervisors, led to lowered satisfaction.

KEY CONCEPTS *Supervisor/subordinate communication, power, control, influence, affinity-seeking strategies, employee satisfaction, behavior alteration techniques, job satisfaction, organizational outcomes.*

VIRGINIA P. RICHMOND (Ph.D., University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1977) is Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506. JAMES C. McCROSKEY (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) is Professor and Chair in the Department of Speech Communication, WVU, Morgantown, WV 26506. LEONARD M. DAVIS (Ph.D., Northern University, 1958) is a Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, WVU, Morgantown, WV 26506.

Two of the major concerns of supervisors in organizations are how to alter or modify their subordinate's behavior in such a manner as to increase work output and how to establish and maintain a positive relationship with their subordinates. The first concern focuses on supervisory methods of control and the second focuses on the development of affinity between supervisor and subordinate. Germaine to both concerns is the communication employed by the supervisor. Managerial communication research indicates that the communication used by the supervisor significantly impacts the relationship between supervisor and subordinate (Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; Richmond, McCroskey, Davis, & Koontz, 1980; Richmond, McCroskey, & Davis, 1982; Richmond, Wagner, & McCroskey, 1983, Riccillo & Trenholm, 1983; Richmond, Davis, Saylor, & McCroskey, 1984).

Employee satisfaction is central to the relationship between supervisors and subordinates. A number of variables operating within the organizational framework have been found to impact employee satisfaction. Variables such as working conditions (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939); job enrichment (Herzberg, 1966); opportunity to participate in decision-making (Daly, McCroskey, & Falcione, 1976); employee self-esteem (Falcione, McCroskey, Daly, 1977); leadership style (Sadler, 1970); management communication style (Richmond and McCroskey, 1979); and supervisory power strategies (Richmond et al., 1984) appear to impact the degree to which employees are satisfied.

Significance of Employee Satisfaction

In 1976 Locke estimated that over 3,300 studies on the subject of employee satisfaction had been reported. Since that time studies dealing with employee satisfaction have continued to be a major focus of researchers and practitioners of organizational communication. It is not uncommon to pick up any management or communication journal and find at least one article on how to keep employees satisfied or motivated. The findings to date generally show a positive relationship between satisfaction and productivity, although the relationship is not always large and, in some cases, is not statistically significant. In some situations there is no meaningful relationship between the two. Importantly, however, almost all of the literature indicates that, when a significant relationships exist, it is a positive one.

There is also substantial evidence to suggest that employee satisfaction is negatively related to absenteeism and turnover rate (Day & Hamblin, 1964; Student, 1968; Baum & Youngblood, 1975). A possible explanation for this is that happy employees like to come to work and it is more difficult to get them to leave their position. However, it may not be this simple. Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959), in their two-factor theory of job satisfaction, suggest there are two continua, one for satisfaction and one for dissatisfaction. They stress that an employee can be very satisfied while being very dissatisfied at the same time but in response to different elements in the work environment. Hence, people who miss very little work and stay with the same position may or may not be totally satisfied. They may in fact be very happy with the supervision they receive while being very dissatisfied with the physical surroundings, or vice versa. Smith, Kendall, & Hulin (1969) suggest that employee satisfaction is comprised of multiple dimensions, where each dimension represents a separate satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum. They isolated the following dimensions: supervision, work, pay, promotion, and co-workers.

Although a universal one-to-one relationship does not seem to exist between employee satisfaction and employee productivity, it is clear that employee satisfaction/dissatisfaction is linked to significant organizational outcomes. It is also clear that communication between supervisor and subordinate can impact employee satisfaction. Hence, the present investigation examines the extent to which subordinates' perceptions of their supervisor's communication of power (control) strategies and subordinates' percep-

tions of their supervisor's communication of affinity strategies relate to their satisfaction.

Communication of Power and Satisfaction

While there is a general consensus that organizational effectiveness depends in part on the exercise of power, the nature of the relationship between power and employee satisfaction is not clear cut (Thibaut & Riecken, 1955; Cohen, 1959; Etzioni, 1961; Bacharach & Lawler, 1976; French & Raven, 1968; Richmond et al., 1980, and Richmond et al., 1984). Several personality and situational variables appear to impact the relationship between power usage and employee satisfaction. For example, the locus of control of the supervisor impacts the type of power a supervisor is likely to employ. Externally controlled managers tend to utilize more coercive power than internally controlled managers (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973). Other researchers have found that persons who lack confidence are more likely to employ coercive type of power (e.g., threats) to get others to comply (Goodstadt & Kipnis, 1970; Kipnis & Lane, 1962). Riccillo & Trenholm (1983) demonstrated that some managers tend to use coercive power with employees they don't trust, while, utilizing more positive persuasion techniques with employees they trust. Thus, supervisors appear to vary substantially in their choices of power to exercise with their subordinates. These choices are impacted by both the personality of the supervisor and the situational variation introduced by the variability in subordinates.

Nevertheless, supervisors do seem to be relatively consistent in their use of control strategies with individual subordinates and their choices appear to be meaningfully related to subordinate satisfaction (Richmond & McCroskey, 1979). Higher subordinate satisfaction appears to be associated with a management communication style which is employee-centered and interactive while low satisfaction appears to be associated with the exercise of coercive control strategies by the supervisor (Richmond et al., 1984).

Pelz (1952) has suggested that a combination of power and good human relations is associated with higher employee morale. Thibaut and Riecken (1955) suggested that subordinates will respond differently toward a person who communicates with legitimate rather than coercive power. Day and Hamblin (1964) found that subordinates' performance and attitudes varied according to the supervisors' use of punishment and closeness of supervision. Herzberg (1968) contends that coercion or the threat of coercion does not lead to job satisfaction or motivation, and that reward power also does not lead to job satisfaction or motivation. He contends that the communication of coercion or reward power only leads to employee movement, not internalization which is necessary for satisfaction.

Student (1968) studied each of the five bases of power outlined by French and Raven (1968) and correlated the ratings of perceived power usage with behavioral measures of satisfaction as well as independent evaluations of actual work performance. Student's results indicated that as perceived use of referent and expert power increased, subordinates had excused absences. Legitimate power was found to be unrelated to actual performance. Referent

power was positively related to high evaluations on indirect cost performance, scrap cost performance, quality of product, and number of suggestions submitted for improving the plant operations. Expert power was positively related to high evaluations on supply cost performance and quality of product produced. Reward power was positively associated with cost performance but negatively associated with average earnings. Coercive power was negatively associated with maintenance cost performance and suggestions submitted for improving plant operations.

We may conclude from this research that use of some types of power (referent and expert) are likely to be associated with both higher satisfaction and improved performance while use of other types (particularly coercive) are likely to lead to lower satisfaction and performance quality. More recently, Richmond et al. (1980) found that coercive and legitimate power associated with a "tell" management communication style and negative job satisfaction. Referent and expert power usage were positively associated with satisfaction with supervisor, while reward power had little impact on satisfaction. Using an extended typology of power strategies, Richmond et al. (1984) found that subordinates' use of behavior alteration techniques with their supervisors is most associated with their supervision. In other words, if a subordinate is satisfied with their supervisor, they are less likely to feel the need to influence their supervisor. In addition, they found that perceived supervisor use of behavior alteration techniques was significantly negatively associated with satisfaction with supervision. They concluded that the supervisors' use of the following techniques was negatively related to subordinate satisfaction: Punishment from Source, Referent-Model, Legitimate-Higher Authority, Punishment from Behavior, Personal Relationship-Negative and Legitimate-Personal Authority.

In conclusion, the communication of power within an organization is related to employee satisfaction. In fact, the power message employed by the supervisor may be a major contributor to the satisfaction an employee feels toward his/her supervisor. It should be stressed, however, that the nature of any causation which may be present is not firmly established. While it appears likely that differential use of controlling messages causes changes in satisfaction levels, it is also quite likely that differentially satisfied employees may cause supervisors to use different, or at least different amounts of, controlling messages. Reciprocal causation, thus, appears to be present in this relationship.

Communication of Affinity-Seeking Strategies and Satisfaction

The way in which we communicate with another person determines in large part how we are perceived and respond to by the other person. Researchers have established that increasing liking and similarity increases a person's chance of establishing a positive relationship with another. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) and Rogers (1983) suggest that perceived similarity between two persons can increase the likelihood that one can influence the other to try a new idea or change his/her behavior.

Many interpersonal communication researchers have attempted to define

what interpersonal variables impact the dyadic relationship in terms of liking and influence and each has posited a variety of variables (e.g., attraction, similarity, credibility, communicator style and so on.). Recently, Bell and Daly (1984a,b) have taken a broad view of interpersonal relationships and have posited a typology of affinity-seeking strategies that can be utilized in a variety of contexts to increase liking and affect between two people. Bell and Daly (1984b) define affinity-seeking as "the active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to get others to like and to feel positive toward them." (p. 91). They continue by suggesting that "the ability to evoke positive feelings is a favorably regarded and often envied skill." (p. 91). This is further substantiated by the reasoning that affinity-seeking is an "important communication function" (p. 91) and that those who lack these strategies often "suffer from a variety of social and personal turmoils." (p. 91). Bell and Daly (1984b) found that in six relationships (work supervisor, romantic, partner, close friend, acquaintance, roommate, and neighbor) that there was a strong link between affinity-seeking and interpersonal attraction, life satisfaction, and social success. They also found that people "who were thought to use many affinity-seeking strategies were judged as likeable, socially successful, and satisfied with their lives." (p. 111).

Affinity-seeking is not only useful in developing and maintaining relationships in our everyday lives but could be invaluable in the work environment. For example, the young executive who wants to be liked by his/her supervisor might be taught to employ the appropriate affinity-seeking behaviors. As Bell and Daly (1984b) suggest, "people expend considerable social energy attempting to get others to like and to appreciate them" (p. 91), and the work environment is a context in which we want to be able to facilitate better communicative relationships and facilitate liking. The subordinate who gets along with his/her supervisor is much more likely to be satisfied than the subordinate who doesn't. In the same vein, the supervisor who is liked and has developed a positive relationship with his/her subordinates is likely to be more satisfied and have subordinates who are more satisfied with their supervision. Although the typology of affinity-seeking strategies developed by Bell and Daly (1984b) has not yet been studied in an organizational environment, it shows considerable promise as a unified framework within which to examine the communication of supervisors and subordinates. In particular, the constructs of affinity and satisfaction with supervision, although certainly not isomorphic, appear to be closely related. If a supervisor is successful in obtaining greater affinity from a subordinate, it should follow that the subordinate will be more satisfied with his/her supervision.

Research Method

As noted previously, the focus of this investigation is on the relationships between perceptions of certain supervisor behaviors and subordinate satisfaction. The implicit assumption underlying this work is that, with other things equal, increased subordinate satisfaction is a positive outcome to be desired in supervisor-subordinate relationships.

Unfortunately, subordinate satisfaction cannot be the only, and often not

even the most important, concern of supervisors. Supervisor roles exist primarily to enhance the probability of effective and efficient work performance by subordinates. The successful enactment of the role requires the individual supervisor to cause alterations in the work-related behaviors of subordinates. The most effective supervision, at least from the vantage point of the organization, is that which accomplishes the necessary behavior alterations in subordinates while simultaneously maintaining subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

Considerable research in the area of compliance-gaining and behavior alteration recently has appeared in the communication literature (Miller, Boster, Roloff & Siebold, 1977; Wheelless, Barraclough & Stewart, 1983; Kearney, Plax, Richmond & McCroskey, 1985; Kearney, Plax, Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Richmond et al., 1984). The recent work of Richmond et al. (1984) has pointed to the value of certain behavior alteration techniques in comparison with others in terms of impact on subordinate satisfaction. The present study, like most of those noted above, does not focus on the relative effectiveness of behavior alteration techniques in actually modifying behaviors. Rather, this study sought to replicate and extend the findings reported by Richmond et al. (1984) in a more broadly representative sample of organizational environments. Thus, our first research question was the same as that posed by Richmond et al. (1984), namely

R1: To what extent is perceived supervisor use of behavior alteration techniques related to subordinate satisfaction in diverse areas of employment?

The results of the earlier work by Richmond et al. (1984), as well as other similar studies in the educational environment (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Kearney et al., 1984; Kearney et al., 1985; and Wheelless et al., 1983) suggest that, for the most part, employment of behavior alteration techniques leads to reduced rather than increased employee satisfaction. Thus, the results of this research, particularly if replicated in the present investigation, provide considerable information on what a supervisor should *avoid* doing, but little information of a positive nature as to what the supervisor might do to enhance satisfaction short of not supervising, a generally unacceptable alternative.

As noted above, the typology of affinity-seeking strategies developed by Bell and Daly (1984a,b) appears to have promise for yielding such positive information. Hence, our second research question was:

R2: To what extent does perceived supervisor use of affinity-seeking strategies impact subordinate satisfaction in diverse areas of employment?

Method

Sample

The sample used in the study consisted of 328 employees from various organizations and areas of employment within the organizations (111 financial; 91 educational; 31 professional/technical; 14 mining/production; 13

sales; 19 secretarial/clerical; 29 management; 15 various blue collar; and 5 non-specific). The sample represented employees who held positions from near the top of their organization to middle management to employees who held positions near the bottom of their organization.

Measurement

Power Strategies. The revised and most recent version of the Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) instrument developed by Kearney et al. (1984) was employed as a measure of power strategies. The instrument included 22 unlabeled behavior alteration techniques with representative messages¹. The Richmond et al. (1984) study employed the first version of the Behavior Alteration Techniques instrument which had 18 techniques. The only difference between this study and the Richmond et al. study is that in this study the most recent version of the BAT instrument was employed. The revised instrument includes all 18 techniques included in the original version. The new version splits the previous "Reward from Behavior" BAT into "Immediate Reward from Behavior" and "Deferred Reward from Behavior" and the previous "Referred-Model" BAT into "Peer Modeling" and "Supervisor Modeling." Two new BATs are added: "Punishment from Others" and "Supervisor Feedback."

Affinity-Seeking Strategies. The Bell and Daly (1984a,b) 25-item affinity-seeking strategies instrument was employed as a measure of affinity-seeking. The instrument included the 25 unlabeled strategies for affinity-seeking (AS) with representative messages¹. The only difference between the original Bell and Daly measure and the one employed here is that ours were written in the supervisor/subordinate context as opposed to the general interpersonal context. Bell and Daly (1984b) suggest that even though affinity-seeking is constrained by the context, it is still important to view the unique relationships such as affinity-seeking between supervisor and subordinate and its impact on the work environment. Hence, we felt that this was the appropriate means of measuring affinity between supervisors and subordinates.

Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall & Hulin (1969) was employed to measure satisfaction with supervision. Previous studies have demonstrated that the JDI is a stable instrument with good reliability (Smith et al., 1969; Falcione et al., 1977; Hurt & Teigen, 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; and Richmond et al., 1984). Previously obtained reliabilities have been good (e.g., supervision .92). Since, the Richmond et al. study demonstrated that perceived supervisor use of power strategies was significantly associated with satisfaction with supervision, while the proportion of significant associations with work/position satisfaction were only slightly better than chance, it was decided not to include the work dimension of JDI.

Data Collection

The data were collected in two ways. Some of the subjects were spouses of teachers enrolled in a graduate class entitled "Communication in the

Educational Organization." On the first day of class the students were asked to take the questionnaire home and get one other person to complete it. There was no chance for contamination from any material presented in the class since the instrument was sent home before any material related to the questionnaire was discussed. All the respondents returned their questionnaires before the fourth day of class. There were 217 usable forms from 226 returned. The second set of questionnaires were collected from persons associated with the banking/financial industry during a managerial workshop conducted by one of the authors. These were also collected before any material related to the questionnaire was discussed. There were 111 usable forms from 113 returned.

The questionnaire asked the subjects to list "your current job title/position." The authors coded the job into one of the following categories: financial; educational, professional/technical; mining/production; sales; secretarial/clerical; blue collar; management; and other.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of the 22 behavioral alteration message groupings. The subjects were presented with the message group then told:

Below are a series of strategies that your supervisor might use to get you to change your behavior or to do something they want you to do. Read each message group, then indicate by circling Yes or No after the message whether your supervisor has ever used the strategy. If Yes circle how often you have observed your supervisor using the same strategy by very circling one of the following: rarely = 1; occasionally = 2; often = 3; and very often = 4. If No, go on to the next strategy.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the 25 affinity-seeking message groupings. The subjects were presented with the message group then told:

Below are a series of strategies that your supervisor might use to get you to like him/her and to develop and maintain a good relationship. Read each message group, then indicate by circling Yes or No after the message whether your supervisor has ever used the strategy. If Yes circle how often you have observed your supervisor using the same strategy by circling one of the following: rarely = 1; occasionally = 2; often = 3; and very often = 4. If No, go on to the next strategy.

Lastly, the subjects were asked to complete the JDI measure for supervision by indicating on a 7-point scale the degree to which they agreed that various statements described their supervisor (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = neutral or uncertain; 5 = somewhat agree; 6 = agree; 7 = strongly agree).

Data Analysis

Three primary analyses were performed on the data. The first analysis involved computing the frequency with which the subjects responded "Yes" to the inquiry as to whether their supervisor ever employed each of the various behavior alteration and affinity-seeking strategies. This analysis was

conducted in order to determine how common the use of each technique is in the organizational environment.

A sub-analysis involving the Yes-No response was also concluded. Chi-square analyses were computed for Yes-No by employment type for each BAT and AS strategy. Only three of the 47 tests yielded significant results, about the number which would be expected by chance at the Alpha .05 level. Since the financial and education categories accounted for over half of the subjects, a second sub-analysis was conducted which retained these categories and collapsed the remaining categories. Again, only three tests yielded significant results. The only one of these which accounted for more than three percent of the variance was on the BAT labeled Deferred Reward from Behavior, where financial subjects reported more frequent use and educational subjects reported less frequent use than the other group. Since these analyses indicated little difference over all among our subject group, and no more than might reasonably be expected by chance, all remaining analyses were conducted with the subjects grouped as a single sample.

The second primary analysis involved correlating the Yes-No responses with the satisfaction scores of all subjects. This was done to provide an estimate of the relationship between satisfaction and simple presence or absence of use of the techniques.

The final analysis involved only the subjects responding "Yes" to a given technique. How often these subjects reported their supervisors used the given technique was correlated with their satisfaction score. This analysis was conducted to estimate the impact of increased use of the given technique on subordinate satisfaction.

The reliability on the supervisor dimension of the JDI was computed. The internal reliability was .93. This is very consistent with previous studies (Falcione, et al. 1977, Richmond & McCroskey, 1979; and Richmond et al., 1984). All other tests were conducted at the alpha .05 level of significance.

Results

Behavioral Alteration

Research question one asked: To what extent is perceived supervisor use of behavior alteration techniques related to subordinate satisfaction in diverse areas of employment? Based on the criterion that a BAT must be used by at least 40% of the supervisors to be considered commonly used, the following are the 7 commonly used BATs: Immediate Reward from Behavior; Deferred Reward from Behavior; Self-Esteem; Legitimate-Higher Authority; Personal Responsibility; Altruism; and Expert (see Table 1). The correlations of use/nonuse and satisfaction indicated that the following BATs when used were correlated positively with satisfaction: Deferred Reward from Behavior; Self-Esteem; and Supervisor Feedback. The correlations of use/nonuse and satisfaction indicated that the following BATs when used were correlated negatively with satisfaction: Punishment from Supervisor; Punishment from Others; Guilt; Legitimate Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship-Negative; Legitimate-Higher Authority; Legitimate-Supervisor Authority; Personal

TABLE 1 Percentage of BAT Use and Correlations Between BAT Use and Satisfaction

<i>Behavior Alteration Technique</i>	<i>Percentage of Supervisors Using BAT</i>	<i>Correlation of Use/Non-Use and Satisfaction*</i>	<i>Correlation of Frequency of Use and Satisfaction*</i>
1 Immediate Reward from Behavior	44.8		
2 Deferred Reward from Behavior	51.1	.16	
3 Reward from Source (Supervisor)	22.0		
4 Reward from Others	19.4		
5 Self-Esteem	63.5	.11	
6 Punishment from Behavior	8.7		-.27
7 Punishment from Source (Supervisor)	11.1	-.22	-.52
8 Punishment from Others	1.9	-.11	-.78
9 Guilt	9.9	-.17	
10 Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship: Positive	24.5		
11 Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship: Negative	7.7	-.20	
12 Legitimate: Higher Authority	72.1	-.26	
13 Legitimate: Supervisor Authority	26.3	-.34	
14 Personal Responsibility	48.4	-.14	
15 Duty	20.0		
16 Normative Rules	20.6		
17 Debt	11.6	-.15	
18 Altruism	40.0		
19 Peer Modeling	12.2		
20 Referent (Supervisor) Modeling	26.4		
21 Expert	57.1		-.30
22 Supervisor Feedback	22.5	.12	-.40

*p < .05, non-significant correlations omitted.

Responsibility; and Debt (see Table 1). The correlations of frequency of BAT use and supervisor satisfaction indicated that five BATs were negatively correlated with supervisor satisfaction. They were: Punishment from Behavior; Punishment from Supervisor; Punishment from Others; Expert and Supervisor Feedback (see Table 1).

Taken together, these results indicate that two relatively commonly used BATs are positively associated with subordinate satisfaction—Deferred Reward from Behavior and Self-Esteem. The only other BAT positively associated with subordinate satisfaction, Supervisor Feedback, is used by only about 1 in 5 supervisors.

In contrast, two relatively commonly used BATs are negatively associated with subordinate satisfaction—Legitimate—Higher Authority and Personal Responsibility. Six other BATs are negatively associated with subordinate

satisfaction: Punishment from Supervisor, Punishment from Others, Guilt, Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship-Negative, Legitimate-Supervisor Authority, and Debt. Fortunately, none of these appear to be used by many supervisors. On average, 11.4 percent of the supervisors reportedly use each of these.

Results for five of the BATs indicated the more they were used the more negative was the subordinate's satisfaction with supervision. Two of these, Punishment from Supervisor and Punishment from Others, were negatively associated with satisfaction whenever used and more negative the more they were used. Two others, Punishment from Behavior and Expert showed no correlation with satisfaction in Yes-No analyses. However, the correlation with frequency of use were significantly negative. This may suggest that these BATs may have little effect on subordinate satisfaction when used in moderation but are very negative when overused. The fifth BAT, Supervisor Feedback, presents a particularly interesting picture. The correlation with simple use-nonuse and satisfaction for this BAT is positive whereas the correlation between frequency of use and satisfaction is negative. This may be taken to indicate that moderate use of Supervisor Feedback is a positive element in supervisor-subordinate relations, but heavy use of this BAT is a negative element.

Affinity-Seeking

Research question two asked: To what extent is perceived supervisor use of affinity-seeking strategies related to subordinate satisfaction in diverse areas of employment? Based on the criterion that an affinity-seeking strategy must be used by at least 40% of the supervisors to be considered commonly used, the following are the 17 commonly used AS strategies: Assume Control; Assume Equality; Comfortable Self; Conversational Rule-Keeping; Dynamism; Elicit Other's Disclosures; Facilitate Enjoyment; Listening; Nonverbal Immediacy; Openness; Optimism; Personal Autonomy; Physical Attractiveness; Self-Concept Confirmation; Sensitivity; Supportiveness; and Trustworthiness (see Table 2). Based on the correlation of use/nonuse of AS and perceived subordinate satisfaction with supervision, the following AS strategies correlate positively with satisfaction when used: Assume Equality; Comfortable Self; Conversational Rule-Keeping; Elicit Other's Disclosures; Facilitate Enjoyment; Inclusion of Other; Listening; Nonverbal Immediacy; Openness; Optimism; Physical Attractiveness; Self-Concept Confirmation; Sensitivity; and Trustworthiness (see Table 2). The correlations of frequency of AS use and perceived supervisor satisfaction by the subordinate yielded eleven positively significant relationships: Assume Equality; Comfortable Self; Conversational Rule-Keeping; Elicit Other's Disclosures; Listening; Nonverbal Immediacy; Optimism; Self-Concept Confirmation; Sensitivity; Supportiveness; and Trustworthiness (see Table 2). The correlations of frequency of AS use and perceived supervisor satisfaction by the subordinate yielded two negatively significant relationships: Assume Control and Present Interesting Self.

Taken together, these results indicate that most of the affinity-seeking

TABLE 2 Percentage of AS Use and Correlations Between AS Use and Satisfaction

<i>Affinity Seeking Strategy</i>	<i>Percentage of Supervisors Using AS</i>	<i>Correlation of Use/Non-Use and Satisfaction*</i>	<i>Correlation of Frequency of Use and Satisfaction*</i>
1 Altruism	31.8		
2 Assume Control	53.1		-.16
3 Assume Equality	61.8	.40	.34
4 Comfortable Self	46.7	.18	.23
5 Concede Control	22.5		
6 Conversational Rule-Keeping	52.7	.27	.22
7 Dynamism	42.7		
8 Elicit Other's Disclosure	66.0	.31	.36
9 Facilitate Enjoyment	52.3	.24	
10 Inclusion of Other	36.9	.17	
11 Influence Perceptions of Closeness	34.5		
12 Listening	61.7	.37	.41
13 Nonverbal Immediacy	51.4	.13	.19
14 Openness	49.1	.16	
15 Optimism	51.4	.21	.25
16 Personal Autonomy	54.2		
17 Physical Attractiveness	66.3	.20	
18 Present Interesting Self	32.9		-.21
19 Reward Association	21.6		
20 Self-Concept Confirmation	55.8	.27	.28
21 Self-Inclusion	21.2		
22 Sensitivity	59.8	.41	.45
23 Similarity	33.0		
24 Supportiveness	47.0		.18
25 Trustworthiness	66.8	.32	.32

* $p < .05$, non-significant correlations omitted.

strategies considered in this investigation are positively related to subordinate satisfaction. However, there are exceptions to this general pattern. Two commonly used AS strategies, Dynamism and Personal Autonomy, apparently are unrelated to subordinate satisfaction. Similarly, six AS strategies which are less commonly used are also unrelated to subordinate satisfaction: Altruism, Concede Control, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Reward Association, Self-Inclusion, and Similarity.

Two AS strategies provide a contrasting picture, Assume Control and Present Interesting Self. While these two AS strategies yielded no significant relationship with subordinate satisfaction in terms of simple use/nonuse, overuse was found to be associated with lower subordinate satisfaction.

Conclusions

The similarity of results between the earlier Richmond et al. (1984) study with regard to frequently used behavioral alteration techniques is striking. The

five most commonly used techniques observed in that study were the same as six of the seven observed in this study (Reward from Behavior in that study was divided into Immediate and Delayed Reward from Behavior in the present study). Altruism, the seventh BAT identified as commonly used in this study, was the next most frequent used BAT in the earlier study.

The pattern for less commonly used BATs was also very similar in the two studies. Of the 11 BATs identified as less frequently used in the earlier study, none were found to be frequently used in this study. In fact, the average frequency of use of these 11 BATs in this study was less than 16 percent.

Although this was not an exact replication of the earlier study, the BAT pool was enlarged and the response options changed, the consistency of the results enhances our grounds for drawing conclusions concerning the use of BATs and subordinate satisfaction. This is particularly the case since the present investigation involved subjects from a wide variety of occupations.

As a result of these two investigations it is clear there is little advice we can give to supervisors who wish to increase subordinate satisfaction by means of positive use of behavior alteration techniques. We can only suggest that the supervisor increase use of Deferred Reward from Behavior and Self-Esteem while employing the Supervisor Feedback BAT at a low frequency level. Clearly, increasing subordinate satisfaction is more a function of positive use of affinity strategies than positive use of behavior alteration techniques, and we will address suggestions in this area later.

While the three BATs noted above, properly used, may make a modest contribution to improved subordinate satisfaction, the main concern of the supervisor when choosing among BATs should be with avoiding reducing subordinate satisfaction while still altering the behavior in the desired direction. The results of these studies provide grounds for much more substantive advice to the supervisor in this area. BATs which clearly should be avoided when possible are: Punishment from Supervisor; Punishment from Others; Guilt; Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship: Negative; Legitimate-Higher Authority; Legitimate-Supervisor Authority; Personal Responsibility; and Debt. All of these BATs may be described as "anti-social," meaning that few people would desire to have the BAT used on themselves. They are all associated with the coercive or legitimate bases of power outlined by French and Raven (1968) and found to have negative impact on satisfaction by Richmond et al. (1980), and Richmond et al. (1983), as well as a negative impact on a variety of "bottom-line" variables by Student (1968).

Several BATs appear to be generally unrelated to subordinate satisfaction. These provide options for supervisors beyond the few positive and many negative options noted above. These options are: Immediate Reward from Behavior; Reward from Supervisor; Reward from Others; Supervisor-Subordinate Relationship: Positive; Duty; Normative Rules; Altruism; Peer Modeling; Referent (Supervisor) Modeling. In addition, Punishment from Behavior and Expert, may be employed in moderation without anticipating adverse effects on subordinate satisfaction.

Most of these BATs can be labeled pro-social, although not all of them. They generally fall within the categories of reward, referent, or expert bases of

power outlined by French and Raven (1968) are found to be positively related or non-related to subordinate satisfaction and "bottom-line variables in previous research.

Our general conclusion from this study, in conjunction with the earlier research in this area, is that only a few BAT options are generally positive, while many are negative or neutral, in terms of impact on subordinate satisfaction. This should not be seen as particularly surprising, since BATs are designed to get someone to do something they would not do otherwise. Nevertheless, the effective supervisor need not sacrifice employee satisfaction every time he/she must alter their behavior. Options for altering behavior without lowering satisfaction are available and should be used whenever possible. Of course, some circumstances may make choices of BATs which reduce satisfaction unavoidable. Under such circumstances, the importance of employing effective affinity-seeking strategies becomes extremely high. However, the supervisor who uses such AS strategies effectively will most likely find far fewer circumstances when selection of negative BATs is unavoidable.

The results of this investigation relating to affinity-seeking strategies presents a very promising picture. The supervisor appears to have many potentially effective strategies among which to choose. Only two of these studied here, Assume Control and Present Interesting Self, appear to be potentially negative if used extensively. Weaker options, although not harmful, seem to be Altruism, Concede Control, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Reward Association, Self-Inclusion, and Similarity.

The remaining 17 AS strategies studied in this investigation appear to be positive for the supervisor. Of these, Assume Equality, Elicit Other's Disclosures, Listening, Sensitivity, and Trustworthiness seem to have the most potential for success. Of course, not all of these 17 options may be fully compatible with a given supervisor's personality or with the initial supervisor-subordinate relationship. Fortunately, sufficient options exist so that no supervisor can argue that there is nothing he/she can do to improve relationships with her/his subordinates.

The roles of the supervisor is to make certain that the behaviors of subordinates are compatible with the interests of the organization. This role is most easily performed when a strong positive relationship exists between the supervisor and subordinates. Effective use as affinity-seeking strategies can enhance such relationships and prevent the necessity of the selection of behavior alteration techniques which damage relationships. In most circumstances the astute supervisor can modify necessary behaviors of subordinates without reducing meaningfully their satisfaction. When this is not possible, it is doubly important that the supervisor employ effective affinity-seeking strategies to repair the damage.

Note

¹The descriptions of the Behavior Alteration Techniques and Affinity-Seeking Strategies designed for supervisor/subordinate use are available upon request from the senior author. They were omitted because of the amount of space they would consume.

References

- Bacharach, S.B., & Lawler, E.J. (1976). The perception of power. *Social Forces*, 55, 123-134.
- Baum, J.F., & Youngblood, S.A. (1975). Impact of an organizational, control policy on absenteeism, performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 688-694.
- Bell, R.A., & Daly, J.A. (1984a). Affinity-seeking: Its nature and correlates. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.
- Bell, R.A., & Daly, J.A. (1984b). The affinity-seeking function of communication. *Communication Monograph*, 51, 91-115.
- Cohen, A. (1959). Situational Structure, Self-esteem and threatening oriented reactions to power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 35-52). Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Daly, J.A., McCroskey, J.C., & Falcione, R.L. (1976). Communication apprehension, supervisor communication receptivity and satisfaction with supervisors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia.
- Day, R.C., & Hamblin, R.L. (1964). Some effects of close and punitive styles on supervision. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69, 499-510.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Falcione, R.L., McCroskey, J.C., & Daly, J.A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employee's communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of their immediate supervisors. In B.D. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 1* (pp. 363-375). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory* (pp. 259-269)(3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Goodstadt, B.E., & Hjelle, L.A. (1973). Power to the powerless: Locus of control and the use of power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 190-196.
- Goodstadt, B., & Kipnis, D. (1970). Situational influences on the use of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 201-207.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland: World.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 53-62.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Hurt, H.T., & Teigen, C.W. (1977). The development of a measure of perceived organizational innovativeness. In B.R. Ruben (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 1* (pp. 377-388), New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T.G., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1984). Power in the classroom IV: Teacher communication techniques as alternative to discipline. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 8* (pp. 724-746), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T.G., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. *Communication Education*, 34, 19-28.
- Kipnis, D., & Lane, W. (1962). Self-confidence and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 291-295.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). Nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- McCroskey, J.C., & Richmond, V.P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education*, 32, 175-184.
- McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., Plax, T.G., & Kearney, P. (1984). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training, and learning. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago.
- Miller, G.R., Boster, F., Roloif, M., & Siebold, D. (1977). Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. *Communication Monographs*, 44, 37-51.
- Pelz, D.C. (1952). Influence: A key to effective leadership in the first-time supervisor. *Personnel*, 29, 209-217.
- Riccillo, S.G., Trenholm, S. (1983). Predicting managers' choice of influence mode: The effects of interpersonal trust and worker attributions on managerial tactics in a simulated organizational setting. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 47, 323-339.
- Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1979). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement, and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple-factor approaches. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 3* (pp. 359-373). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Richmond, V.P. & McCroskey, J.C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. *Communication Education*, 33, 125-136.

- Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C., & Davis, L.M. (1982). Individual differences among employees, management communication style, and employee satisfaction: Replication and extension. *Human Communication Research, 8*, 170-188.
- Richmond, V.P., Wagner, J.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1983). The impact of perceptions of leadership style, use of power, and conflict management style on organizational outcomes. *Communication Quarterly, 31*, 27-36.
- Richmond, V.P., Davis, L.M., Saylor, K., McCroskey, J.C. (1984). Power strategies in organizations: Communication techniques and messages. *Human Communication Research, 11*, 85-108.
- Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C., Davis, L.M., & Koontz, K.A. (1980). Perceived power as a mediator of management communication style and employee satisfaction: A preliminary investigation. *Communication Quarterly, 28*, 37-46.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., & Dickson, W.J. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rogers, E.M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, E.M., & Shoemaker, F.F. (1971). *Communication of innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Sadler, P.J. (1970). Leadership style, confidence in management, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 6*, 3-19.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Student, K. (1968). Supervisory influence and work-group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*, 188-194.
- Thibaut, J.W., & Riecken, H.W. (1955). Authoritarianism, status and the communication of aggression. *Human Relations, 8*, 95-120.
- Wheless, L.R., Barraclough, R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook VII* (pp. 105-145), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.