

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND AFFINITY-SEEKING
IN SUPERIOR-SUBORDINATE RELATIONSHIPS

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

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationships between supervisor use of affinity-seeking strategies and subordinates' trait-like communication apprehension, shyness, and apprehension concerning communication with the supervisor. The results indicated little association between the personality-type orientations of subordinates and supervisor use of affinity-seeking strategies. However, substantial association between supervisor use of affinity-seeking strategies and subordinate apprehension about communicating with the supervisor were observed. Since satisfaction with supervision was found to be highly associated with subordinate apprehension about communication with the supervisor it is suggested that appropriate use of affinity-seeking strategies on the part of the supervisor should be expected to both reduce subordinate apprehension and increase subordinate satisfaction.

The primary function of supervisors in an organization is to oversee and modify when necessary, the behavior of their subordinates. The very nature of this role increases the probability that conflict will occur between supervisor and subordinate. Having one's performance constantly scrutinized by another can be very threatening to many people, particularly if the person does not care for or like the person doing the observing. Similarly, being asked or required to change one's behaviors can be very unsettling to a person. If the request or demand comes from a person one dislikes, the potential for a hostile or rebellious response is greatly increased.

Virginia P. Richmond, James C. McCroskey, and Leonard M. Davis are Professors of Speech Communication, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506 USA.

Because of these inherent factors in the relationships between supervisors and subordinates, it is of major importance that a high level of affinity be developed between the people in such a relationship. While the development of such affinity is the partial responsibility of each individual involved, because of her/his role in the relationship a majority of the responsibility must fall on the shoulders of the supervisor. The purpose of the present study was to investigate three factors which may impact the supervisor's acceptance of this responsibility: trait communication apprehension and shyness, and the impact of differential use of affinity-seeking strategies on communication apprehension that subordinates experience when communicating with their supervisors.

The Nature of Communication Apprehension and Shyness

Communication apprehension (CA) is the fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons (McCroskey, 1977, 1984). McCroskey (1984) has advanced a theoretical conceptualization which specifies four types of CA that presumably fall along a continuum from CA experienced as a personality-based, trait-like orientation to a very situation-specific experience. The four types are traitlike, context-based, audience-based, and situational. The two of primary concern here are the traitlike and the audience-based. Trait-like CA is viewed as a relatively enduring orientation toward communication that cuts across communication contexts, types of receivers, and time. Audience-based CA is viewed as more situational in nature and related only to communication with a particular person or group of people. While this type of CA is also seen as relatively enduring over time, it would be quite susceptible to change as a function of the behavior of the target audience. In the present investigation the audience-based CA of interest is the subordinate's general level of CA when communicating with her/his supervisor across communication contexts and time.

Shyness, as viewed here, is distinct from (although presumably correlated with) CA. While CA is viewed as an internally experienced phenomenon, shyness is viewed as a behavioral construct. Shyness is a tendency to withdraw from communication and communicate less. Shyness is seen as a potential product of CA, but shyness can also result from a number of other causes (McCroskey and Richmond, 1982).

High levels of traitlike CA have been reported by up to 20 percent of the population in this culture. Thus, other things being equal, an organization can expect about one in five employees to be a high communication apprehensive. In contrast, virtually all people (hence all employees in an organization) report experiencing high CA as a function of communicating with some particular person or group. CA, then, is a fact of life in the organizational environment.

Shyness, as a behavioral construct, has received far less attention from researchers. However, all studies of shyness have reported the proportion of the population which reports being shy to be at least as high as that for traitlike CA, and usually the proportion is higher. Thus, this pattern of communication behavior appears to be common within the culture and, hence, may be presumed to be so in the organizational environment.

While little research concerning audience-based CA within an organizational context has been reported, considerable research involving trait-like CA and shyness in this context is extant. In her summary of the findings from this research, Richmond (1984) emphasizes a variety of effects of CA and shyness in the organizational context. Apprehensive/shy people tend to seek employment in positions that require little communication, they tend to be discriminated against in the hiring process, they report lower job satisfaction, they are less likely to be retained in their jobs, and they are less likely to be promoted within their organization. Other research has been reported that indicates apprehensive/shy people are perceived more negatively by others in their environment--are seen as less competent, less attractive, and to have less leadership capacity (McCroskey and Richmond, 1982).

Based upon this research it is clearly possible that supervisors may respond to apprehensive and shy subordinates in ways different than they respond to other subordinates. It is also quite possible that for achievement of the most positive effects, supervisors should respond differently.

Affinity-Seeking Strategies

Many scholars as well as popular writers have addressed the perennial question of how one person can get another to like her/his. A major research effort reported recently by Bell and Daly (1984a,b) has drawn much of this work together and generated a typology of "affinity-seeking strategies." This typology includes 25 distinct approaches or strategies that one can use to get higher affinity from another. One of the specific contexts addressed by Bell and Daly (1984b) was supervisor-subordinate communication, hence the resulting typology should be directly applicable in that context.

While relatively little research has been reported that has employed this new typology, among the studies reported by Bell and Daly (1984b) was one in which traitlike CA was correlated with the number of affinity-seeking attempts made by an individual as well as the number of different strategies attempted. The results were significant negative correlations in both cases. Highly apprehensive people made fewer attempts to seek affinity as well as using fewer different kinds of affinity-seeking strategies. If we refer to the principle of reciprocity (we tend to communicate with others as they communicate with us), we might expect that a supervisor who receives less affinity-seeking communication from a subordinate will also make fewer affinity-seeking communication attempts in return.

Research Questions

On the basis of the research reviewed above it appears probable that supervisors may behave differently toward highly apprehensive or shy subordinates because of negative perceptions of those subordinates and/or because of the subordinates' behavior toward them. Consequently, the present study sought to discover whether traitlike CA and/or shyness was a meaningful predictor of how supervisors employ affinity-seeking strategies in their communication with subordinates. Specific research questions were:

Q1: Is traitlike CA of a subordinate a meaningful predictor of use of affinity-seeking strategies on the part of the supervisor?

Q2: Is shyness of a subordinate a meaningful predictor of use of affinity-seeking strategies on the part of the supervisor?

While the concern of our first two research questions was with the impact of traitlike CA and shyness of subordinate on the behavior of the supervisor, the concern of our third research question was with the impact of differential supervisor behavior on the audience-based apprehension of the subordinate. In essence, our concern was with whether supervisors might increase or decrease the apprehension of the subordinate by their choices of affinity-seeking strategies. The specific research question was:

Q3: Is differential use of affinity-seeking strategies by a supervisor meaningfully related to subordinate apprehension about communication with the supervisor?

Our final research question centered on the importance of any results obtained related to the first three questions. In brief, we were concerned that differences might exist but they might not be meaningfully related to any important organizational outcome. In order to probe this possibility, we chose to investigate subordinate satisfaction with supervision, a criterion variable commonly used in research related to communication in organizations. We posed the following research question:

Q4: To what extent are the use of affinity-seeking strategies and subordinate apprehension about communicating with supervisor predictive of subordinate satisfaction with supervision?

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 nonspecific). 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. There were 190 males and 138 females in the sample.

Measurement

Traitlike Communication Apprehension. The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (PRCA-24) instrument developed by McCroskey (1982) was employed to measure a subject's traitlike CA. The alpha reliability coefficient for the PRCA-24 in this study was .97.

Shyness Measure. The 14 item Shyness Scale (SS) developed by McCroskey was employed to measure a subject's shyness (McCroskey, Andersen, Richmond & Wheelless, 1981). The alpha reliability coefficient for the Shyness Scale in this study was .94.

Subordinate Apprehension. A subordinate's apprehension about communicating with her/his supervisor was measured by the McCroskey and Richmond (1982) 20-item Situational Communication Apprehension Measure (SCAN). The alpha reliability coefficient for the SCAN in this study was .97.

Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) was employed to measure a subject's satisfaction with her/his supervisor. Since satisfaction with supervision was the main thrust of this study, only the supervision portion of the JDI was employed. Subjects were asked to complete the JDI measure for satisfaction with supervision by indicating on a 7-point scale the degree to which they agreed that various statements described their supervisor. The alpha reliability coefficient for the JDI in this study was .91.

Affinity-Seeking Strategies. The Bell and Daly (1984a,b) 25-item affinity-seeking strategies (AS) instrument was employed to measure affinity-seeking. The instrument included the 25 unlabeled strategies for affinity-seeking with representative messages (see Table 1). The only difference between the original Bell and Daly measure and the one employed here is that the strategies were couched in the supervisor-subordinate context as opposed to the interpersonal context.

Table 1
Affinity-Seeking Strategies

Strategy	Description
1. <u>Altruism.</u>	The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her tries to be of help and assistance to this individual in whatever s/he is currently doing. For example, the person holds the door for this individual, offers to get him or her something to drink, takes his or her coat, and is also generally available to run errands for this individual. S/he also gives advice when it is requested.
2. <u>Assume Control.</u>	The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as a leader, a person who has control over what goes on. For example, s/he directs the conversations held with the other person, takes charge of the activities the two engage in, and mentions examples of where s/he has taken charge or served as a leader in the past.
3. <u>Assume Equality.</u>	The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as an equal of the other person. For example, s/he avoids showing off, does not act superior or snobbish, and does not play "one-upmanship" games. If the person attempting to be liked is of lower status, s/he treats the other individual as an equal, rather than as a superior.
4. <u>Comfortable Self.</u>	The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her acts comfortable in the setting the two find themselves, comfortable with himself or herself, and comfortable with the other person. S/he is relaxed, at ease, casual, and content. distractions and disturbances in the environment are ignored (e.g., loud noises and obnoxious people). The person tries to look as if s/he is having fun, even if s/he is not. The impression this person tries to convey is "nothing bothers me".

5. Concede Control. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her allows this person to control the relationship and situations the two individuals find themselves in. For example, s/he lets the other take charge of their conversations and decide what they do and where they go. The supervisor attempting to be liked also lets the other individual influence his or her actions by not acting dominant.
6. Conversational Rule-Keeping. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her follows closely the culture's rules for how people are to socialize with one another by demonstrating cooperation, friendliness, and politeness. This person works hard at giving relevant answers to questions, saying "the right thing", acting interested and involved in the conversation, and adapting his/her messages to the particular characteristics of the other party. S/he avoids changing the topic of conversation too soon, interrupting the other person, being pushy, dominating the conversation, and excessive self-references. When talking to strangers and acquaintances, s/he engages in small talk, rather than serious discussions. S/he also avoids topics that are not of common interest to both parties.
7. Dynamism. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as a dynamic, active, and enthusiastic person. For example, s/he acts physically animated and very lively while with the other person, varies his/her intonation and other vocal characteristics, and is outgoing and extroverted in the presence of the other person.
8. Elicit Other's Disclosures. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her encourages the other to talk by asking questions and reinforcing the other person for talking. For example, s/he inquires about the other person's interests, feelings, opinions, views, etc., responds as if these are important and interesting, and continues to ask more questions of the other person.
9. Facilitate Enjoyment. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her seeks to make the situations in which the two are together very enjoyable experiences. For example, the person does the things the other will enjoy, is entertaining, tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, says funny things, and tries to make the environment conducive to enjoyment.
10. Inclusion of Other. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her includes this person in his or her social activities and groups of friends. For example, s/he introduces the other to his/her friends, and makes the person feel like "one of the guys" or "one of the girls".
11. Influence Perceptions of Closeness. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her engages in behaviors that lead this person to perceive the relationship as being closer and more established than it has actually been. For example, s/he uses nicknames when addressing the other, and talks about "we", rather than "you" and "I". S/he also mentions any prior activities that included both of them.
12. Listening. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her pays close attention to what this individual says, listening very actively. S/he focuses attention solely on this person, paying strict attention to what is said. Moreover, the person attempting to be liked demonstrates that s/he listens by being responsive to the other's ideas, asking for clarification of ambiguities, being open-minded, and remembering things the other says.

13. Nonverbal Immediacy. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her signals interest and liking for this person through various nonverbal cues. For example, the person frequently tries to make eye contact with this other person, stands or sits closer to him or her, and smiles at him or her. S/he also uses nonverbal signs of interest, such as leaning forward, frequent head nodding, and directing much gaze toward the other person. All of these indicate that this person is very much interested in the other individual and what s/he has to say.

14. Openness. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her is open. For example, the person discloses information about his/her background, interests, and views, and insecurities, weaknesses, and fears to make the other individual feel very special and trusted (e.g., "Just between you and me").

15. Optimism. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as a positive individual—an optimist—so that s/he will appear to be a person who is pleasant to be around. S/he acts in a "happy-go-lucky" manner, is cheerful, and looks on the positive side of things. S/he avoids complaining about things, talking about depressing topics, and being critical of self and others. In short, the person makes a concerted effort to avoid being "a drag".

16. Personal Autonomy. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as an independent, free-thinking person—the kind of person who stands on their own, speaks their mind regardless of the consequences, refuses to change their behavior to meet the expectations of others, and knows where s/he is going in life. For instance, if the person attempting to be liked finds that s/he disagrees with the other individual on some issues, s/he states his/her opinion anyway, is confident that his/her view is right, and may even try to change the mind of the other person.

17. Physical Attractiveness. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her tries to look as attractive as possible in appearance and attire. S/he wears nice, fashionable clothes, practices good grooming, shows concern for proper hygiene, stands up straight, and monitors his/her appearance.

18. Present Interesting Self. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self to be a person who would be interesting to know. For example, s/he highlights past accomplishments and positive qualities, emphasizes things that make him/her especially interesting, expresses unique ideas, and demonstrates intelligence and knowledge. The person may also try to discretely drop the names of impressive people s/he knows. S/he may even do outlandish things to appear unpredictable, wild, or crazy.

19. Reward Association. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as an important figure who can reward this individual for associating with him or her. For instance, s/he offers to do favors for the other, and gives this person gifts and information that would be valuable. The person's basic message to this individual is, "if you like me, you will gain something".

20. Self-Concept Confirmation. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her demonstrates respect for this individual, helping him or her feel good about how they see themselves. For example, s/he treats the individual like a very important person, compliments this person, says only positive things about him or her, and treats the things this individual says as being very important information. S/he may also tell other people what a great person this individual is, in hopes that the comment will get back to the person through third parties.

21. Self-Inclusion. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her sets up frequent encounters with this person. For example, s/he initiates casual encounters with this individual, attempts to schedule future encounters, places himself or herself physically close to the other person, and puts him or herself in a position to be invited to participate in their social activities.

22. Sensitivity. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her acts in a warm, empathic manner toward this individual to communicate concern and caring. S/he also shows sympathy to this person's problems and anxieties, spends time working at understanding how this individual sees their life, and accepts what the individual says as an honest response. The message this person attempts to send to the other is "I care about you as a person".

23. Similarity. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her tries to make this individual think that the two of them are similar in attitudes, values, interests, preferences, personality, etc.. S/he expresses views that are similar to the views the other holds, agrees with what the other person says, and points out the things that the two have in common. Moreover, s/he deliberately avoids engaging in behaviors that would suggest differences between the two parties.

24. Supportiveness. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her is supportive of this individual and his or her positions by being encouraging, agreeable, and reinforcing to him or her. The person also avoids criticizing this individual or saying anything that might hurt this person's feelings, and sides with this person in any disagreements s/he has with others.

25. Trustworthiness. The supervisor attempting to get another individual to like him or her presents self as trustworthy and reliable. For example, s/he emphasizes his or her responsibility, reliability, fairness, dedication, honesty, and sincerity. S/he also maintains consistency among his or her stated beliefs and behaviors, fulfills any commitments made to the individual, and avoids "false fronts" by acting natural at all times.

Data Collection

The data were collected in two ways. Some of the subjects were spouses and/or friends 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 home the questionnaire and get one other person to complete it. There was no chance for contamination from any material presented in the class since the questionnaire was handed out before any material relevant to the questionnaire was discussed. There were 217 usable forms from 226 returned. The second set of questionnaires was 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 their current job title or position. The authors then coded the job title 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 asked the subjects to complete the PRCA-24, the Shyness Scale, and the SCA. In this study the subjects were given the following instructions for the SCAM: "Please complete the following questionnaire about how you feel when interacting with your supervisor." The subjects were to indicate from 1 to 7 how accurate each statement was in terms of describing how they felt while interacting with their supervisor.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the 25 affinity-seeking message groupings (see Table 1). The subjects were presented with the message groups and told "Below are a series of strategies that your supervisor might use to get you to like her/his 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 that strategy. If "Yes," circle how often you have observed your supervisor using the same strategy by circling one of the following: 1=rarely, 2=occasionally; 3=often; and 4=very often. If "No," go on to the next strategy. Lastly, the subjects completed the JDI.

Data Analyses

In order to generate results related to the first three research questions, Pearson correlations were computed. The predictors were scores on the PRCA, Shyness Scale, and SCAM. The criterion variables were use/nonuse of each affinity-seeking strategy and frequency of use of each affinity-seeking strategy. In addition, to determine the joint relationship of the various affinity-seeking strategies with apprehension about communicating with the supervisor (RQ3), a multiple correlation was computed employing use/nonuse scores on affinity-seeking as the predictor and scores on the SCAM as the criterion.

To investigate the fourth research question a multiple regression analysis was computed employing scores on the SCAM and the use/nonuse

scores on affinity-seeking to predict satisfaction with supervisor. The variance accounted for in this analysis was decomposed into independent and colinear components.

RESULTS

Results relating to our first three research questions are reported in Table 2. With regard to the first research question, the predictive power of traitlike communication apprehension with use of affinity-seeking strategies, the results indicated very little relationship between the two. Only two PRCA/affinity-seeking use/nonuse correlations were significant, and only one correlation of PRCA with frequency of use was significant. Thus, only three of a possible fifty correlations were significant, almost exactly what would be expected by chance.

Table 2
Correlations of Shyness, PRCA, and
SCAM with Use/Nonuse of Strategies and
Frequency of Strategy Use*

Strategy	Shyness		PRCA		SCAM	
	Use/Nonuse	Frequency	Use/Nonuse	Frequency	Use/Nonuse	Frequency
Altruism	-	-	-	-	-	-.19
Assume Control	-	-	-	-	.18	.21
Assume Equality	-	-.15	-	-	-.33	-.29
Comfortable Self	-	-	-	-	-.14	-.17
Concede Control	-	-	-	-	-	-.25
Conversational	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rule Keeping	-	-	-	-	-.16	-.19
Dynamism	-.17	-	-	-	-	-
Elicit Other's	-	-	-	-	-	-
Disclosure	-	-	-	-	-.20	-.31
Facilitate	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enjoyment	-	-.17	-	-	-.20	-
Inclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-
Influence	-	-	-	-	-	-
Perceptions of	-	-	-	-	-	-
Closeness	-.15	-	-.12	-	-	-
Listening	-.14	-.16	-	-.23	-.28	-.36
Nonverbal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Immediacy	-	-	-	-	-	-.20
Openness	-	-	-	-	-	-
Optimism	-	-.20	-	-	-.12	-
Personal Autonomy	-	-	-	-	-	.21
Physical	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attractiveness	-	-	-	-	-	-
Present Interesting	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self	-	.21	-	-	-	.20
Reward Association	-	-	-	-	.18	.19
Self-Concept	-	-	-	-	-	-
Confirmation	-.12	-.18	-	-	-.22	-.22
Self Inclusion	-.14	-	-.13	-	-	-.17
Sensitivity	-	-	-	-	-.28	-.31
Similarity	-	-	-	-	-.16	-
Supportiveness	-	-	-	-	-.18	-
Trustworthiness	-	-	-	-	-.31	-.18

*All correlations are significant, $p < .05$. Nonsignificant correlations have been omitted.

Correlations between shyness and affinity-seeking were somewhat more encouraging. Five correlations relating to use/nonuse were significant and six correlations with frequency of use were significant. However, the most shared variance indicated by the significant correlations was only approximately 4 percent.

Results relating to our third research questions were much more meaningful. Of the fifty simple correlations computed, thirty were significant. Shared variance ranged upward to approximately 13 percent. This should be considered substantial shared variance given the dubious reliability of the single-item scales used to measure frequency of use.

With regard to the use/nonuse results, only two of the 14 significant correlations were positive, indicating use was associated with higher apprehension. Of the 16 significant correlations with frequency of use, 12 were negative indicating more frequent use was associated with lower apprehension. The strategies labeled Assume Control and Reward Association were reported to be used by more supervisors when subordinates were more apprehensive and were used more frequently with those subordinates than others. Although use/nonuse of Personal Autonomy and Present Interesting Self was not related to apprehension, the subjects reported more frequent use of these strategies with subordinates who were more highly apprehensive. All other significant relationships indicated a greater probability of use of an affinity-seeking strategy with subjects with lower apprehension as well as more frequent use with those subordinates.

With only minor exceptions, then, the results relating to our third research question suggest lower subordinate apprehension about communicating with their supervisor is associated with greater affinity-seeking behavior on the part of the supervisor. Only five affinity-seeking strategies failed to yield a significant correlation with apprehension on either use/nonuse or frequency. These were Dynamism, Inclusion of Other, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Openness, and Physical Attractiveness. The results of the multiple correlational analysis also indicated a substantial association between use/nonuse of affinity-seeking strategies and subordinate apprehension. The obtained multiple correlation was .59, indicating approximately 35 percent of the variance in apprehension was predictable from affinity-seeking strategy usage.

The results of the multiple regression analysis related to our fourth research question indicated a multiple correlation of .67 for affinity-seeking strategy use/nonuse and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. This indicates the predictors could in combination account for approximately 45 percent of the variance in satisfaction. Simple correlations indicated that affinity-seeking strategy use alone ($r = .54$) could account for approximately 35 percent of the variance, and apprehension alone ($r = .52$) could account for approximately 27 percent. Decomposition of the multiple correlation, however, indicated 9 percent of the variance in satisfaction was uniquely predicted by affinity-seeking strategy use and 10 percent was uniquely predicted by apprehension. The remaining 26 percent represented colinear prediction of the two variables.

These results indicate substantial interrelationships among these variables. Satisfaction with supervision tends to increase as a function

of lowered apprehension and increased affinity-seeking on the part of the supervisor and appears to increase most when both of these conditions obtain.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that traitlike CA and shyness of subordinates have very little, if any, meaningful association with supervisors' use of affinity-seeking strategies. This suggests that these personality-type orientations do not produce behaviors that impact supervisors' communication behaviors in this area. This, of course, should not be taken to indicate that these orientations do not have other impacts in the organizational environment, since previous research clearly indicates that they do. However, it appears that supervisors, for the most part at least, do not modify their behaviors toward subordinates as a function of these personality-type orientations.

These findings may be interpreted in either a positive or a negative manner. At least these results suggest that supervisors are not discriminating consciously against the subordinates who are trait apprehensive and/or shy in their attempts to build better relationships with subordinates. On the other hand, highly apprehensive and shy people have difficulty relating to others in their environment and thus the supervisor must assume a greater share of the load in building affinity with these people or such affinity is unlikely to be built. The previous research by Bell and Daly (1984) has indicated that highly apprehensive subordinates are less likely to assume their share of affinity-seeking attempts. Hence, these results suggest a need to teach supervisors about CA and shyness and train them in methods of working with the people under them who experience these problems.

The results relating to use of affinity-seeking strategies and subordinate apprehension about communicating with the supervisor indicate a meaningful association between these variables. Although the observed correlations cannot clearly indicate any causal relationship, it is important to speculate about possible causality in this area. Two causal patterns appear to be possible. First, it is possible that supervisors tend to avoid subordinates who exhibit anxiety behaviors in their interactions. Thus, subordinates who "act anxious" are less likely to be communicated with than others and, hence, less likely to be the recipients of affinity-seeking from their supervisors. This does not seem to be the nature of the causality, however, given our results regarding traitlike CA and shyness. Rather, it appears that supervisors are insensitive (either consciously or unconsciously) to such behaviors in determining their choices with regard to affinity-seeking.

The second possible causal pattern is that a lack of affinity-seeking behavior of the supervisor toward the subordinate tends to increase the subordinate's apprehension. We believe this is more likely the case. Situational, and hence, audience-based, CA is much more likely to occur in a circumstance where we feel we are not liked or are uncertain whether the other person has a positive regard for us. The supervisor who engages in more affinity-seeking attempts with a subordinate indicates a greater degree of liking and puts the subordinate more at ease. Thus, the level of apprehension of the subordinate is reduced.

This interpretation is reinforced by the results relating to our fourth research question. Apprehension concerning communication with the supervisor and satisfaction with supervision were found to be highly associated. While mutual causality may explain this association, we believe the better explanation is that both are, at least in part, caused by the supervisor's communication behavior with regard to affinity-seeking. In other words, the supervisor who engages in more affinity-seeking attempts is more likely to reduce the apprehension and increase the satisfaction of her/his subordinates.

If this causal analysis is correct, it is important to determine which affinity-seeking strategies hold the most promise for the supervisor who wishes to reduce the apprehension of subordinates. Clearly, Assume Control and Reward Association, on the basis of the results reported above, appear to increase rather than decrease apprehension. Similarly, high use of Personal Autonomy and Present Interesting Self appear to increase apprehension.

The affinity-seeking strategies which appear to be most likely to help to reduce the subordinate's apprehension are: Assume Equality, Elicit Other's Disclosures, Listening, Sensitivity, and Trustworthiness. All of these approaches are strikingly similar to recommendations given to supervisors ever since the advent of the human relations movement in business. Our results, then, simply reinforce what has been known for many years, but suggest the triggering element which makes these approaches work may well be that they tend to reduce the subordinate's apprehension about communicating with the supervisor.

We should stress, however, that these five strategies are not the only ones open to the supervisor. Others which appear to be helpful include: Altruism, Comfortable Self, Concede Control, Conversational Rule-Keeping, Facilitate Enjoyment, Nonverbal Immediacy, Optimism, Self-Concept Confirmation, Self-Inclusion, Similarity, and Supportiveness. The supervisor who wishes to increase affinity and reduce apprehension in the hope of building a better relationship with subordinates, therefore, has many positive strategies available. Supervisory training should include instruction in these strategies and their appropriate use.

REFERENCES

- Bell, R.A. and J.A. Daly (1984a). Affinity-seeking: Its nature and correlates. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.
- Bell, R.A. and J.A. Daly (1984b). The affinity-seeking function of communication. Communication Monographs 51, 91-115.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research 4, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1982). An introduction to rhetorical communication (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- McCroskey, J.C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J. A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (eds.) Avoiding communication: shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Richmond, V.P. (1982). The quiet ones: Communication apprehension and shyness (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Gorsuch, Scarisbuck.
- McCroskey, J.C., J.F. Andersen, V.P. Richmond & L.R. Wheelless (1981). Communication apprehension of elementary and secondary students and teachers. Communication Education 30, 122-132.
- Richmond, V.P. (1984). Implications of quietness: Some facts and speculations. In J.A. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (eds.). Avoiding Communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp. 145-156). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Smith, P.C., L.M. Kendall & C.L. Hulin (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.