

---

Student Work

---

7-1-1986

## A Study of the Relationship Between Specialty Shoe Store Managers' Communicative Attitudes and Job Related Variables

W Wayne Foster  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>  
Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Foster, W Wayne, "A Study of the Relationship Between Specialty Shoe Store Managers' Communicative Attitudes and Job Related Variables" (1986). *Student Work*. 806.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/806>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

A Study of the Relationship Between Specialty  
Shoe Store Managers' Communicative  
Attitudes and Job Related  
Variables

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Department of Communication  
and the  
Faculty at the Graduate College  
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
University of Nebraska at Omaha

By  
W. Wayne Foster  
July, 1986

UMI Number: EP73346

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73346

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
<u>Robert E. Carlson</u>	<u>Communication</u>
<u>Joe Digan</u>	<u>Communication</u>
<u>James M. Thomas</u>	<u>Psychology</u>

Robert E. Carlson  
Chairman

4/22/87  
Date

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
Literature Review . . . . .	4
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	10
II. Research Design & Procedures . . . . .	12
Subjects and Setting . . . . .	12
Instruments . . . . .	12
Procedure . . . . .	15
Analysis . . . . .	16
III. Results & Discussion	
Scale Correlations . . . . .	17
RHETSEN Mean Comparison of Managers and Assistant Managers . . . . .	19
RHETSEN Mean Comparison by the Sex Variable	19
RHETSEN ANOVA Based on Education Level . . .	23
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Tenure . . . . .	25
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Promotability . . . . .	28
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Satisfaction . . . . .	30
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Responsibility . . . . .	33
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Status . . . . .	35
One-Way ANOVA and SNK Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Supervisor Communication	38
Pearson r Correlation Summary of RHETSEN Means with Significant Variables . . . .	41

#### IV. Conclusion to the Study

Summary . . . . .	44
Limitations . . . . .	48
Recommendations . . . . .	49

#### Appendices

Appendix A . . . . .	53
Appendix B . . . . .	54

Bibliography . . . . .	57
------------------------	----

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past eight years I have interviewed thousands of people for management positions. The people interviewed were applying for positions ranging from entrance level training positions all the way up to executive management. A question that I ask each candidate, as part of a "structured interview" is: "What, in your opinion, is the difference between a successful and unsuccessful manager." Invariably, candidates refer to the "communication environment" of management in terms of success. The reference to "communication skills" comes from both the prospective and experienced managers; the "superior and subordinate," if you will (Jablin, 1979 and McCallister, 1980).

Much has been written about the role of communication in management. Some basic tenets of a perspective of communication in management might include these points:

1. Good managers are skilled at explaining policies, procedures, and corporate philosophies.
2. Good managers are both direct speakers and good listeners.
3. Good managers are able to persuade peers and subordinates.
4. Good managers speak and act in a sensitive way

while coaching and counseling.

5. Good managers give subordinates sufficient information to do their work well and maintain a well informed group.

6. Good managers can talk effectively through all levels of subordinate or management, both privately and in public.

7. Good managers enlist and encourage interaction of subordinates.

This list is not exhaustive but it certainly covers a lot of communicative territory (Argyris, 1953; Bostrom, 1981; Jablin, 1979; Mandall, 1956; McCallister, 1980; Seibold, 1975).

The concept of "good manager-good communicator" is certainly not a new idea. What is becoming more important in the present day environment is to be more specific when attempting to define or even find the "good manager-good communicator." Certainly modern business scenarios are much more complex in the 80's than at any decade prior. The Western management culture is strategizing the assimilation of oriental management philosophies as well as products. Organized labor is playing a constantly decreasing role in the business world. Complex economic issues are always present as are the equally complex technological changes. How can one keep up . . . much less compete?

Management has begun to play the role of "facilitator"

in the 80's. Managers in the 80's "facilitate" production much more than "direct" it, in all industries. Large staffs of people produce management information in all industries from retailing to manufacturing . . . from investment to government. Information systems is an 80's buzz word; however, the most effective form of communication and the most used vehicle of communication is still verbal. The old format of "the boss just told me . . ." is still a respected and appreciated form of feedback. How would modern day management live without meetings or telephones if this were not quite true.

How does one identify the effective manager? This is not a new question, only a new and ever changing environment makes the question more challenging than ever. This study will reveal some insights to the relationship of communication attitude to job related variables. The issues of sex, age, tenure, and education will also be addressed. The design of the present study includes a performance rating but regrettably insufficient data were collected for study.

The essential vehicle for investigation is the RHETSEN scale (Carlson, 1978), which taps theoretical positioning of a person's "Rhetorical Sensitivity" (Hart and Burks, 1972). The RHETSEN scale is based on three communicator archetypes; Rhetorically Sensitive, Noble Self and Rhetorical Reflector. Another type of communicator, the rhetorical ambivalent,

surfaces in this study as in Carlson's (1978) original study. The focus of the present study, however, remains on the relative merits of the three archetypal communicators previously mentioned and how those communicator attitudes relate to both demographic and job related variables of specialty shoe store managers.

The now famous passage from Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson's (1967) book Pragmatics of Human Communication, "You cannot, not communicate," is an issue of crucial importance to successful management teams worldwide. This study will reveal some direction on who those people may be in an organizational setting.

#### Literature Review

In an article written in 1972 Hart and Burks introduced the concept of "Rhetorical Sensitivity." They describe a rhetorically sensitive person as one who: (1) tries to accept role--taking as part of the human condition, (2) attempts to avoid stylized behavior, (3) is characteristically willing to undergo the strain of adaptation, (4) seeks to distinguish between all information and information acceptable for communication, and (5) tries to understand that an idea can be rendered in multi-form ways (Hart & Burks, 1972).

In 1976 Darnell and Brockriede added some structure for theoretical positioning of the rhetorical sensitivity

construct. In their book Persons Communicating they develop a "sensitivity continuum" which positions the "Sensitive Person" between a "Noble Self" and a "Reflector." The Noble Self is characterized by Darnell and Brockriede as having a unitary view of "self." Such persons see any varying from their personal norms as hypocritical, a denial of their personal integrity. They regard Noble Self as a finished product, a work of art, and something not to be blemished by erratic or inconsistent behavior. For the Noble Self type of person, "self" is the primary basis for making communicative choices. The needs of another person or the pressures of a situation are considered to be secondary (Darnell & Brockriede, 1976).

Reflectors occupy the role opposite Noble Self. Rather than viewing self as unitary, Reflectors represent "pluralism gone wild." They have no "self" to call their own. For each person and each situation they present a self to match. If the Reflector has evaluated the situation and the other communicator accurately, he or she will hope to please the other person and be liked by that person. The self and role developed for each situation is unique. When the situation "dies" that "self" dies, never to be used again. In fact, Darnell and Brockriede believe "self" is not a very good term to describe a Reflector, since each of the many selves have no energy of their own but merely reflect the power and substance of the "other" (Darnell &

Brockriede, 1976).

Rhetorically sensitive persons occupy a midpoint between the polar archetypes of Noble Self and Reflector according to Darnell and Brockriede. The choice-making of a Sensitive Person is much more complex than that of a Noble Self or a Reflector. Sensitive persons may well have in their repertoire, selves capable of ranging across the whole continuum. They may choose to play Noble Self to complement a person who takes a passive, dependent Reflector position; they may choose to play a Reflector when confronted by a parent figure playing Noble Self, or they may choose to respond sensitively to another Sensitive person.

Darnell and Brockriede developed a "positional foundation" for rhetorical sensitivity by defining and explaining the "Sensitive Person." Carlson (1978) and Hart, Carlson and Eadie (1980) continued work from that point to operationalize the theoretical perspective of a continuum of rhetorical positions through development of a Rhetorical Sensitivity Scale. The scale identified Rhetorical Sensitivity (RS) as a midpoint between the Noble Self (NS) and the Rhetorical Reflector (RR) which has been described earlier by Darnell and Brockriede.

One of the first RHETSEN studies investigating management was conducted by Salyer (1979) in which a field study was done to investigate whether there are any specific communication behaviors associated with assessments of job

effectiveness for retail management. Salyer found that RR were judged to be more promotable than NS or RS communicators. She also found the RR mean of the managers was much higher than that of the Carlson's (1978) mean for college students. Furthermore, Salyer suggested people who are naturally more RR may gravitate toward jobs where "the customer is always right."

Cahn and Shulman (1980) found a significant relationship between rhetorical sensitivity and leadership effectiveness in the Michigan National Guard. They found that higher ranking officers had higher RS scores and that the RR scores of enlisted men decreased as they progressed up through the ranks of sergeant.

Bell and Luis (1982) investigated the relationship of differences in managerial talent, rhetorical sensitivity and sex of managers in organizations, to the managerial status they achieved. Their results provide evidence that managers can be distinguished from non-managers in an overall construct of "managerial talent." Bell and Luis' analyses of rhetorical sensitivity do not provide evidence that any one rhetorical style is directly related to success; contrary to Salyer's findings, partial correlation analyses tentatively indicated that the RS and NS styles may be more predictive of managerial status and success.

As mentioned earlier, a contingency approach to management has been favored in the recent literature. Ward

(1981) investigated different environments and manager's scores on RHETSEN. Analyses of variance in Ward's study indicated that there were significant differences in different organizational settings in both supervisors' rhetorical sensitivity scores and in subordinates satisfaction with their supervisors. Ward found that rhetorical sensitivity can be helpful, harmful, or irrelevant to subordinates satisfaction with their supervisor, depending on the "situation." In a non-union manufacturing plant, the RS supervisor was more favorable, in a unionized plant, subordinates preferred older RR supervisors due to the heavily structured "rules environment." Contrary to Carlson's (1978) findings, Ward discovered that RS nursing supervisors were not held in any positive or negative esteem. Their RS nature was found to be "irrelevant."

The original theoretical assumptions of Hart, Carlson, and Eadie (1980) assert that RHETSEN taps only an attitude or pre-disposition toward speech. The theory of RHETSEN is now at a point where investigators should attempt to infer some direction of verbal behavior. Or in other words, explain and predict communicative behavior within certain situations. Eadie (1982) compared scores on the "Communicator Style Measure" with RHETSEN scores. He found that persons who scored high on the RS scale tended to see themselves as being less animated, relaxed and impression-

leaving (three style dimensions) than others. Persons who scored high on the NS scale, on the other hand, tended to see themselves as being more dramatic, impression-leaving, and attentive. Eadie was surprised to find that NS communicators considered themselves to be attentive since all attentive items in the Communicators' Style Measure deal almost exclusively with listening behavior. Eadie's "RS results" probably come from the "strain" a RS communicator feels in the situation. The burden of congruence accepted by the RS communicator with respect to various situations is likely to produce a strain on the RS. The RR communicator was found by Eadie to be virtually unassociated with any general communicator style.

As to the attitude-behavior link, the most tangible study was conducted by Carlson and Brilhart (1980). They found a possible relationship between essential hypertension (consistently elevated blood pressure with no known physiological cause) and an incongruence between communicative attitudes and self perceptions of communicative behavior. Carlson and Brilhart found that a NS communicator that behaved unassertively had a tendency toward essential hypertension. When this type of person received assertiveness training, blood pressure readings for the person were generally lowered (Carlson & Brilhart, 1980).

To gain insight into the attitude-behavior link, it is appropriate to refer to a "theory of reasoned action"

presented by Ajzen and Fishbein (1975): "According to the theory, a person who believes that performing a given behavior will lead to mostly positive outcomes will hold an unfavorable attitude." If a person feels that communicating in a certain way is unlikely to satisfy his or her personal communicative goals, the person is unlikely to communicate in that manner; the converse of that statement should also be true. If a person holds a particular attitude toward communication, he or she is likely to exhibit behavior which is influenced or regulated by that person's attitude. Theoretically, this attitude-behavior link will be observable in communication situations generally and management situations specifically.

#### Purpose of the Study

With the exception of the Hart, Carlson and Eadie (1980) research, virtually all RHETSEN studies have been conducted cross-sectionally and with a small subject pool. Even though Carlson generalized that sex, education, and age affect RHETSEN scores, few other studies have explored those variables within a single study. Additionally, most studies have failed to address the effect of "time on the job," or tenure and RHETSEN scores.

To date, the predilection toward a "Manager--Communicator" archetype insofar as RHETSEN is concerned has received mixed results. Some have even suggested RR type

managers may gravitate toward a specialty store operation (Salzer, 1979). This study will explore the RHETSEN perspective in detail based on both demographic and job related variables and report the conclusions.

Finally, RHETSEN is a measure of attitude . . . a communication construct, if you will. Some recent research has explained the "attitude-behavior" relationship with regard to communication (Bradley & Baird, 1977, 1979; Eadie & Paulson, 1982; Steinfatt & Infante, 1976; Eadie, 1982; Bostrom, 1970, 1982). This study will attempt to reveal some conclusions with regard to performance variables in the business world and attitude toward communication.

The following research questions will explore the relationship of communicator attitude with the job related variables of specialty store management:

1. What difference, if any, exists between RHETSEN scores of specialty store managers and other normative scores from previous research?
2. What effect, if any, does sex, education and tenure have on RHETSEN scores?
3. What relationship, if any, exists between scores on the RHETSEN Scale with the following perceptions of respondents: promotability, job satisfaction, responsibility, status, communication environment of a manager, and job performance.

## CHAPTER II

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

#### Subjects and Setting

The subject pool consisted of a group of managers and a group of assistant managers in a southern region of shoe stores which were part of a national chain. The stores totaled 158 at the time of study. The prospective subject pool should be 316; however, many stores were not of sufficient sales volume to require an assistant manager. Some questionnaires were further scrutinized and discarded due to omissions or by signing a name, a store number or some identifying factor which would negate total anonymity. The final subject pool was reduced to 150 managers and 106 assistant managers for a total of 256. Considering that 37 questionnaires were ruled out, the response was quite adequate, and represented one of the largest RHETSEN subject pools studied in an applied environment. The sex breakdown of the group was 63 percent women and 37 percent men.

#### Instruments

A booklet was designed that included demographic information, job description information, a job evaluation scale, and the RHETSEN Scale (See Appendix B).

#### Demographics and Job Description

The items in this section of the booklet requested

information on: "sex," "title," "tenure," "education," and "performance rating."

### Job Evaluation Scale

The items for the Job Evaluation Scale (JES) were selected by the author. The JES contained a Likert type scale of six questions. The questions were:

1. I feel I deserve to be promoted to a higher position within the next twelve months.
2. All things considered, I am satisfied with my job.
3. I would accept a job with more responsibility without getting a pay raise immediately.
4. I would accept a job with more status without getting a pay raise immediately.
5. I feel my district supervisor communicates with me well.
6. I feel I communicate very well with all people I work with.

The JES items were selected based in part on previous RHETSEN studies and feedback from management seminars conducted by the writer.

As the literature review stated Salyer (1979) conducted a study which investigated promotability of convenience store managers. Cahn and Shulman (1980) investigated the movement of RHETSEN subscores in an organization setting with mixed results. The question on promotion within a year

then becomes an operational definition, for the purposes of this study, of "promotability."

The search for the ideal manager usually includes a question on job satisfaction and this study is no different. Satisfied workers may not be more productive than unsatisfied workers but they are easier to be around. If a communicator attitude perspective could indicate job satisfaction, the selection process would be more precise.

Some types of people always "volunteer" for "extra duty." Some people never volunteer and of course a number of people fall between this bipolar concept. In the business world the types of people who solicit this extra responsibility and status are high achievers. They are people who are vertically mobile and want to keep their fate in their "own hands" as much as possible. The questions of "responsibility and status" are really one, two part question. Due to the research design the two part question . . . responsibility and status were made into two questions which should tap the same theoretical space.

The communication environment of the specialty store manager is the focal point of this study. Do certain types of communicators communicate better than others? What type of communicator do other types of communicators prefer?

The question on "district supervisor" communication relates to the quality of communication a store manager feels he or she receives from a supervisor. The question on

managers' "personal communication" investigates which store manager-communicator type feels he or she is an effective communicator. How well managers communicate in these situations has a strong bearing on their managerial success. Questions five and six then operationalize the communication environment of a store manager for the purposes of this study.

These six questions on the JES are self assessments of: promotability, job satisfaction, responsibility and status, and the communication environment as they apply to a specialty shoe store manager.

#### RHETSEN

The RHETSEN Scale is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring attitudes toward encoding messages (Carlson, 1978; Hart et al., 1980). The scores of this scale have been validated substantially to typify three communicator perspectives, the "Rhetorically Sensitive," the "Noble Self" and the "Rhetorical Reflector."

#### Procedure

Three groups of subjects were involved in the total study. The first group, members of a business class for bank tellers, were used to test the reliability of the "Job Evaluation Scale." The second group and the main subject pool responded to the entire questionnaire.

### Part I

To pretest the Job Evaluation Scale, thirty-five bank tellers answered the six questions on the JES and four weeks later responded to the same questionnaire. The scales were identified with the individual's personal code for comparison purposes. The Pearson  $r$  procedure was implemented to determine the stability coefficient.

### Part II

A cover letter (see Appendix A) with the questionnaire booklet (see Appendix B) was sent to all 158 units comprising a region of shoe stores which also are part of a national chain. The letter, soliciting response, made it clear this was a voluntary program. The letters with the questionnaire were sent to the stores with a pre-addressed postage paid envelope for return mail. The only reminder came from the supervisor who reminded all subjects to respond if they had not already done so. Within five weeks 293 responses were received. Due to the fact the researcher was also the "employer," age was omitted from the questionnaire to preserve anonymity of the respondents.

### Analysis

All statistics were performed on the University of Nebraska Omaha's VAX computer through application of the SPSSX package. The appropriate statistical tests were selected: T-Tests for paired and independent groups; ANOVA; One-Way ANOVA with Student-Newman-Keuls; and Pearson  $r$ .

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Scale Correlations

##### Results

The "Job Evaluation Scale" (see Appendix B) was pretested for reliability prior to its use with the RHETSEN scale. Table I presents the stability coefficients for the six items of the JES. The stability coefficients indicate very adequate reliability.

---

Insert Table I about here

---

##### Discussion

This procedure was used only for determining the reliability of the scale by "pretesting" the questions and computing a stability coefficient with the Pearson  $r$  procedure. The group of bank tellers were a reasonably different group of people from the subject pool of this study. The responses of the bank tellers were recorded in separate sessions, four weeks apart. The Pearson  $r$  procedure indicates a high correlation coefficient with all questions.

Table I  
Stability Coefficient For Job Evaluation Scale (JES)

---

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Pearson r</u>
1. Promotability	.98
2. Job Satisfaction	.89
3. Responsibility	.92
4. Status	.94
5. Supervisors Communication	.95
6. Personal Communication	.93

---

## RHETSEN Mean Comparison of Managers and Assistant Managers

### Results

A two-tailed T-test reported in Table II compares the RHETSEN scores of managers/assistant managers. There is no significant difference between scores of managers and assistant managers.

---

Insert Table II about here

---

### Discussion

Although assistant managers had higher RS scores, lower NS and RR scores than managers the differences were not statistically significant. The scores of managers and assistant managers are pooled from this point forward to form one 256 subject group. All the respondents will be referred to as "managers" hereafter.

## RHETSEN Mean Comparison Of Managers By The Sex Variable

### Results

A two-tailed T-test reported in Table III compares managers RHETSEN scores by sex. There is a significant difference between the RS scores of male managers and female managers ( $M=29.02$ ,  $F=25.02$ ,  $p=.000$ ). There is also a significant difference between the NS scores of male and female managers, ( $M=14.29$ ,  $F=16.87$ ,  $p=.005$ ). The RR factor

Table II  
RHETSEN Mean Comparison of Managers And  
Assistant Managers

RHETSEN	TITLE	N	M	S.D.	"F"	"T"	p
RS	Manager	150	25.83	<u>+9.0</u>	1.03	-1.44	.152
	Assistant	106	27.47	<u>+8.9</u>			
NS	Manager	150	16.30	<u>+7.5</u>	1.19	.96	.332
	Assistant	106	15.42	<u>+6.9</u>			
RR	Manager	150	9.58	<u>+5.2</u>	1.04	.60	.549
	Assistant	106	9.18	<u>+5.3</u>			

showed a slight but nonsignificant difference between male and female managers.

---

Insert Table III about here

---

### Discussion

The results of the T-test indicate a significant difference between the RS and NS factors by sex but not the RR factor. This differs from Carlson's (1978) original study where he found males to be significantly higher RS than females. Carlson also found no significant difference between sex and the NS factor, (contrary to the present study), but did find females to be significantly more RR than males. The present study found no significant difference between male and female managers in the RR factor. The explanation of this finding could be similar to the study of Hennig and Jardim (1977) where they found women in middle management developed a "foreman's perspective," if you will, that relies on being tough minded and decisive. Baird and Bradley (1979) also indicated that this same type of management style tends to suppress upward mobility because of a perceived lack of ability or motivation to adapt to new situations. The difference in the RS scale was not surprising. Virtually all RHETSEN studies find a difference in the RS factor. The lack of significant difference in the RR factor may indicate that male and

Table III  
RHETSEN Mean Comparison Of Managers By Sex

RHETSEN	SEX	N	M	S.D.	"F"	"T"	p
RS	M	93	29.02	<u>+8.2</u>	1.26	3.59	.000
	F	162	25.02	<u>+9.2</u>			
NS	M	93	14.29	<u>+6.8</u>	1.20	-2.83	.005
	F	162	16.87	<u>+7.4</u>			
RR	M	93	8.80	<u>+5.1</u>	1.11	-1.50	1.35
	F	162	9.80	<u>+5.3</u>			

female managers are equally predisposed to reflective communication, even though each mean was considerably higher than Carlson's (1978) college sophomore. The "customer is always right" syndrome may force some people to the RR factor over time which Salyer (1979) suggested. A more likely inference is that the general public, external to the college campus, is more reflective than Carlson's (1978) study indicated.

#### RHETSEN ANOVA Based on Education Level

##### Results

An analysis of variance (Table IV) based on educational level revealed no significant difference in the RS, NS, or RR scores.

---

Insert Table IV about here

---

##### Discussion

Even though the difference of the means of all managers were not found to be statistically significant, the direction of the means bears some discussion. Obviously, the high school educated manager has a RHETSEN profile leaning toward the NS and RR factor. The college graduate's profile is less NS and RR and more RS. Again, this result may be a function of the subject pool whose probable RHETSEN profiles are more NS and RR and less RS than Carlson's (1978) college sophomores.

Table IV  
RHETSEN Profile Based on Education

---

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>RS</u>	F=.808 p=.447	<u>NS</u>	F=.271 p=.763	<u>RR</u>	F=.641 p=.938
High School	25.45		16.70		9.60	
Some College	26.77		15.38		9.44	
College Graduate	29.09		14.68		8.97	

---

Note: This table is presented in this manner to exhibit a RHETSEN "profile" which will be referred to in some cases later in this study.

This table also indicates a movement of some people toward "rhetorical ambivalence." Carlson (1978) found that some people can hold a position of NS and RR at the same time. An "ambivalent" was identified by Carlson to score higher than +1 standard deviation on both the NS and RR scales. No demographic characteristics identify the ambivalent. This response occurs equally among all demographic groups. Of course this discussion has been given with the understanding that the RHETSEN profiles are not significantly different given  $p < .05$ , the profiles are only cause for interest not conclusions at this time.

One-Way ANOVA and Student-Newman-Keuls  
Procedure for RHETSEN Means Based on Tenure

Results

In Table V a one-way analysis of variance and the Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) procedure revealed significant differences in the means of the RS and NS scores based on five tenure groups. RS scores for the less than six month group were significantly higher than the other four groups; NS scores for each group were significantly different from each other--the longer the tenure, the higher the NS scores; no differences were found for any group in the RR scores.

---

Insert Table V about here

---

Table V

One-Way ANOVA and Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure  
For RHETSEN Means Based On Tenure

One-Way ANOVA Of RS Means Based On Tenure

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	498.5040	6.6797	< .000
Within Groups	250	74.6292		
TOTAL	254			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure of RS Means Based On Tenure

GROUP	MEAN
< 6 months	30.7667***
> 6 months < 1 year	27.6129
> 1 year < 3 years	26.3472
> 3 years < 5 years	24.5227
> 5 years	22.7083

\*\*\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .01 Level

One-Way ANOVA Of NS Means Based On Tenure

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	294.0146	6.0389	< .0001
Within Groups		48.6866		
TOTAL				

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure Of NS Means Based On Tenure

GROUP	MEAN
< 6 months	12.2833
> 6 months < 1 year	15.3871*
> 1 year < 3 years	16.7778*
> 3 years < 5 years	17.1364*
> 5 years	18.2292*

\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 Level

One-Way ANOVA Of NS Means Based On Tenure

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	29.4551	1.0699	< .3719
Within Groups	250	27.5303		
TOTAL	254			

Note: No two groups are significantly different at the .05 Level

### Discussion

The results of the one-way analysis of variance indicated significant difference in the RS group who had been managers for less than six months. Earlier findings established that new employees in the present study were better educated, i.e., college graduates. This group was the only group with a significantly different mean. This contrasts markedly with the NS group. The NS group had significantly different means in each group with tenure greater than six months. The RR factor revealed no significant difference with any tenure group. Even though the tests differ in method, the results of the means are not dissimilar to the results of the sex variable with the RHETSEN means from Table III. Carlson's (1978) study found the fewest differences in his demographic comparison of NS communicator, more in the RS factor and the most difference in the RR factor. The present study has found the greatest difference in the NS factor and no significant difference in the RR factor at this point. A possible explanation for this difference is that the current study's subject pool is quite likely more RR than college trained people and less NS than college trained people. Even though Carlson (1978) surveyed professional nurses outside the college campus, he did not ask the question of job tenure. He was able to detect differences based on age and education in his survey, a question the present study was unable to ask. Carlson

(1978) did find that nurses under the age of 35 were significantly more RS than were those over 55 and that the older nurses scored higher on the RR scale than did the younger. Did Carlson's (1978) nurses grow toward the RR position over time? Were these nurses more RR to begin with? Were the younger nurses simply more RS because of their age, education, or enculturation? Many of the same patterns for age in Carlson's (1978) study hold some resemblance to tenure in the present study. A point can be made in both studies that older people become more RR over time. In the present study, however, it also seems that the NS communicator may be steadfast over time with a hint of ambivalence. Low tenured managers are unlikely to be "older" people due to the pay structure, labor pool, training program, etc. The majority of managers are quite likely women over 25 who emanate from a working class background. The results of the tenure factors are consistent, then with the findings of other studies particularly Carlson (1978), Slayer (1979), Baird and Bradley (1979), and Hennig and Jardim (1977).

#### One-Way ANOVA of RHETSEN Means Based on Promotability

##### Results

In Table VI a one-way analysis of variance with the SNK procedure revealed significant differences in the RS and RR scores and the respondents' estimate of being promoted. No

significant differences were indicated in the NS factor. Respondents who strongly agreed or agreed that they would be promoted were more rhetorically sensitive and less rhetorically reflective than other respondents.

### Discussion

The "promotability" question from the JES is a "self estimate" of the likelihood of being promoted within a year. As in all self-assessment scales, the question of veracity is always present. A prior expectation of response was that NS managers would feel most likely to be promoted with the RS possibly feeling "uncertain" and the RR managers responding negatively, to promotion expectation. Only the RR managers responded in the expected manner. The highest mean in the RR group was actually the "strongly disagree" category but the N was too small (6) to be significant. The RS factor was converse to the RR group. Both the strongly agree and agree groups had means of significant difference. The reasons behind this are likely explained through demographic characteristics: higher education, age (new hires) sex (predominantly male) cultural background, etc. The RS manager probably has a balanced view of the career opportunities in a growing company and expects to be promoted quickly as found by Cahn and Shulman (1980). The NS managers do not estimate a quick promotion. Do they really feel insecure in their ability; do they feel uneasy with the relationship they have with their supervisor or do

they just not care about promotion? Salyer's (1979) study indicated that supervisors of convenient stores prefer RR managers for promotion; however, that same study indicated that NS managers tended to feel they deserved promotion more than the RS and RR managers. Carlson's (1978) study, which essentially defined the archetypal positions of RHETSEN did not address the question of "time on the job" per se, nor did Hennig and Jardim (1977) but both studies indicate that older female supervisors tended to be more NS than RS or RR. In this respect, the findings of the present study are consistent with Carlson (1978), Hennig and Jardim (1977), Cahn and Shulman (1980), but not consistent with the findings of Salyer (1979).

---

Insert Table VI about here

---

One-Way ANOVA And Student-Newman-Keuls  
Procedure For RHETSEN Means By Satisfaction

Results

A one-way analysis of variance (Table VII) revealed no significant differences between the RHETSEN means and satisfaction.

---

Insert Table VII about here

---

Table VI

One-Way ANOVA And Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure  
For RHETSEN Means Based On Promotability

One-Way ANOVA Of RS Means Based On Promotability

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	307.6179	3.9689	.0039
Within Groups	249	77.5078		
TOTAL	253			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RS Based On Promotability

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	24.3333
Disagree	22.607
Uncertain	24.1786
Agree	28.2024***
Strongly Agree	28.1772***

\*\*\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .02 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of NS Based On Promotability

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	27.1467	.5150	.7248
Within Groups	249	52.7103		
TOTAL	253			

\*No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of RR Means Based On Promotability

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	102.1430	3.8531	.0047
Within Groups	249	26.5094		
TOTAL	253			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RR Mean Based On Promotability

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	13.1667
Disagree	11.6207**
Uncertain	10.4107*
Agree	8.6071
Strongly Agree	8.4557

Table VII

One-Way ANOVA and Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure  
For RHETSEN Means By Satisfaction

One-Way ANOVA For RS Means Based On Satisfaction

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	93.4228	1.1487	.3342
Within Groups	250	81.3279		
TOTAL	254			

One-Way ANOVA For NS Means Based On Satisfaction

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	17.3662	.3234	.8621
Within Groups	250	53.6976		
TOTAL	254			

One-Way ANOVA For RR Means Based On Satisfaction

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	43.7082	1.5982	.1753
Within Groups	250	27.3484		
TOTAL	254			

### Discussion

While the one-way analysis of variance did not indicate a significant difference between RHETSEN scores and satisfaction, the cell means and N's are thought provoking. Most managers (144) "agreed" that they were satisfied with their job and 60 respondents "strongly agreed" they were satisfied. The question of job satisfaction from the JES is probably an inadequate measure of that complex condition "satisfaction," even as simply as it was intended, and confounded by the "employer administered" questionnaire.

#### One-Way ANOVA And Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RHETSEN Means By Responsibility

### Result

A one-way analysis of variance with SNK procedure (Table VIII) revealed a significant difference in the RS scores based on the respondents' willingness to accept responsibility. The more uncertain a respondent was to this question, the more rhetorically sensitive. No significant differences were found in the NS and RR scores.

---

Insert Table VIII about here

---

### Discussion

The RS group means are the only RHETSEN subscores which show significant difference. The respondents who indicated

Table VIII

## One-Way ANOVA Of RHETSEN Means Based On Promotability

## One-Way ANOVA Of RS Means Based On Responsibility

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	218.7052	2.7678	.0280
Within Groups	251	79.0165		
TOTAL	255			

## Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RS Means Based On Responsibility

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	24.2750
Disagree	25.6667
Uncertain	29.1167*
Agree	27.1571
Strongly Agree	22.8571

\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

## One-Way ANOVA Of NS Based On Responsibility

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	73.6228	1.4000	.2345
Within Groups	251	52.5872		
TOTAL	255			

Note: No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

## One-Way ANOVA Of RR Means Based On Responsibility

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	38.8663	1.4228	.2269
Within Groups	251	27.3173		
TOTAL	255			

Note: No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

they were uncertain about accepting a job with more responsibility without getting a pay raise immediately were more rhetorically sensitive than any other group. There are some plausible explanations for these findings from a practical standpoint which the RHETSEN profile might reveal with more sophisticated statistical investigation than this study provides. The ambivalence factor which has only been addressed in Carlson's (1978) study and which appears to be rather prevalent with the present study's subject pool may confound separation of the RHETSEN subscores. Another factor may be the RS communicator's predisposition toward uncertainty as originally defined by Hart and Burks (1972) and confirmed by Carlson (1978) and Hart et al. (1980). Cahn and Shulman (1980), Shulman and Cahn (1981) and Eadie (1982) had similar results when RS respondents were faced with the median response form a Likert type scale (i.e., uncertain, unclear, maybe).

One-Way ANOVA And Student-Newmann-Keuls  
Procedure For RHETSEN Means By Status

Results

As in the prior section, a one-way analysis of variance with SNK procedure revealed a significant difference in the RS group means based on the respondents' desire for status. The more uncertain a respondent was to the question, the more rhetorically sensitive. No significant differences

were revealed in the analyses of the NS and RR group means; however, the NS group comes close at  $p=.0708$ .

---

Insert Table IX about here

---

### Discussion

Previous management studies by the writer revealed that some managers preferred to be elevated from their peer group by being involved in special projects which allowed those managers some measure of recognition. These types of managers actually sought opportunities to: 1) obtain additional responsibility; and 2) achieve an elevated status within their peer group through extra work or duties. Some managers never volunteered for "extra duty" and still others became incensed at any suggestion of doing anything extra for no additional pay, hence the question on "status." The results of this investigation are inconclusive in as much as the only significant difference is that, just like the "responsibility" question, those respondents who indicated they were uncertain if they would be willing to accept a job with more status without getting a pay raise immediately were more rhetorically sensitive than any other group. A possible explanation might be that, in fact, some RS managers think about the pros and cons of status where as all other groups have more definite ideas. This discussion of the RS communicator and "uncertainty" has been described

Table IX  
One-Way ANOVA Of RHETSEN Means Based On Status

One-Way ANOVA Of RS Means Based On Status

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	254.1338	3.2275	.0132
Within Groups	250	78.7404		
TOTAL	254			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RS Means Based On Status

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	22.000
Disagree	23.5938
Uncertain	25.6104
Agree	27.4521
Strongly Agree	28.9836*

\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of NS Based On Status

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	114.0705	2.1888	.0708
Within Groups	250	52.1158		
TOTAL	254			

Note: No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of RR Means Based On Status

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	32.6284	1.1864	.3173
Within Groups	250	27.5030		
TOTAL	254			

Note: No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

previously in the present study and also documented in the literature. The lack of variability in the NS and RS factor is an indication of greater homogeneity in the RHETSEN subscores than was expected. The tendency toward ambivalence in the RS group was not anticipated. More sophisticated measures to isolate the ambivalent might have proven significant.

#### One-Way ANOVA of RHETSEN Means Based on Supervisor Communication

##### Results

In Table X a one-way analysis of variance with SNK procedure revealed a significant difference in the RS and RR means but no significant difference in the NS means based on supervisor's ability to communicate. Respondents who were uncertain or agreed that their supervisors communicate well with them were more rhetorically sensitive; respondents who strongly disagreed with the statement were much more rhetorically reflective than any other group.

---

Insert Table X about here

---

##### Discussion

Earlier in the discussion of RHETSEN subscores a "profile" of scores was given in Table IV. Based on the results presented in Table X, the profile of managers who think their supervisor communicates well must be a mixed

Table X

One-Way ANOVA Of RHETSEN Means Based On Supervisor Communication

One-Way ANOVA Of RS Means Based On Supervisor's Communication

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	269.5428	3.4350	.0094
Within Groups	250	78.4703		
TOTAL	254			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure Of RS Based On  
Supervisor's Communication

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	20.2727
Disagree	25.5000
Uncertain	29.8182*
Agree	27.7107*
Strongly Agree	24.9059

\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at .05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of NS Means Based On Supervisor's Communication

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	38.7871	.7275	.5739
Within Groups	250	53.3171		
TOTAL	254			

\*No two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Of RR Means Based On Supervisor's Communication

SOURCE	df	Mean Squares	F	p
Between Groups	4	143.4790	5.5970	.0002
Within Groups	250	25.6351		
TOTAL	254			

Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure For RR Mean Based On  
Supervisor's Communication

GROUP	MEAN
Strongly Disagree	15.1818***
Disagree	8.3750
Uncertain	7.090
Agree	8.9669
Strongly Agree	10.1647

\*\*\*Denotes pairs of groups significantly different at the .01 level

group. The profile of managers who don't think their supervisors communicate as well with them must be highly RR in that the RR mean of 15.1818 for those who strongly disagreed resulted in the highest "F" ratio and greatest significance of any test in this study.

Due to the scoring of the RHETSEN scale it would be impossible to score "high" on the NS factor if the RS score is greater than 20. The managers who don't feel their supervisor communicates with them well are quite reflective. The RS means show two groups of significant variability. The group of managers who agree that their supervisor communicates well are not highly RS. The highest RS group is the uncertain category. The uncertain category is not an unusual response with RS managers as the previous results have indicated. The "uncertain" category is hardly definitive for the items on the JES but tends to sustain Hart and Burks (1972) original thinking of the RS communicator to be an ever fluctuating, undulating entity, who is always unsure.

The extreme RR position of the present study introduces a curiosity concerning Salyer's (1979) study. In Salyer's (1979) study she found supervisors preferring the RR manager. Is it unusual that the present study found the RR managers to have rather harsh feelings about the communication of their supervisor? The preferred managers in the present study are more RS than RR, however, and the

reflectors may be both acutely aware of the preference, and accurate in their perception. It does seem unusual that the NS factor shows no significant variability in this portion of the study, which is not as expected.

#### Correlation Summary of RHETSEN Means With Significant Variables Using The Pearson r Procedure

##### Results

In Table XI the RS factor showed high negative correlation with the NS and RR subscores as well as tenure. The RS factor showed slight but significant correlation with education and a slightly higher correlation with promotability.

The NS factor had a relatively high correlation with tenure and a slight but significant correlation with personal communication.

The RR factor had a relatively high negative correlation with promotion.

---

Insert Table XI about here

---

##### Discussion

The Pearson r revealed a significant correlation in the NS factor with personal communication. The significance is slight but significant. No prior tests revealed significance with any of the RHETSEN subscores and personal communication in this study. This test also revealed a

Table XI

N=256

Pearson r Correlation Summary Of RHETSEN Means With Significant Variables

	RS	NS	RR	Tenure	Education	Promota- bility	Communi- cation
RS	1.000	-.7435**	-.5047**	-.2984**	.1456*	.1966**	-.1148
NS	-.7435	1.000	-.1434	.2625**	-.1156	.0367	.1506*
RR	-.5047**	-.1434	1.000	.0972	-.0418	-.2225**	.0380

\*  $p \leq .01$       \*\*  $p \leq .001$

slight but significant relationship between the NS managers and longer tenure. The remainder of the findings confirm the ANOVA's summarized earlier. The RS manager is shorter tenured, better educated and estimates that he or she will be promoted soon. The RR managers were found to estimate their chances for promotion roughly equal but opposite in direction to the RS managers. The results of the Pearson  $r$  procedure do not reveal any surprises at this point, other than the NS correlation with personal communication, a rather expected theoretical finding.

The Pearson  $r$  also reveals intrascale correlations of the RHETSEN subscores to be consistent with previous research (Carlson, 1978; Salyer, 1979; Hart, et al. 1980).

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION TO THE STUDY

#### Summary

This study found some significant differences between the RS and NS encoder as have all the other studies listed in the bibliography. The intrascale correlations for RHETSEN are very similar to other studies (Carlson, 1978; Salyer, 1978; Hart et al., 1980; and Carlson & Brilhart, 1980). The present study also found some significance between the RS and NS communicator insofar as demographic measures and job environment factors are concerned in a management environment. The statistical analysis of these subjects indicate that RS and NS communicators separated significantly in these ways:

1. RS were more likely to be male than female.
2. RS were most likely to be higher educated.
3. RS were most likely to be shorter tenured.
4. RS were most likely to feel promotable.
5. RS were most likely to seek status.
6. RS were most likely to feel their supervisor communicated well.
7. RS were most certain if they communicated well themselves.

1. NS were most likely to be female.

2. NS were most likely to have a lower level of education.

3. NS were most likely to be longer tenured.

4. NS were not likely to seek status.

5. NS felt their supervisor communicated poorly with them.

6. NS felt they communicated well themselves.

1. RR were most likely to be long tenured.

2. RR were most likely to feel not promotable.

The data from the present study continues to position three archetypal communicators as Carlson's (1978) original works suggested. The findings from the present study as well as other studies previously mentioned, (Salyer, 1979; Shulman and Cahn, 1980; Ward, 1981) does show a somewhat "different" communicator from Carlson's college sophomore. The "general public" would seem to be somewhat more RR and less RS than the college sophomore of Carlson (1978) and Hart et al. (1980). Carlson (1978) also indicated that certain demographic groups might be more RR than others and that NS seems to increase with age. This study tends to confirm the original findings.

Carlson (1978) also identified a significant number of respondents who were positioned at both the NS and RR poles. This communicator was termed "Rhetorically Ambivalent."

Many respondents in the present study could possibly be characterized as "ambivalent." Carlson (1978) suggested that ambivalents are "trying to cope with new territory and a changing environment." It should be noted that: 1) the present study included the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia and Florida, 2) the subjects were 63% women, 3) not educated to the level of a "college sophomore" in 57.4% of the respondents. The significance of the "ambivalent" is unclear but it should be relatively easy to picture an "ambivalent" as a communicator type in an environment outside the classroom setting. Rather, the environment, external to the college campus or classroom is likely to produce communicators with RHETSEN scores more closely to the present study than to Carlson (1978) or Hart et al. (1980).

Of course, it is from the "general public" that most specialty stores usually draw potential managers rather than the college campus. Therefore, as the data from the present study indicates, some people will be selected to manage who don't have a communicator attitude or style that would allow that person to optimize success. The present study does indicate that the RR communicator is the least likely to be selected as a manager in this group of specialty stores; however, there are obviously some managers who are RR communicators. The findings of the study also indicate that the RS manager is most favored and the NS manager more

avored than the RR manager in the selection process.

A post hoc situation later indicated that previous finding to be even more plausible. A group of people selected by their supervisor for promotion and additional training, who were members of the original subject pool, were rated in an assessment center approximately 9 months after the data for this study was collected.

As part of the assessment center regimen the RHETSEN SCALE was administered to 36 store managers. The RHETSEN profile for this group was: RS=30.5; NS=14.0; and RR=8.2. Clearly the supervisors preferred managers who were more RS and NS than the means of the original subject pool of the present study. After managerial assessments of the candidates were made, the group of 36 were split into three groups (high, moderate, and low potential). The RHETSEN means for the top group were: RS=33.6; NS=8.6; and RR=8.4. The moderate group was RS=27.4; NS=14.2; and RR=8.5; and the low potential group was RS=28.1; NS=16.0 and RR=7. The assessment raters clearly favored the RS types over all other communicator types.

Most assessors rated an RR type of manager as either, "needing considerable development" or "unqualified for promotion." While the RS were most preferred and the RR least preferred, there are situations where the NS can perform well in an assessment center or in the field. If groups tended to wander from the subject at hand an NS

person would be most likely to keep a group on track. The NS, however, was judged to be insensitive to others needs, self-centered, etc. (typical NS) and could not get relatively strong people to accept the NS style of leadership.

As stated earlier, this assessment center was produced approximately nine months after the data for the present study was collected. No statistical significance is included in this discussion because no measures were taken to measure validity, or reliability significance (rater's consensus only). It is interesting to note, however, that the RHETSEN means of the 36 managers as a group were much higher than the RHETSEN means of this study. Furthermore, the RHETSEN means of the "high potential" managers was not only higher than the RHETSEN means from the present study but much higher than the overall mean of the 36 "select" managers. The present study does show that RS people are being hired at a higher rate than NS or RR people. Furthermore, the supervisors who hire, train and maintain their management staff of people seem to prefer the RS manager, post hoc consideration notwithstanding.

#### Limitations

The jeopardy of self assessment surveys is well documented. The age variable would likely give additional dimension to this subject group, but it was not possible to obtain due to the need for anonymity.

When an employer administers a questionnaire, the outcome may be suspect. The scores on the JES and RHETSEN were similar to other groups, however.

An even bigger problem is the self assessment for promotability, which is certainly not the same as a supervisor's assessment of promotability.

The lack of response to the performance rating was a regrettable loss. Performance is a behavior construct which has not been addressed in most studies to date. Performance is, of course, how managers are ultimately judged.

The limitation of virtually all RHETSEN studies to date is the cross sectional nature of this and previous research designs. The data in this study suggest that people who are managers, particularly mid-level managers, become more NS over time. These findings are similar to Baird & Bradley's (1979) findings which suggest certain NS people, principally women, take on a mid-level management perspective which negates the opportunity for vertical mobility (Baird & Bradley, 1979; Cahn & Shulman, 1980). Only longitudinal inference may be suggested (i.e., longer tenure more NS), when length of time in the workplace is known or individual age is given. Attrition could also be a factor in the NS tenure relationship but this is only conjecture.

#### Recommendations For Research

Most studies concerning the RHETSEN scale and the application external to college students have been

correlational in design and using very small subject pools. The obvious limitation of these cross sectional studies should be addressed by undertaking an empirical study, over time, to develop longitudinal direction. It would be very interesting to compare RHETSEN scores from the terminated or exited employees with the scores of incumbents or "survivors." This would be an excellent longitudinal opportunity to investigate any movement of RHETSEN attitude, over time; in the work place.

A RHETSEN study that followed students from junior high through college and/or their workplace should provide insight to the movement of RHETSEN, over time and educational level. The RHETSEN studies to date are correctional primarily because it is, as yet, unclear whether the RHETSEN variables are dependent or independent in effects. An empirical study of this type of subject pool would also give direction to the attitude/behavior question.

It appears from the data of this study that three strong variables, sex, education, and length of tenure, affect the communicator attitude over time. These variables have been glossed over it seems, in past research. If persons are a type of communicator regardless of environment, an empirical study exploring the sex, age, and education variables would uncover more basic direction. Carlson (1978) and Hart et al. (1980) appear to be the only

sources of literature for these three variables in combination.

These data appear to confirm that the RR communicator is not typically a "successful manager" by sheer "numbers" alone, in that only 14.5% of the respondents in this study are "pure RR," according to Carlson's (1978) normative cut off. If RR people gravitated toward management there should certainly be a higher population of RR in this subject pool. Furthermore, the RR scale showed insignificant or negative correlation with virtually all variable categories from the JES.

By virtue of definition a rhetorically ambivalent communicator is a paradox. Can the RR person who has been in a management position over time and who has been instructed in "management technique" over time become an ambivalent communicator? Is an ambivalent communicator a good manager? Can this ambivalent manager maintain communicative consistency an effective manager needs to be understood? Is an ambivalent more likely to be found in the business world than in academia? Virtually all research save Carlson (1978) and Hart et al. (1980) have ignored the ambivalent. Some studies have even ignored the RR scale in management assessment. Additional research should explore the relationship of management variables with the reflector as well as the ambivalent. These data would suggest that a person can modify his or her behavior over time and grow

away from the RR archetype. Carlson (1978) also found that people grow more NS as they age but the age variable has not been explored in an applied environment. Is the age/tenure relationship a determinant in the NS, RR or ambivalent communicator?

The attitude-behavior link is another area that needs empirical research. No substantial behavior link was established in this study except at slight significance. If, in fact, certain communicator attitudes are more successful in an organizational environment, the attitude-behavior link needs to be more firmly established by utilizing identifiable behavior factors in the research design. The communication style construct developed by Norton (1978), has been used in correlational studies with the RHETSEN scale with some success as in Salyer (1979), Baird and Bradley (1979), and Talley and Richmond (1980). Jablin (1979), Bradley and Baird (1977), Bostrom (1982), Shulman and Cahn (1981), Eadie (1980, 1982), and Carlson & Brilhart (1980) have pursued behavioral responses also but with more definitive results. The attitude, belief, behavior relationships need to be explored in more and various ways to properly position the value of RHETSEN, and to determined the foundation of the communicator attitude beginnings.

## Appendix A

Dear Associate:

Over the past few years we have tried to promote a "team" concept in our region; however, we need to find out some more details about the most important team members . . . the people who manage the stores. We want to help you do your job better. Please take the time to answer some questions which will help us, help you.

This questionnaire booklet is designed to provide some information which will give your management team a better insight to your feelings. This survey is completely confidential so do not write your name or store number on any of the pages. Only the district code is necessary for identification. Please fill out the questionnaire completely and be sure to answer the questions the way you want to. This survey should only take about ten minutes to fill out, but please return it as quickly as possible. Remember this is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers and you should not compare answers with other associates.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Wayne Foster

## Appendix B

PERSONAL DATA

1. District Code \_\_\_\_ 2. SEX \_\_\_\_ 3. Position Title \_\_\_\_

4. YEARS IN POSITION: less than 6 months \_\_\_\_

more than 6 months  
but less than 1 year \_\_\_\_more than 1 year  
but less than 3 years \_\_\_\_more than 3 years  
but less than 5 years \_\_\_\_

more than 5 years \_\_\_\_

5. How many years of school have you attended? \_\_\_\_

6. What was your performance level rating on your last  
performance appraisal?

Level \_\_\_\_

Please insure the confidentiality by mailing it right away.  
Thank you for participating in this survey. Your answers  
will be very helpful.

Please make sure you answer every question by placing a check mark in the boxes you select. Only one answer for each question is appropriate.

1. I feel I deserve to be promoted to a higher position within the next twelve months.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. All things considered I am satisfied with my job.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. I would accept a job with more responsibility without getting a pay raise immediately.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. I would accept a job with more status without getting a pay raise immediately.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. I feel my District Supervisor communicates with me well.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. I feel I communicate very well with all people I work with.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

LISTED BELOW ARE A NUMBER OF STATEMENTS TO WHICH WE WOULD LIKE YOUR REACTIONS. PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT INDIVIDUALLY AND BE ASSURED THAT THERE ARE NO ABSOLUTELY RIGHT OR ABSOLUTELY WRONG ANSWERS. FOR EACH STATEMENT, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR OPINION BY CIRCLING ONE OF THE FOLLOWING RESPONSES IN FRONT OF THE STATEMENT: A = ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE; B = FREQUENTLY TRUE; C = SOMETIMES TRUE; D = INFREQUENTLY TRUE; E = ALMOST NEVER TRUE.

- |           |     |  |
|-----------|-----|--|
| A B C D E | 1.  | People should be frank and spontaneous in conversation.  |
| A B C D E | 2.  | An idea can be communicated in many different ways.  |
| A B C D E | 3.  | When talking with someone with whom you disagree, you should feel obligated to state your opinion.               |
| A B C D E | 4.  | A person should laugh at an unfunny joke just to please the joke-teller.   |
| A B C D E | 5.  | It's good to follow the rule: before blowing your top at someone, sleep on the problem.                          |
| A B C D E | 6.  | When talking to others, you should drop all of your defenses.  |
| A B C D E | 7.  | It is best to hide one's true feelings in order to avoid hurting others.   |
| A B C D E | 8.  | No matter how hard you try, you just can't make friends with everyone.   |
| A B C D E | 9.  | One should keep quiet rather than say something which will alienate others.                                      |
| A B C D E | 10. | You should share your joys with your closest friends.  |
| A B C D E | 11. | It is acceptable to discuss religion with a stranger.  |
| A B C D E | 12. | A supervisor in a work situation must be forceful in his or her communication with subordinates to be effective. |
| A B C D E | 13. | A person should tell it like it is.  |
| A B C D E | 14. | "Look before you leap" is the most important rule to follow when talking to others.                              |
| A B C D E | 15. | You should tell a friend if you think they are making a mistake.   |
| A B C D E | 16. | The first thing that comes to mind is the best thing to say.   |
| A B C D E | 17. | When conversing, you should tell others what they want to hear.  |
| A B C D E | 18. | When someone dominates the conversation, it's important to interrupt them in order to state your opinion.        |
| A B C D E | 19. | You really can't be yourself when talking to your parents.   |
| A B C D E | 20. | When angry, a person should say nothing rather than say something he or she will be sorry for later.             |
| A B C D E | 21. | When someone has an irritating habit, they should be told about it.  |
| A B C D E | 22. | An effort should be made to tell the same thing to different people in different ways.                           |
| A B C D E | 23. | When talking to your friends, you should adjust your remarks to suit them.                                       |
| A B C D E | 24. | You really can't put sugar coating on bad news.  |
| A B C D E | 25. | A person who speaks his or her gut feelings is to be admired.  |
| A B C D E | 26. | You shouldn't make a scene in a restaurant by arguing with a waiter.   |
| A B C D E | 27. | Putting thoughts into words just the way you want them is a difficult process.                                   |
| A B C D E | 28. | A friend who has bad breath should be told about it.   |
| A B C D E | 29. | If you're sure you're right, you should argue with a person who disagrees with you.                              |
| A B C D E | 30. | If a woman cheats on her husband, she should tell him.   |
| A B C D E | 31. | Spoken confrontations with others should be viewed as a <u>last</u> resort.                                      |
| A B C D E | 32. | If people would open up to each other the world would be better off.   |
| A B C D E | 33. | There is a difference between someone who is "diplomatic" and one who is "two-faced."                            |
| A B C D E | 34. | You should tell someone if you think they are about to embarrass themselves.                                     |
| A B C D E | 35. | In life you have two choices: to be your own person or to be a "jellyfish".                                      |
| A B C D E | 36. | One should not be afraid to voice his or her opinion.  |
| A B C D E | 37. | If your boss doesn't like you, there's not much you can do about it.   |
| A B C D E | 38. | You should tell someone if you think they are giving you bad advice.   |
| A B C D E | 39. | Saying what you think is a sign of friendship.   |
| A B C D E | 40. | When you're sure you're right, you should press your point until you win the argument.                           |
| A B C D E | 41. | "If you feel it, say it" is a good rule to follow in conversation.   |
| A B C D E | 42. | If a man cheats on his wife, he should tell her.   |
| A B C D E | 43. | It is better to speak your gut feelings than to beat around the bush.  |
| A B C D E | 44. | We should have a kind word for the people we meet in life.   |
| A B C D E | 45. | One should treat all people in the same way.   |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, C. "Some Characteristics of Successful Executives," Personnel Journal. 32, 1953, 50-53.
- Baird, John E. & Pat H. Bradley. "Styles of Management and Communicating: A Comparative Study of Men and Women." Communication Monographs. 46 (1979), 101-11.
- Bassett, G. A. "The Qualifications of a Manager," California Management Review, 12 (1969), 35-44.
- Bell, A. M., Luis, S. J. A comparison of rhetorical sensitivity and managerial talent in business settings. Unpublished paper. University of Washington, 1982.
- Bostrom, R. N. Communication attitudes and communicative abilities. Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, 1981.
- Bostrom, R. N. & C. Bryant. "Cognitive, affective, and Behavioral Dimension of Communicative Attitudes." Journal of Communication, 1970. 20, 359-366.
- Bradley, P. H. and Baird, J. E. Jr. "Management and Communicator Style: A Correlational Analysis, "Central States Speech Journal" 28, (1977), 194-203.
- Cahn, D. D. & Shulman, G. M. An exploratory study of the relationship between rhetorical sensitivity, leadership effectiveness, and rank in a military organization. The Michigan Speech Association Journal, 1980, SV-1, 1-12. ~

- Carlson, R. E. Rhetorical sensitivity: Theoretical Perspective, measurement and implications in an interpersonal and organizational context. (Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, (1978) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 2615A. (University Micro-films No. 78-21, 426).
- Carlson, R. E. & Brilhart, J. K. Communicative attitudes and perceptions of behavior: Predictors of Essential hypertension. Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Acapulco, 1980.
- Darnell, D. K. & Brockreide, W. Persons Communicating. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Day, David R. "Leader Behavior of Male and Female Supervisor: A Comparative Study," Personnel Psychology, 25, (1972), 353-360.
- Eadie, W. F. The relationship between communicator attitudes and communication behavior: Initial Evidence. Paper presented to Western Speech Communication Association, Denver, 1982.
- Eadie, W. F. & Paulson, J. W. "Relationship Among Attitudes Toward Communication, Communication Style and Communication Competence." (An unpublished paper. Department of Speech Communication, California State University, Northridge, California, 1982).
- Eadie, W. F. & Pearch, W. B. Interpersonal Communication. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1982.

- Fairhurst, G. T. Test of a Model of Message-Attitude-Behavior Relations. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1981.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1975.
- Hart, R. P. & Burks, P. "Rhetorical Sensitivity and Social Interaction," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972) 75-79.
- Hart, R. P., Carlson, E. E. & Eadie, W. F. Attitudes toward communication and the assessment of rhetorical sensitivity. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47, 1-22.
- Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. The Managerial Woman. New York, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977, p. 72.
- Jablin, Frederic M. "Superior-Subordinate Communication: The State of the Art," Psychological Bulletin. 86 (Nov. 1979), 1215.
- Mandall, M. M. "Supervisory Characteristics and Rating: A Summary of Recent Research," Personnel, 32 (1956), 435-440.
- McCallister, L. Verbal reprimanding among supervisors: A profile of the noble self. Paper presented to the Central States Speech Association, Chicago, 1980.
- McCallister, L. Rhetorical sensitivity, sex of interactants, and superior-subordinate communication. Paper presented to I.C.A., Boston, 1982.

- Mills, D. Q. "Human Resources in the 1980's, Harvard Business Review, 1979, July/Aug., 43, 148-155.
- Mintzberg, H. The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Norton, R. W. Foundations of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 99-122.
- Norton, R. W. & Pettegrew, L. S. Attentiveness as a style of communication: A Structural Analysis. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46, 13-26.
- Porter, D. T. Communicator style perception as a function of communication apprehension. Communication Quarterly, 1982, 30, 237-244.
- Salyer, R. R. Communication Behavior and Managerial performance: A field study. Unpublished paper based on research conducted for master's thesis at Purdue University, 1979.
- Seibold, D. R. Communication research and the attitude verbal report-overt behavior relationship: A critique and theoretic reformulation, Human Communication Research, 1975, 2, 3-32.
- Shulman, G. M. & Chan, D. D. "The Relationship Between Rhetorical Sensitivity and Styles of Coping with the Loss of a Spouse," (Unpublished Paper, Central States Speech Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1980).
- Steinfatt, T. M. & Infante, D. A. Attitude - BEH

relationship in Communication Research. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1976, 62, 267-78.

Talley, M. A. & Richmond, V. P. The Relationship between psychological gender, orientation and communicator style, *it cr*, 1980, 6, 326-339.

Ward, Steven A. "Rhetorically Sensitive Supervisory Communication: A Situational Analysis." A competitive paper presnted to the Speech Communication Association, Applied Communication Division, Anaheim, CA 1981.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. & Jackson, D. D. Pragmatics of Human Communications. New York: Norton, 1967.