University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

5-1-1997

Impact of a supervisor's use of compliance gaining strategies on perceptions of the supervisor's communication competence.

Matthew J. Witzke

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

Recommended Citation
Witzke, Matthew J., "Impact of a supervisor's use of compliance gaining strategies on perceptions of the supervisor's communication competence." (1997). *Student Work*. 2981.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2981

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.

IMPACT OF A SUPERVISOR'S USE OF COMPLIANCE GAINING STRATEGIES ON PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUPERVISOR'S COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Communication

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Matthew J. Witzke

May, 1997

UMI Number: EP74443

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
Dissertation Publishing

UMI EP74443
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

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

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

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

Committee

Name	Department/School
Randall A. Rose	Communication
William T. Clute	Sociology/Anthropology
Robert E. Carlson	Communication/A&S

Chairperson Robert E. Carlson

Date 4/21/97

ABSTRACT

This research is an attempt to explore the relationship between the use of compliance gaining strategies and communication competence. In four video taped scenarios involving a supervisor using a positive or negative compliance gaining strategy on a subordinate, a total of 98 respondents answered a questionnaire that included the Rater of Alter Competence (RAC) and demographic questions. The results of this study supported the notion that those who use positive compliance gaining strategies will be perceived to have a higher level of communication competence than those who use negative compliance gaining strategies. It is also noted that the age, gender, job title, and organizational responsibility of the 98 respondents did not effect this relationship. This study also discovered that a female supervisor was seen to be more communicatively competent than a male supervisor when using a positive compliance gaining strategy, and less communicatively competent when using a negative compliance gaining strategy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank the entire graduate faculty for all their help and support. I would also like to thank Dr. Rose and Dr. Clute for agreeing to be on my thesis committee and for offering all their wisdom and knowledge. And to Dr. Carlson, the Chairperson of my committee, thanks for everything and for making this thesis a great learning experience. I knew I picked the right person to chair my thesis. A very big thank you goes to Amber. I appreciate all your love and support during the completion of this thesis. You are it. I would also like to thank my brother, John and my father Jack. Thanks for your understanding and support during my quest for the Master's degree. Finally, a very special and final thank you goes to my mother, Shirley. Thanks for pushing, I now have the degree.

Table of Contents

Abstract iii
Acknowledgment iv
List of Tables vii

Chapter 1 1
Introduction 1
Review of Literature 3
Communication Competence 3
Definitions of Communication Competence 3
Measuring Communication Competence 7
Organizations and Communication Competence 11
Compliance Gaining 12
Power 13
Marwell and Schmitt 15
Measuring Compliance Gaining 17
Compliance Gaining and the Organization 18
Gender 19
Women and Men in Management 20
Statement of Purpose 22

Chapter 2 25
Methodology 25
Sample 26
Procedure 26
Instrumentation 27
Statistical Analysis 29

Chapter 3 30
Results 30
Research Question 1a & 1b 32
Research Question 2 34
Gender 34
Age 34
Job Title 39
Organizational Responsibility 39

Chapter 4 45
Discussion 45

Chapter 5 49
Conclusion 49

References 52

Appendix A 56
Appendix B 59

List of Tables

Table 1 Demographic Statistics 31

Table 2 One Way ANOVA - RAC Scores by Compliance Gaining Strategy 33

Table 3 t-tests - RAC Scores by Gender of Subjects 35

Table 4 One Way ANOVA - RAC Scores by Age 37

Table 5 One Way ANOVA - RAC Scores by Job Title 40

Table 6 One Way ANOVA - RAC Scores by Organizational Responsibility 42

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Business organizations are dynamic and constantly evolving. These organizations have many inner workings that influence individual and organizational success or failure. Each corporation works in a different way and has a different corporate culture. Organizational climate can range from being very closed and uptight to being very open and relaxed.

Business corporations do have some aspects in common. All organizations have levels of power and individuals will apply this power in a persuasive way to attempt to get people to behave in prescribed manners. This broad area can be termed compliance gaining.

Corporations also are made up of individuals who will judge the communication ability of others on how the others convey messages. The communication ability that is judged is known as communication competence.

Organizations also have gender issues that arise during the daily workings of the corporation. Differences between males and females can be personified in a corporate setting. Differences in pay, perceptions of communication, leadership ability, and levels of power potentially can all relate to gender.

Issues of compliance gaining, communication competence, and gender differences are all present in corporate America. And all of these areas are important to understand and gain insight into organizational functioning.

Compliance gaining is a set of important strategies that are used in many organizational settings, mostly by managers and supervisors. Compliance gaining is based on the use of power as described by French and Raven (1960). From French and Raven's power literature, Marwell and Schmitt (1967) developed a list of 16 compliance gaining

strategies that employ various uses of power. These strategies are either positive or negative in nature. Since Marwell and Schmitt's first introduction of these strategies, many more have been described by researchers over the years. However, the original 16 strategies developed by Marwell and Schmitt are still used in research today. Most research involving compliance gaining usually addresses the issue of strategy selection. Few studies look at the outcomes of the use of compliance gaining strategies.

Communication competence is a vastly researched construct in the communication field, however it still remains a very elusive and hard to define construct. McCroskey (1984) defines communication competence as the adequate ability to make ideas known to others by talking or writing. This definition is basic and it has been accepted by many in the field of communication. However other definitions of communication competence have been offered. Some of these other definitions put forth such phrases as; *performance of appropriate behavior, knowing when and how to use language,* and *effective expression of knowledge.* Research and definitions continue to be abundant in the communication competence research and definitions continue to be developed and refined.

Gender issues are in the forefront of an organizations' behavior today. Males and females have been perceived differently in the organizational setting. Researchers (Hirokawa, et al. 1990, Wheeless et al., 1985) have found that men and women view each other differently in terms of managerial skills, competence, and the uses of power.

The present study will explore the potential link between compliance gaining and communication competence in an organizational context. In addition, gender issues potentially influencing this link will be examined.

Review of Literature

Communication Competence

Communication competence dates back to ancient Greek times, where philosophers spoke in terms of "eloquence" and the "art of speaking" (Rubin, 1990). Even though communication competence's basic premise dates back that far, the actual term "communication competence" was first mentioned in a research journal in 1974 (Rubin, 1990). Since 1974, communication competence has become an intensely important aspect of modern society. Spitzberg (cited in Johnson, 1992) believes communication competence is a vital organizational variable currently as well as in the future. As society continues to develop new technology, members have increased mobility, and there is a greater reliance on information, competent communication transactions will become more important for society (Johnson, 1992). Communication competence is a significant organizational topic that must be researched, studied, and measured to its fullest.

Definitions of Communication Competence

The definitions of communication competence are nearly as vast as studies involving this elusive construct. A total of eleven definitions from various researchers will be discussed briefly. This listing is not exhaustive, since many more definitions exist and more are sure to be developed as research continues.

The first definition is from structural linguists such as Chomsky and Pylyphyn. Both of these researchers interpret communication competence as a mental phenomenon distinct and separate from behavior (Rubin & Henzl, 1984). This definition relies on the individual's basis of knowledge and the structure of the language he/she speaks. A person

who knows a lot about the structure of language would be considered competent in communication by a linguist such as Chomsky.

Hymes, a sociolinguist, believes the competence definitions by structural linguists are inaccurate. Hymes (cited in Rubin and Henzl, 1984) defines communication competence as tacit knowledge of an individual and the ability to use language. This definition puts forth the performance aspect of communication competence.

The third definition, by McCroskey, is in accord with Hymes basic premise. McCroskey believes communication competence is an elusive construct and concrete definitions are hard to grasp. McCroskey (1984) formed a definition in a unique way, by taking the actual word *competence* and looking it up in two different dictionaries. These dictionaries yielded definitions such as "adequate ability" and "fitness too." McCroskey (1984) after reading these definitions stated the definition of communication competence to be, the adequate ability to make ideas known to others by talking or writing. This definition is short, but to the point.

Phillips applauds McCroskey's definition. Phillips (1983) believes competence is knowledge and skill based. Knowledge is how much an individual knows about communication and skill is the ability to express that knowledge properly. Phillips (1983) believes that competence is based on the observation of skill and effectiveness in goal achievement. What is not evident in this definition is whether competence is a behavioral act, response, or performance.

Wiemann (1977) defined communication competence as:

> the ability of an interactant to choose among available communicative behaviors in order that he/she may successfully accomplish his/her own interpersonal goals during an encounter while maintaining the face and line of his/her interactants within the constraints of the situation (p. 207).

McCroskey (1982) believes this definition puts forth the idea that a person being deemed competent must not only know the appropriate behavior of being competent, but that person must also perform the appropriate behavior. Again the aspect of performance is mentioned in a definition of competence. What is being equated here is competence and performance.

Performance of communication behavior may also be found narrowly in the definition provided by Larson et al. Larson et al. (cited in McCroskey, 1982) define communication competence as the ability of an individual to demonstrate knowledge of the appropriate communication behavior in a given situation. McCroskey (1982) believes this definition shows that a person must have the ability to behave in a correct manner and the ability must be manifested behaviorally. Someone must perform the behaviors in a situation and there must be another watching and observing the situation checking for the appropriate behavior.

The seventh definition of communication competence is from Cegala who believes in a performance based concept. Cegala (1982) states communication competence is knowing when and how to use language in a social context.

Cegala and Waldron (1992) expanded on this definition by saying that communication competence may be defined as effective and appropriate behavior. The key terms in this definition are effective and appropriate - - terms that have found there way into many definitions of communication competence. Cegala and Waldron (1992) view effectiveness as the ability to obtain desired goals during interaction. This is very similar to a definition by Spitzberg and Cupach. Spitzberg and Cupach (1989) believe effectiveness is successful goal achievement or task accomplishment. The term appropriateness, according to Cegala and Waldron, is the manner in which these goals are sought. Spitzberg and Cupach are much more specific in their definition of appropriateness. Spitzberg and Cupach (1989)

define appropriateness as the avoidance of violating social or interpersonal rules, norms, or expectations. This is politeness. When individuals go after their goals, they are deemed to be more competent if they abide by the social norms and rules of that given situation in that given society.

Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) during the development of the Rater of Alter Competence (RAC) scale define relational competence as the extent to which objectives functionally related to communication are fulfilled through cooperative interaction appropriate to the interpersonal context (p. 100). This definition includes the key ideas of effectiveness and appropriateness. Effectiveness is the fulfillment of objectives, while the appropriateness deals with the avoidance of violating norms in the interpersonal context. Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) used the above definitions to help development the RAC, in an effort to measure perceptions within an actual episode of communication. Spitzberg (1988) believes the RAC is related to conversational appropriateness and effectiveness, thus making it an appropriate scale for the measurement of perceptions within a communication event.

Definitions of communication competence do not always rely on the ideas of performance, effectiveness, and appropriateness; some rely on skills. Many definitions of a skill have been put forth. Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) believe skill is the successful performance of a communication behavior. Rubin (1990) states that skills are a matter of judgment, being able to choose the correct skill from one's repertoire. McFall (1982) believes social skills are the specific abilities that enable a person to perform competently at particular social tasks. With all these definitions of skills in mind, Goodall (cited in Rubin 1990) defines communication competence as a repertoire of skills or strategies used to understand and respond in interactions. In essence, Goodall believes everyone has skills when dealing with communication interactions and each individual may be deemed

competent or incompetent depending on how well they choose which skills to use in a certain situation.

Rubin, Martin, Brunning, & Powers (1993) define interpersonal communication competence as a person's ability to interact flexibly with others in a dyadic setting so that the communication is seen as appropriate and effective for the content. This definition does include the terms appropriate and effective, but this definition strictly deals with people in a dyadic situation.

All of these definitions add insight into communication competence, but none of these are considered perfect for all situations. The elusive quest for a perfect definition of communication competence is never ending. Many new ones continue to be exposed in recent literature. Maybe someday the quest will end and a definition will be developed that applies in every situation. Until then, all researchers must do the best with what is available.

Measurement of Communication Competence

There are many scales and instruments available to measure communication competence. Many new measurements are introduced as studies continue to amass. No one instrument has yet to be judged the best overall instrument for assessing or measuring communication competence. There are three major ways that have been used to measure communication competence. 1. *self report measures* (Rubin, 1990). A person receives a questionnaire and answers the questions contained in it, which may give an indication of that person's communication competence. Many researchers seem to feel these are invalid in assessing speaking skills, making them invalid to fully assess communication competence. 2. *trained raters provide objective observations* (Rubin, 1990). A rater, trained in communication skills and communication competence and proper

communication behavior, watches a communication interaction and reports on how well the people communicate. Problems may also exist with this form of measurement. Who trained the rater? How well were they trained? Were they trained correctly? These questions would need to be answered. Another problem is inter-rater reliability. Will all raters see the same results and rate them the same way? 3. *untrained observers.* These untrained observers will rate a communication interaction. Validity and inter-rater reliability are both problems in this form of measurement.

The problems do not stop there. What skills should be assessed? Should it be knowledge, skills, motivation, behavioral, or something else. Even with all these problems, some scales have been claimed reliable and valid in certain situations. Below is a description of three separate instruments for measuring communication competence.

The first measurement is a self report instrument. It is the Self Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC) from James McCroskey. McCroskey found that self report instruments may have little validity when it comes to reporting communication competence, but they may be useful for measuring self perceptions. McCroskey developed this scale to measure people's own perceptions of communication competence. The SPCC is composed of 12 items reflecting four communication contexts, 1. public speaking, 2. talking in a large meeting, 3. talking in a small group, and 4. talking in a dyad. Three common types of receivers were examined: strangers, acquaintances, and friends. The subjects were to estimate their communication competence for each question on a 0-100 scale (McCroskey and McCroskey, 1988). McCroskey and McCroskey (1988) tested this instrument on an N=344, and found it to be reliable. This scale has proven to be very useful in measuring subjects' perceptions of their competence and what causes these perceptions.

Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) developed an instrument and study that attempted to measure communication competence as related to five areas; knowledge, motivation, interaction management, anxiety, and immediacy. All items had Likert-style five point scales ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The instruments were tested by using a group of 180 dyads (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984). The dyads were to converse in natural settings such as malls, beaches, movie theaters, parks, and parking lots. Once these dyads engaged in conversation, they were approached and interrupted by one of the graduate researchers (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984). The dyads were given a questionnaire to complete regarding the conversation they just completed. In the questionnaire, the Likert-scale was explained and respondents were asked for their perceptions of the variable under investigation (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984). Questionnaires were collected and kept together as a dyad.

The task in this study was to develop a Likert-style, self measure that is isomorphic with the components of the model (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984, p. 580). The measures were, first, designed to tap the impression of a state rather than a trait (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984). Second, competence judgments were based on both molecular and the general evaluations of self and relationship (Spitzberg and Hecht, 1984). Third, since competence is seen as a dyadic event and is relationship-specific, Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) utilized a perceptual approach that casts the participants in the role of participant-observer.

Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) found that for most measures of communication, motivation and skill provide an effective model of competent communication. Skills seem to be the most powerful predictor in this study.

Most of the nonsignificant relationships found by Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) involve the knowledge variable. Spitzberg and Hecht (1984) performed a study that included

several dyads of people. The dyads studied by Spitzberg and Hecht were in the conversations by choice and the settings were completely natural. This means the communication event should have been enjoyable for those involved. Motivation and skills were higher, but knowledge was found to be lower. Even though this was found, the study and instrument was respectable since it did have people in real conversations in real places which is very promising.

The final instrument discussed is the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI). The main objective of the CCAI is to ascertain skills in an educational setting, mainly college level (Rubin 1985). Rubin (1982) states the foundation of the CCAI is in four basic competence areas, 1. communication codes, 2. oral message, 3. basic speech communication skills, and 4 human relations. These four areas are then broken into 19 specific competencies. The 19 specific competencies in the educational context had three application examples each which resulted in 57 examples (Rubin, 1982). These examples are educational in nature. Areas such as class lectures, instructors, and classroom reports are listed.

The CCAI is given in three sections. First the student is to give a three minute extemporaneous persuasive speech on a topic of interest and during his/her speech, six judgments about the student's speaking ability are recorded (Rubin, 1982). The six judgments are according to Rubin (1982), pronunciation, facial expression/tone of voice, speech clarity, informative/persuasive distinction, clarity of ideas, and ability to express and defend a point of view. In the second section, the student views a video tape containing a six and one half minute lecture and is asked four questions regarding what is seen in the lecture (Rubin, 1982). This video taped lecture helps to assess the difference between fact and opinion, the student's ability to understand suggestions, ability to identify the work needed to complete an assignment, and ability to summarize (Rubin, 1982). The third and

final section has the student respond to statements about experiences he/she has had in the educational environment (Rubin, 1982). This allows the researcher to assess introduction of self, ability to ask and answer a question, express feelings, use topical order strategies, give accurate directions, describe another's viewpoint, and describe difference of opinion (Rubin, 1982).

This measurement has been used in several studies with some noteworthy results. The topic of college level competency is important and this measurement can provide some information on what a college student may need in regards to future course work. This can help a student achieve even higher standards, because if a student knows areas in which he/she is weak, he/she can begin to strengthen those areas through course work. This in turn will help the students become more effective communicators, which benefits them and everyone they are involved with. Also, an instructor may gain valuable information on what points to stress in a class from knowing the students' competencies. This can focus an instructor's class material, which in turn will help the students.

Organizations and Communication Competence

Communication competence in an organizational context has not been vastly researched. Monge, Backman, Dillard, and Eisenberg (1982) studied perceptions of communication competence rated by supervisors and subordinates in the work environment. Monge et al. (1982) discovered that subordinates attach more significance to a supervisor's message if the supervisor directs numerous communication messages to the subordinate. This may suggest that a subordinate's perceptions of the number and types of compliance gaining messages from the subordinate's supervisor may lead to an evaluation of the supervisor's perceived level of communication competence. It is possible that the appropriateness and effectiveness of a supervisor's compliance gaining strategy

may have a major effect on the subordinate's view of that supervisor's communication competence.

Johnson (1988) found that a supervisor's communication competence is related to how positive or negative a supervisor's compliance strategy is perceived by the subordinate. Johnson (1992) also found that task attraction may affect how a subordinate views a supervisor's communication competence level.

Communication competence is important in the organization because communication is what helps make a business operate. If communication competence is low in an organization, problems may arise and infrastructure problems may develop.

Compliance Gaining

The concept of power is central to the lives of most every organizational communicator. These communicators participate daily in interactions requiring the analysis of interpersonal goals, barriers to those goals, and various means of securing compliance from others in obtaining these goals (Berger, p. 1985). Compliance gaining research has become a method that was developed to study the use and sometimes abuse of power in interpersonal communication situations. Compliance gaining behaviors are defined as; "behaviors used by an agent in order to elicit, from a target, a selected behavior" (Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart, 1983).

Compliance gaining is one of the most researched fields in communication (Littlejohn, 1992). However, research in compliance gaining studies has tended to be method bound and subject to many criticisms. Some of these criticisms are: compliance gaining studies do not ground themselves in previous theoretical literature, the methods used to develop taxonomies of compliance gaining tactics or strategies are not always consistent with one

another, and little is known of the context in which compliance gaining attempts are made and the effects of the tactics used.

Power

Many social theorists who adopt the power perspective for compliance gaining claim that an agent's ability to be coercive and gain compliance depends on that person's ability to have control over the resources (Garko, 1990). There have even been ways developed to classify ones resources. Kipnis (1976) offers two ways to classify resources of power. 1. Personal resources: these are located in the individual and include intelligence, status, physical strength and communication skills. 2. Institutional resources: these are seen as possibly being available to the individual and include weapons, legal capability, and legitimacy of position. Power holders will take everything they have and combine the resources to exhibit as much power as they can. Thus an influencer's power can be a blend of personal resources and institutional resources. This is a resource model of power.

The resource model of power requires that an agent's base of power is exercised through some means of influence, like compliance gaining (Dahl, 1957). The base of power then is used as an influence to indicate how power is carried out to gain compliance. Power is thus very central to compliance gaining, so it is appropriate to discuss some of those researchers who are important in the power perspective.

<u>French and Raven.</u> French and Raven (1960), pioneers in power related literature, listed six types of power: 1. reward power, 2. coercive power, 3. legitimate power, 4. referent power, 5. expert power, and 6. informative power. French and Raven's treatment of power is one of the most referred to pieces of literature and is one of the bases for compliance gaining studies.

Etzioni. Etzioni (1975) cast his theory within an organizational context. He characterizes organizations as compliance groups. Organizations have a need for compliance and complexity. Etzioni (1975) defines compliance as a relationship consisting of the power employed by superiors to control subordinates and the orientation of the subordinates to this power. Power is an agent's ability to get a target person to carry out his/her wishes. Thus, compliance is the result of the relationship between those who have power and those over whom it is exercised. If this is true, then the agent must always have more power than the target person.

What distinguishes a person's power are the physical and material resources at his/her disposal. These resources are manipulated so the target person will respond to them. Etzioni has three types of power bases and the means to exercise them:

1. Coercive power. Compliance achieved through the application of of threat of application of physical sanctions such as infliction of pain, deformity, or death; restriction of movement; control of basic needs such as food, sex, comfort, etc.

2. Remunerative power. Compliance achieved through the allocation of material resources and rewards such as salaries, wages, commissions, and contributions, fringe benefits, services, and commodities.

3. Normative power. Compliance achieved through the allocation of symbolic rewards and deprivation.
   a. Pure normative power. Compliance achieved through manipulation of esteem, prestige, ritualistic symbols like a flag.
   b. Social power. Compliance achieved through the allocation and manipulation of acceptance and positive responses.

Etzioni (1975) believes that pure normative power is the most useful because supervisors can exercise it down the hierarchy.

Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart. Wheeless et al. (1983) believe the most useful way to use the term compliance is to have it refer to the performance by one person, the target,

of specific behaviors desired of another person, the agent. The agent decides what target behaviors would be desirable. He/she attempts to persuade the target to complete the behaviors through compliance gaining tactics. Attitudes may be present as determinants of behavior, but compliance is a behavioral and not an attitudinal result of persuasive communication (Garko, 1990). In simpler terms, compliance refers simply to target performance of agent desired behaviors, whether an intervening cogitative process is present or not (Wheeless et al. 1983).

Wheeless et al. (1983) offer a clear explanation of what they mean by compliance gaining. "Gaining" means eliciting, while "compliance" means a response that would not have otherwise occurred except for the agent's presentation of a stimulus to the target. According to Wheeless et al. (1983), the compliance gaining process is best conceptualized as the implementation of power. Power represents the potential for exercising influence, and compliance serves as the demonstration of that potential. Wheeless et al. (1983) compare the power and compliance relationship to that of a trunk of a tree and its branch. Just as a branch can not live without the trunk, the gaining of compliance from someone can not exist without power.

It can be inferred from Wheeless et al.'s discussion that the reasons found within compliance gaining tactics are the resources comprising the agents power bases (Johnson, 1988). It can be further inferred that the target is induced to comply because he/she values and desires the resources controlled by the agent (Johnson, 1988).

Marwell and Schmitt

Marwell and Schmitt (1967) published the earliest and probably most widely used list of compliance gaining strategies. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) proposed a list of 16 compliance gaining tactics in five general areas: 1. rewarding activity, 2. expertise,

3. activation of impersonal commitment, 4. activation of personal commitment, and 5. punishing activity. Many researchers since Marwell and Schmitt have used and modified this list and now 50 to 60 strategies are said to exist (Johnson, 1988).

Marwell and Schmitt use an exchange theory approach. They feel compliance is an exchange for some other resources supplied by the compliance seeker (Littlejohn, 1992). This approach seems to rest on the idea that people act to gain something for themselves. One may do what another wants to gain rewards, power, esteem, prestige, happiness, to relive tension, and release an obligation.

Marwell and Schmitt may have been pioneers in compliance gaining research, but many researchers since them have found problems with Marwell and Schmitt's 16 strategies. Three areas of criticisms have been produced: 1. methods Marwell and Schmitt used to complete their list of 16 compliance gaining strategies, 2. individual characteristics of persuaders in relation to their choice of control strategies, and 3. situational differences and their effects on the choice of control strategies. A brief summary of each of these criticisms is as follows.

Methods used by Marwell and Schmitt. Marwell and Schmitt came up with their 16 strategies by deductive reasoning which has been supported by some researchers (Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold 1977 and Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981). However deductive reasoning forces subjects to choose from a pre determined list of behaviors in rating an actor's method of compliance. Many other researchers (Clark, 1979, and O'Keefe & Delia, 1979) believe an inductive path should be followed in creating compliance gaining strategies. This would allow the actual subjects to list what tactic or strategies they would use and then comparisons can be made and categories and patterns can be developed.

Source Variables. Marwell and Schmitt in the list of 16 strategies, do not give much consideration to source variables that affect an individual's choice of tactics. No consideration was given to gender. Gender, according to many researchers (de Turck, 1985; Harper & Hirokawa, 1986; and Hirokawa, Kodana, & Harper, 1990), is a very important determining factor in the use and reception of compliance gaining tactics. A source variable such as gender can have a large impact on the success or failure of compliance gaining tactics, since women and men may have different views of compliance gaining.

Situational Variables. The final weakness in Marwell and Schmitt's 16 compliance gaining strategies is the lack of possible situation variables that may affect the selection of compliance gaining strategies. Many researchers (McLaughlin, Cody, & Robey, 1980; Cody, Jordan, & Woelfel, 1983; and Boster & Stiff, 1984) believe situation factors are a key to selecting and receiving compliance gaining tactics. Areas such as organizational environments, training environments, and family groups possibly could have an effect on the selection of compliance gaining strategies and tactics.

Measuring Compliance Gaining

Compliance gaining measurements cover a broad range of methods. Some researchers (de Turck, 1985) present subjects with a situation and the subjects are to role play the episode. Then judges rate the compliance gaining strategies. This type of study, if the situations are constructed well and realistically, can lead to some worthwhile results and predictions of compliance gaining.

Questionnaires are also a way of measuring compliance gaining. The questionnaires usually provide a situation or scenario the subject must read and interpret. The subject will then list what compliance gaining strategy he or she would enact. Another way subjects

have been asked to respond is by listing whether they would resist the compliance gaining tactic or not (McLaughlin et al. 1980).

Another way to measure compliance gaining, presented by Hirokawa et al., (1990) is to ask potential persuaders to answer a form based on a selected scenario and Marwell and Schmitt's 16 compliance gaining strategies. The subjects would be asked about each of the 16 strategies for each scenario presented on an eight point scale. The range would be from 1 (extremely likely) to 8 (extremely unlikely).

A final way to measure compliance gaining, as presented by Dillard (1988), is by having the subjects involved to a much greater extent. The subjects are asked to recall and provide a written description of an interaction they had in which they tried to persuade someone to do something. Once that was completed, they were then informed of Marwell and Schmitt's 16 compliance gaining tactics. Each was described and defined. The subjects were then asked to list on a seven point Likert-type scale how likely they would use each of the strategies in the situation they had just described.

Measuring techniques for compliance gaining have been very extensive and the one's cited in this review are but some of the ways in which it can be accessed.

Compliance Gaining in the Organization

The business organization is a logical place to find compliance gaining. Supervisors use many different strategies on subordinates.

Researchers (de Turck, 1985; Harper & Hirokawa, 1988; and Hirokawa et al., 1990) have highlighted gender as a possible determinate in compliance gaining behaviors in the organization. It is believed that there is a difference between how female and male managers gain compliance. And there is also a belief that females and males have different reactions to the use of compliance gaining behaviors by their supervisors.

Johnson (1992) believes compliance gaining is related to task attraction. Johnson (1992) states there is a difference between the use of pro-social compliance gaining compared to antisocial strategies. The more a supervisor elicits a social liking tactic, the more the subordinate is likely to go along with the request.

Finally, Podsakoff (1982) believes compliance gaining is based on a supervisor's use of rewards and punishments. The subordinate will strive to complete the task asked if a reward is attached to the completion of the task and the subordinate will also respond to the request it he/she knows a punishment will occur if they do not.

Gender

The day we are born, each of us is labeled with an identity by the attending physician. The identity we receive is either boy or girl. This gender label shapes the rest of a person's life and it weighs heavily on everyone in society. For example, if a friend calls and says "Shannon had her baby," your first question inevitably is "what did she have?" The answer to that question guides what happens to the child; the kinds of toys he/she plays with; the way he/she is dressed; the way he/she is played with; and the way he/she is spoken to. All of these differences will begin at the moment of birth (Harriman, 1985).

The gender label continues on through adulthood. What is the first aspect you notice when you first meet someone? Is it his/her eyes? Smile? More than likely the answer to the question is the person's gender. Most people find it a necessity to determine the gender of another person with whom they interact (Nielson, 1978).

There are many terms regarding gender used in this study and because of this, definitions should be put forth.

Sex: Biological characteristics that are present to a large degree from the time of birth (Bate, 1988).

Gender: The expansion or elaboration of biological sex distinctions, which occur through human communication from infancy on (Bate, 1988).

Masculine/Feminine: The labels people attach to gender-related behaviors (Bate, 1988).

Women and Men in Management

Women in our society have always traditionally been labeled housewives and men have been labeled breadwinners. Women made an initial entrance into the labor force during World War I. After the war, the men returned home and the women relinquished their jobs back to the men and the women became homemakers again (Chapman, 1991). During World War II women again entered the labor force, but after the war, many women stayed in the work force. The number of paid women in the work force has steadily increased since World War II. We now live in a society where the dual income family is the rule, not the exception (Lont & Friedley, 1989).

The management force in the United States has always been dominated by men and is still that way today. However, the percentage of women mangers in the United States continues to grow steadily (Hirokawa et al., 1990). Since 1966, the percentage of women mangers has increased from 15% to nearly 40% (Hirokawa et al., 1990). This rapid growth has contributed to the social and behavioral sciences attempt to expand the research devoted to female managers and to attempt to describe and evaluate female management styles as well as compare and contrast female to male managers on a variety of dimensions.

Much of the research has been concerned with describing managers in masculine and feminine terms. Some researchers (Harper & Hirokawa, 1988; Kanter, 1977; Kipnisetal, 1980; and Putnam & Fairhurs, 1985) in recent years have suggested that behavioral differences between male and female managers are likely to exist in their communication

interaction with other organization members. In particular, researchers have suggested that female and male managers tend to differ in their use of persuasive (compliance-gaining) message strategies (Hirokawa et al., 1990). Kanter (as cited in Hirokawa et al., 1990) suggests that women tend to exhibit communication strategies that show passivity, open mindedness, and nurturance and on the other hand men typically exhibit communication strategies that show strength, power, and assertiveness. Conrad (as cited in Hirokawa et al., 1990) also notes that men and women can be distinguished on the basis of their use of "weakening" and "strengthening" strategies of argumentation. Women tend to use more ambiguous and apprehensive language than men and men tend to use structured and well founded argument.

Wheeless and Berryman-Fink (1985) performed a study to determine the relationship among attitudes toward women in general, women as mangers, and perceptions of communication competencies of women mangers. Through the literature, Wheeless and Berryman-Fink found that the field of management is still clearly defined as masculine and that if female managers exhibit masculine behaviors, they are often seen in a negative light by both males and females. Males and females feel that women mangers who act masculine are imitating men to gain power and position in the company. The reason for this is that women who become managers and take on masculine roles are violating the role expectations of the traditional stereotypical female.

Wheeless and Berryman-Fink (1985) through their study of 178 employees (98 males, 80 females) found that men and women do differ in their attitudes toward women managers. Female managers were seen as more positive than males toward female subordinates. Because of this finding, it should be no surprise that female respondents viewed female mangers higher in communication competence than the male respondents.

Although empirical data exists to support the ideas that male and female mangers differ in their use of persuasive messages and strategies, there is literature that states the opposite (Hirokawa, 1990). Harper and Hirokawa (1988) compared the compliance-gaining strategies used by males and females in five different organizations in the United States and found that males and females did not differ on the types of persuasive strategies used to influence their male and female subordinates. Harper and Hirokawa (1988) state there are some differences to be discovered among the persuasive strategies used by male and female managers, however there are fewer than popular opinion might predict.

The literature seems to give support to both sides of the argument. Researchers have found support that male and female managers do not differ on the persuasive messages and strategies they send to their subordinates. However many other researchers have found that men and women do differ on the persuasive messages sent and exhibited to their subordinates.

Statement of Purpose

Compliance gaining and communication competence are heavily studied areas of research. Although compliance gaining and communication competence have not been linked together in many studies, there seems to be some basis for a linkage. Compliance gaining strategies used by an individual may predict that person's perceived communication competence.

The first purpose of this study is to explore the potential relationship between compliance gaining and communication competence. Compliance gaining appears to be related to many of the definitions of communication competence that were discussed earlier. Kipnis (1976), who introduced two ways to classify resources power (personal and institutional), believes that personal resources include intelligence and communication

skills. These personal resources can be directly compared to many components in definitions of communication competence. For example, McCroskey (1984), believes competence is the "adequate ability too." The "adequate ability to" appears to relate to intelligence. It should be noted that intelligence does not mean that a person will have the "adequate ability to," but intelligence can be a basis for acquiring the "ability to."

Many other definitions of communication competence equate performance with competence. Many researchers (Wiemann, 1977; Cegala, 1982; and Larson et al. as cited in McCroskey, 1982) believe if a person can perform the appropriate behavior, he or she is considered to be competent. Performance can also be linked to compliance gaining because compliance gaining can be seen as the proper performance of positive or negative power strategies. Thus, both compliance gaining and communication competence can be related to performance.

Another parallel that can be drawn between competence and compliance is seen in Cegala's definition. Cegala (1982) believes being competent in communication is knowing how to use language in a social setting. This can be paralleled to compliance gaining because often times in order for someone to be successful at compliance gaining, he/she has to be able to know how and when to use language properly in a social setting.

A study noted earlier by Johnson (1992) also links compliance gaining with communication competence. Johnson's (1992) basic premise is that if a supervisor uses positive compliance gaining strategies and the task is perceived to be attractive by the subordinate, then the subordinate will perceive the supervisor to be competent. And if the supervisor uses negative compliance gaining strategies and the task is seen as unattractive by the subordinate, then the subordinate will perceive the supervisor to be communication incompetent. Johnson's 1992 study is limited by the definition of task attraction and how it

is measured, but the study does provide some support for linking compliance gaining to communication competence.

The second purpose of the present study is to explore possible gender differences in perceptions of competence as it relates to compliance gaining. The area of interest is whether female and male supervisors will be perceived differently in terms of communication competence based on the compliance gaining strategy (positive or negative) used with same and different sex subordinates. This possible difference is important in determining how subordinates may react to their supervisor, whether male or female, when compliance is trying to be attained by that superior.

It is evident from the literature review and the parallels that have been drawn above that compliance gaining and communication competence may be related. The present study will explore two research questions.

RQ1a: If a person uses positive compliance gaining strategies, will that person be perceived as more communication competent than that same person when using negative compliance gaining strategies?

RQ1b: Are there any differences in perceived communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on the person's gender?

RQ2: Are there any differences in percieved communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on observing subjects' demographic characteristics of gender, age, job title, or organizational responsibility.

CHAPTER 2

Methodology

This study is an analysis of compliance gaining as a predictor of communication competence in an organizational setting. The intent is to gain valuable information regarding superior/subordinate relations and subordinate perceptions of a superior's communication competence as related to the use of compliance gaining strategies.

The terms, positive compliance gaining, negative compliance gaining, communication competent, and communication incompetent, will be defined as follows.

Positive compliance gaining is the actor/supervisor using encouraging or rewarding language when asking or telling a subordinate to perform a task. For example, from Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) list, the promise strategy; "If you comply, I will reward you."

Negative compliance gaining is the actor/supervisor using undesirable language and actions when asking or telling a subordinate to perform a task. For example from Marwell and Schmitt's (1967) list, the threat strategy, "If you do not comply, I will punish you."

Communication competent will be the term used to describe a person who exhibits a high level of understanding of language and communication and is effective in using them in an interpersonal situation as measured by the Rating of Alter Competence (RAC) (Spitzberg & Cupach).

Communication incompetent will be the term used to describe a person who exhibits a low level of understanding of language and communication and is not effective in using them in interpersonal situations as measured by the Rating of Alter Competence (RAC) .

Sample

Subjects were selected from the marketing division of a medium sized company located in a midwestern city. The Marketing division employed approximately 150 people. A review of the subjects found that it is a nearly 50/50 split between men and women. The age range was from 24 to 53.

The subjects who were chosen were a willing volunteer sample approached by the author, who requested their participation in a study about communication between employees and their supervisors. The subjects were also told their participation would take approximately 20 minutes. If any of the subjects refused, they were thanked for their time and allowed to leave.

Procedure

The subjects were asked to view four video taped scenarios (see Appendix A for the transcripts of the scenarios) that deal with a supervisor using a compliance gaining tactic (positive or negative) in an attempt to get the subordinate to comply. All of the scenarios had a male as the subordinate. Two of the scenarios had a female as the supervisor and two scenarios had a male as the supervisor. The four video taped scenarios had the following combinations; 1. female supervisor using a positive compliance gaining strategy on a male subordinate, 2. female supervisor using a negative compliance gaining strategy on a male subordinate, 3. male supervisor using a positive compliance gaining strategy on a male subordinate, and 4. male supervisor using a negative compliance gaining strategy on a male subordinate. To help with the flow of the tape, a narrator was used to set up the next scenario.

The subjects viewed one scenario at a time and the subjects filled out a questionnaire (see Appendix B) after each scenario. The first part of the questionnaire contained eight

compliance gaining strategies and a brief definition of each. There are four positive and four negative. The four positive were: 1. promising, 2. pregiving, 3. positive altercasting, and 4. showing positive esteem. The four negative compliance gaining strategies were: 1. attributing negative feelings, 2. negative altercasting, 3. showing negative esteem, 4. threatening.

The second part of the questionnaire contained Spitzberg and Cupach's (1984) Rater of Alter Competence (RAC). The RAC contains 27 phrases which are each answered on a five point Likert-type scale. The scale is as follows; 1. strongly disagree, 2. mildly disagree, 3. undecided, 4. mildly agree, 5. strongly agree. The subjects were asked to circle one of the five choices for each of the 27 phrases (e.g. she/he was versatile, she/he was likable, she/he was supportive, etc.) based on the subject's opinion of the supervisor in the given scenario.

A demographic questionnaire was also included (see Appendix B) that asked for the subject's gender, age, job title, and supervisory responsibility.

Instrumentation

Compliance Gaining. Compliance gaining is not being directly measured in this study. The subjects are asked to identify the compliance gaining strategy used by the superior in the scenario. There is a correct answer to which of the eight compliance gaining strategies is chosen for each scenario.

Communication competence. Communication competence is measured by using Spitzberg and Cupach's Rater of Alter Competence (RAC). There were some slight modifications to the scale, so it is not of a personal nature, but rather for a person looking at an outside scenario that he or she is not involved.

The objectives in developing the RAC was twofold. First, it was determined that an alternative to trait measures was needed to elicit perceptions of the process of interaction within an actual episode of communication (Spitzberg, 1988). The solution was to develop a measure that references a specific conversation. The measurement is instilled with the respondent's own sense of context, even though a particular context is not specified. Second, it was seen as important to attempt to reference both interactants involved in the interpersonal encounter (Spitzberg, 1988). Since it is assumed that interpersonal communication is an interdependent process, it is vital that both self and alter be assessed.

The RAC originally had 66 items to reference self and 66 items to reference alter. After the pilot study by Spitzberg (1988), it was reduced to a total of 27 items. In its current form, the scale is comprised of 27 five step Likert-type items. The scale is as follows; 1. strongly disagree, 2. mildly disagree, 3. undecided, 4. mildly agree, 5. strongly agree.

Reliability of the scale has been reported to be very high. Spitzberg (1988) reports reliabilities ranging form .90 to .94 and averaging .93 across 11 studies. Johnson (1992) performed a study using the RAC and it reported a reliability of alpha= .86.

The RAC has been used in over 14 studies. Situations studied range from conflict and problem solving to get-acquainted and interrupted natural conversations. Spitzberg (1988) states the RAC is significantly related to interaction involvement, attentiveness, interpersonal communication apprehension, reported anxiety behaviors, communicative adaptability scale, social self-esteem, knowledge, motivation, and its companion, Self Rated Competence scale (SRC). The RAC is also related to many measures of communication quality, including communication satisfaction, conversational appropriateness and effectiveness, perceived confirmation, feeling good, and immediacy.

The RAC, as a general evaluation of competence in a specific episode, is strongly supported as a self rating by research literature. It is highly reliable, suitable for virtually any context, and is related to criteria of competent interaction, as well as other measures of competence. The RAC is most useful when interest is in exploring the process of inferring others' overall competence in a given episode of interaction. Because of all these qualities that the RAC possesses, it was selected to be the instrument of measure for communication competence in this study.

Statistical Analysis

This study is trying to ascertain if the compliance gaining strategy used can predict a superior's level of communication competence and also if there are gender differences in perceptions related to positive or negative compliance gaining strategies.

The data obtained from the study were analyzed by using SPSSx. Descriptive statistics related to the demographic data were calculated. In addition, descriptive statistics related to compliance gaining strategies and individual RAC item responses and total RAC scores were calculated.

t-tests and analysis of variance techniques were used to test for differences based on communication competence ratings of the supervisors in the different scenarios, on demographic variables in the level of communication competence in relation to the compliance gaining strategy used in each scenario, and on communication competence ratings of the supervisors based on the person's gender. The .05 level of significance was established for all statistical tests of differences.

CHAPTER 3

Results

The demographic descriptive statistics can be observed in Table 1. The total number of respondents in the study was 98 -- 57 male and 41 female. The age break out is also depicted and separated into eight divisions. The first group, which is below the age of 20, does not have any subjects populated in it. The other seven groups had a subject range of 10 to 22. The age group with the most subjects was the 31 to 34 age group.

The job title of the subjects is also depicted in Table 1. Marketing Representative, Sales Representative, Marketing Manager, and Other are the categories populated by the most subjects, with 19, 11, 17, and 20 subjects respectively. The group with the least number of subjects was regional manager with two. There are a total of 32 subjects who responded as managers and 40 who responded as a representative. Six people were listed as a secretary and 20 answered job title as other.

Table 1 also breaks out Organizational Responsibility which indicates if the subjects responding in this study have organizational responsibility over other employees. The number of subjects who stated they have organizational responsibility is 42 and 56 of the subjects stated they did not.

And finally, all 98 people who responded picked the type of scenario (positive or negative) correctly. The 98 subjects also did very well in picking the actual compliance gaining strategy used in each scenario. The breakdown is as follows. Scenario one; 94 picked the correct strategy while 4 did not. Scenario 2; 91 picked the correct strategy while 7 did not. Scenario 3; 97 picked the correct strategy while 1 did not. And scenario 4; 95 picked the correct strategy and 3 did not.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS

Type	Number	Percent
Gender		
Males	57	58.2%
Females	41	41.8%
Total	98	100%
Age		
21-25	11	11.2%
26-30	16	16.3%
31-35	22	22.4%
36-40	13	13.3%
41-45	14	14.3%
46-50	10	10.2%
Over 50	12	12.2%
Total	98	100%
Job		
Customer Service Rep.	6	6.1%
Human Resource Rep.	4	4.1%
Marketing Rep.	19	19.4%
Sales Rep.	11	11.2%
Secretary	6	6.1%
Customer Service Manager	7	7.1%
District Manager	3	3.1%
Human Resource Manager	3	3.1%
Marketing Manager	17	17.3%
Regional Manager	2	2.0%
Other	20	20.4%
Total	98	100%
Organizational Responsibility		
Yes	42	42.9%
No	56	57.1%
Total	98	100%

Research Question #1a and 1b

RQ1a: If a person uses positive compliance gaining strategies, will that person be perceived as more communication competent than that same person when using negative compliance gaining strategies?

RQ1b: Are there any differences in perceived communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on the person's gender?

Both parts of this research question were answered by executing a one-way ANOVA on the four different scenarios, using the corresponding means for each. The compliance gaining strategy in each scenario is the independent variable and communication competence as measured by RAC score is the dependent variable. The means for both negative groups (groups 2 & 3) are below the neutral score of 81, and the means for the positive groups (1 & 4) are well above the neutral score of 81 (see Table 2).

The one-way ANOVA, as seen in Table 2, did show the two negative compliance gaining scenarios did have a lower mean and were significantly different at the .05 level than the two positive compliance gaining scenarios.

Not only were the two negative and two positive compliance gaining scenarios seen to be significantly different at the .05 level, but a significant difference was also discovered among each set. The difference found in the negative set is that Scenario 2 RAC scores were found to be significantly lower than RAC scores for Scenario 3 at the .05 level; and the positive set, Scenario 1 RAC scores were significantly lower than RAC scores for Scenario 4 at the .05 level. The female supervisors were seen as more extreme. In the negative compliance gaining strategies, the female supervisor was seen as more negative in terms of communication competence than the male supervisor, and in the positive compliance gaining situations the female supervisor was seen as more positive in terms of communication competence than the male supervisor.

TABLE 2

ONE WAY ANOVA - RAC Score By Compliance Gaining Strategy

SOURCE	D. F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	P
BETWEEN GROUPS	3	39631.60	267.64	.0000
WITHIN GROUPS	388	148.08		
TOTAL	391			

STUDENT-NEWMAN-KEULS

		GROUP			
		2	3	1	4
MEAN	**GROUP**				
71.78	Grp 2				
75.34	Grp 3	*			
104.90	Grp 1	*	*		
111.13	Grp 4	*	*	*	

(*) DENOTES PAIRS OF GROUPS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AT THE .05 LEVEL

Table 2 Key

Group 1 = Positive Scenario 1
Group 2 = Positive Scenario 2
Group 3 = Positive Scenario 3
Group 4 = Positive Scenario 4

Research Question #2

RQ2: Are there any differences in perceived communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on observing subjects' demographic characteristics of gender, age, job title, and organizational responsibility?

The independent variables for this question were: the compliance gaining strategy and the gender, age, job title, and organizational responsibility of the subjects who answered the questionnaire. The dependent variable is communication competence.

Gender

A t-test was executed on each scenario by using the gender of the subjects and the RAC scores for each scenario. There were a total of four t-tests performed. One for each of the four scenarios in this study. The results are seen in Table 3. No significant differences in RAC scores were discovered between males and females in any of the four scenario conditions.

Age

To test to see if there were any differences in RAC scores based on the age of the subjects, a one-way ANOVA was executed. As can be seen in Table 4, all of the age groups viewing the negative scenarios were significantly different ($p < .05$) on RAC scores than all of the ages groups viewing the positive scenarios. In addition, there were no significant age group differences in RAC scores for the negative scenarios. A few significant age group differences in RAC scores were discovered for the positive scenarios.

Group 3 (subjects ages 26-30 - Scenario 1), group 27 (subjects ages 26-30 - Scenario 4), group 28 (subjects ages 31-35 - Scenario 4), group 29 (subjects ages 36-40), and group 30 (subjects ages 41-45 - Scenario 4) were all seen to be significantly different at the .05 level than group 8 (subjects ages 50-over - Scenario 1).

TABLE 3

t-tests - RAC Scores by Gender of Subjects

Male and Female Subjects Responding to Scenario 1

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob
Male	57	102.75	18.23	2.42	-1.66	95.71	.101
Female	41	107.88	12.35	1.93			

Male and Female Subjects Responding to Scenario 2

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob
Male	57	71.67	11.04	1.46	-.13	95.05	.897
Female	41	71.93	8.75	1.37			

(Cont.)

TABLE 3 Continued

t-test - RAC Scores by Gender of Subjects

Male and Female Subjects Responding to Scenario 3

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob
Male	57	75.79	12.28	1.63	.49	95.21	.626
Female	41	74.71	9.64	1.51			

Male and Female Subjects Responding to Scenario 4

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	t-Value	Degrees of Freedom	2-Tail Prob
Male	57	109.95	10.87	1.44	-1.41	94.07	.162
Female	41	112.78	8.99	1.40			

TABLE 4

ONE WAY ANOVA - RAC Scores By Age

SOURCE	D. F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	P
BETWEEN GROUPS	27	4676.09	33.98	.0000
WITHIN GROUPS	364	137.63		
TOTAL	391			

STUDENT-NEWMAN-KEULS

MEAN	GROUP	15	11	16	12	13	10	21	23	19	20	18	22	14	24	08	07	05	32	06	04	31	28	03	29	27	30	26	02
68.70	Grp 15																												
70.44	Grp 11																												
70.50	Grp 16																												
71.00	Grp 12																												
71.54	Grp 13																												
71.55	Grp 10																												
72.15	Grp 21																												
72.60	Grp 23																												
73.50	Grp 19																												
73.59	Grp 20																												
77.18	Grp 18																												
77.79	Grp 22																												
78.21	Grp 14																												
82.17	Grp 24																												
96.50	Grp 08	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
99.10	Grp 07	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
99.77	Grp 05	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
101.58	Grp 32	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
102.14	Grp 06	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
106.59	Grp 04	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
108.80	Grp 31	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*														
110.05	Grp 28	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*													
110.56	Grp 03	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*													
112.85	Grp 29	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*													
113.44	Grp 27	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*											
115.00	Grp 30	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*											
115.55	Grp 26	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		*											
117.27	Grp 02	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*			*								

(*) DENOTES PAIRS OF GROUPS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AT THE .05 LEVEL

TABLE 4 KEY

Group 1 =	Subjects Under the Age of 20 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 2 =	Subjects Ages 21-25 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 3 =	Subjects Ages 26-30 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 4 =	Subjects Ages 31-35 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 5 =	Subjects Ages 36-40 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 6 =	Subjects Ages 41-45 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 7 =	Subjects Ages 46-50 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 8 =	Subjects Over the Age of 50 Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 9 =	Subjects Under the Age of 20 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 10 =	Subjects Ages 21-25 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 11 =	Subjects Ages 26-30 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 12 =	Subjects Ages 31-35 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 13 =	Subjects Ages 36-40 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 14 =	Subjects Ages 41-45 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 15 =	Subjects Ages 46-50 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 16 =	Subjects Over the Age of 50 Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 17 =	Subjects Under the Age of 20 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 18 =	Subjects Ages 21-25 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 19 =	Subjects Ages 26-30 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 20 =	Subjects Ages 31-35 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 21 =	Subjects Ages 36-40 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 22 =	Subjects Ages 41-45 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 23 =	Subjects Ages 46-50 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 24 =	Subjects Over the Age of 50 Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 25 =	Subjects Under the Age of 20 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 26 =	Subjects Ages 21-25 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 27 =	Subjects Ages 26-30 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 28 =	Subjects Ages 31-35 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 29 =	Subjects Ages 36-40 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 30 =	Subjects Ages 41-45 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 31 =	Subjects Ages 46-50 Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 32 =	Subjects Over the Age of 50 Who Viewed Scenario 4

Group 2 (subjects ages 21-25 - Scenario 1), and group 30 (subjects ages 41-45 - Scenario 4) were seen to be significantly different at the .05 level than group 7 (subjects ages 46-50 - Scenario 1).

Group 2 (subjects ages 21-25 - Scenario 1), group 26 (subjects ages 21-25 - Scenario 4), group 27 (subjects ages 26-30 - Scenario 4), and group 30 (subjects ages 41-45 - Scenario 4) were all seen to be significantly different at the .05 level than group 5 (subjects ages 36-40 - Scenario 1)

And finally group 2 (subjects ages 21-25 - Scenario 1) was seen to be significantly different at the .05 level than group 6 (subjects ages 41-45 - Scenario 1).

Job Title

The job title demographic was the next to be tested. The answers to the job title question were grouped into three separate groups; 1. *managers*, 2. *non-managers*, and 3. *other*. Table 5 depicts the one-way ANOVA that was executed. No significant differences between the positive and negative scenarios were found at the .05 level among the subject's job titles and the scores obtained from the subjects on the RAC. A significant difference at the .05 level was discovered within the positive scenario section. Groups 1 (mangers who rated scenario 1), 2 (non-managers who rated scenario 2), 10 (managers who rated scenario 4), 11 (non-managers who rated scenario 4), and 12 (subjects who responded job title as other; who rated scenario 4) were all seen to be significantly different at the .05 level than Group 3 (subjects who responded job title as other; who rated scenario 1).

Organizational Responsibility

The final demographic tested was organizational responsibility. This was a "yes" or "no" question. A one-way ANOVA was again used to test for a possible difference. Table 6 depicts no significant difference at the .05 level between the negative and positive

TABLE 5

ONE WAY ANOVA - RAC by Job Title

SOURCE	D. F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	P
BETWEEN GROUPS	11	11292.45	82.31	.0000
WITHIN GROUPS	380	137.19		
TOTAL	391			

STUDENT-NEWMAN-KEULS

		GROUP											
		06	04	09	05	08	07	03	02	01	12	11	10
MEAN	GROUP												
70.00	Grp 06												
71.28	Grp 04												
73.05	Grp 09												
73.59	Grp 05												
75.38	Grp 08												
76.30	Grp 07												
91.05	Grp 03	*	*	*	*	*	*						
108.38	Grp 02	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
108.50	Grp 01	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
108.85	Grp 12	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
110.81	Grp 11	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					
112.35	Grp 10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*					

(*) DENOTES PAIRS OF GROUPS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AT THE 0.050 LEVEL

TABLE 5 KEY

Group 1 =	Managers Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 2 =	Non-Managers Who Viewed Scneario 1
Group 3 =	Other Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 4 =	Managers Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 5 =	Non-Managers Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 6 =	Other Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 7 =	Managers Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 8 =	Non-Managers Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 9 =	Other Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 10 =	Managers Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 11 =	Non-Managers Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 12 =	Other Who Viewed Scenario 4

TABLE 6

ONE WAY ANOVA- RAC Scores By Organizational Responsibility

SOURCE	D. F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	P
BETWEEN GROUPS	7	17031.81	114.49	.0000
WITHIN GROUPS	384	148.77		
TOTAL	391			

STUDENT-NEWMAN-KEULS

		GROUP							
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		3	4	5	6	2	1	7	8
MEAN	**GROUP**								
70.60	Grp 03								
72.66	Grp 04								
75.26	Grp 05								
75.39	Grp 06								
103.70	Grp 02	*	*	*	*				
106.50	Grp 01	*	*	*	*				
110.43	Grp 07	*	*	*	*				
111.66	Grp 08	*	*	*	*				

(*) DENOTES PAIRS OF GROUPS SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT AT THE .05 LEVEL

TABLE 6 KEY

Group 1 =	Subjects With Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 2 =	Subjects With No Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 1
Group 3 =	Subjects With Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 4 =	Subjects With No Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 2
Group 5 =	Subjects With Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 6 =	Subjects With No Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 3
Group 7 =	Subjects With Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 4
Group 8 =	Subjects With No Org. Resp. Who Viewed Scenario 4

groups, however a significant difference was discovered at the .05 level among the positive groups. The two groups from Scenario 4; Group 7 (subjects who have organizational responsibility) and Group 8 (subjects who do not have organizational responsibility), are seen to be significantly different from the two groups in Scenario 1; Group 1 (subjects who have organizational responsibility) and Group 2 (subjects who do not have organizational responsibility).

Chapter 4

Discussion

A clear finding from this study is supervisors who use positive compliance gaining strategies will be percieved to be more communicatively competent than supervisors whose use negative compliance gaining strategies. Question 1a, "*if a person uses positive compliance gaining strategies, will that person be perceived as more communication competent than that same person when using negative compliance gaining strategies?*" can easily be supported by the data from this study, as seen in Table 2. It is noted in Table 2 the negative groups (groups 2 and 3) have means (71.78 & 75.34) below the means (104.90 & 111.13) of the positive groups (groups 1 & 4), thus confirming a significant difference at the .05 level between the negative and positive groups.

Research Question 1b, "*are there any differences in perceived communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on the person's gender?*" elicited a very profound discovery. A difference was seen between each positive scenario and each negative scenario. At first this was seen as a possible difference among each scenario, meaning there may be differing degrees of positive and negative seen in each of the strategies used in each of the scenarios. However, a closer look discovered that females seem to be at the extreme end of each type. If both a male and a female use a positive compliance gaining strategy, the female, according to this study will be seen as more positive in nature and have a higher level of communication competence as compared to the male counterpart.

The opposite is also true. If a male and female supervisor both used a negative compliance gaining strategy, the female according to this study, would be perceived as more negative and have a lower level of communication competence as compared to the male counterpart.

A reason for this result could relate to a stereotype in the current society where females are usually seen in a positive light -- mother, wife, caring, and compassionate. If a female manager is positive in her style, this may be what people are expecting, thus explaining why the female supervisors were seen to be more positive than the male supervisors in this study, when both use a positive compliance gaining strategy. A female supervisor using a negative compliance gaining strategy may go against what many people feel a female should be like, thus causing these female supervisors to be seen in a very negative aspect. They are not living to the expectations presented to them by current society.

An implication of the present study may be that supervisors will be perceived in varying degrees, depending on the type of compliance gaining strategy used (positive or negative) and the supervisor's gender. It is also noted from the findings in this study that the compliance gaining strategies themselves may vary in the degree to which they are positive or negative. For example, one positive compliance gaining strategy may be perceived to be more positive than another positive compliance gaining strategy. Hence, a greater degree of communication competence will be perceived for those supervisors who use the more positive compliance gaining strategies. A similar relationship, in terms of this study, can also be seen in regards to the negative compliance gaining strategies.

Research Question 2, "*are there any differences in perceived communication competence of a person using a compliance gaining strategy based on observing subjects' demographic characteristics of gender, age, job title, or organizational responsibility?*" expressed the possibility that demographics such as gender, age, job title, and organizational responsibility of the subjects viewing each scenario may cause a difference in the perceived level of a supervisor's communication competence based on the compliance gaining strategy employed by the supervisor.

The first demographic trait examined was gender of the subjects. There were a total of four t-tests performed; one for each of the four scenarios in this study. The results are listed in Table 3. None of the four t-tests revealed any significant results regarding the effect of the subject's gender on the perceived level of communication competence of the supervisor involved in each scenario.

The age demographic was examined by using an ANOVA to test for any possible significant differences at the .05 level. All of the age groups viewing the negative scenarios were significantly different ($p < .05$) on RAC scores than all of the age groups viewing the positive scenarios. In addition, there were no significant age group differences in RAC scores for the negative scenarios. A few significant age group differences in RAC scores were discovered for the positive scenarios. No meaningful patterns were discovered in these few differences and they possibly were caused by chance because of the small sample size. The conclusion from the results of this study is that age of subjects viewing the scenarios did not make a difference in the perception of communication competence.

The next demographic examined was job title which was classified according to three types: 1. Manager, 2. Non-Managers, and 3. Other. There was no significant difference seen at the .05 level among the subjects' job titles and the scores on the RAC among the positive and negative scenarios for this study.

The positive scenarios did have one significant RAC difference based on job title appear at the .05 level. A total of five (Groups 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12) of the six positive groups were found to be significantly different from group 3 at the .05 level. Group 3 is the "other" grouping, which included a vast array of respondents, from administrative assistants to a vice president. Groups 1, 2, and 3 are the responses to Scenario 1 and

Group 3 has the lowest mean of these three groups. Since there are so many occupations classified in "other", conclusions concerning this issue can not be drawn.

The final demographic tested was organizational responsibility. This question was answered with either a "yes" or "no". An ANOVA was again used to test for any possible significant differences. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between the positive and negative groups based on the responses to the questions. However, within the positive groups, a significant difference was seen at the .05 level. The two groups in positive scenario # 4 (Group # 7, subjects who have organizational responsibility and Group # 8, subjects who do not have organizational responsibility) are seen to be significantly different at the .05 level, than the two groups in the other positive scenario, #1, (Group #1,subjects who have organizational responsibility and Group #2 subjects who do not have organizational responsibility). These results are not necessarily linked to organizational responsibility, but possibly to the fact that the two positive scenarios seem to differ on how positive each scenario is perceived. Again, this leads to the conclusion that differences in how positive a compliance gaining strategy may be, can create subtle differences in the overall perception of situations involving a supervisor and a subordinate.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This study revealed some interesting information regrading supervisor and subordinate relations and perceptions in an organizational setting. It was seen in this study that positive and negative compliance gaining strategies will make a difference in how the person using them is percieved in terms of communication competence. This study is important for future research, but first some limitations of this study must be outlined.

The first limitation would be the scenarios themselves. Each one could have been filmed more professionally with better lighting, equipment, and possibly actual actors. Also better scripts could have been developed to display more closely the actions of each person in the scenario. Gestures and facial expressions could have been enhanced to add to the realism of the scenarios. All of this could have led to more realistic scenarios and possibly yielded better and more reliable results.

The second limitation would be the number of people who participated in this study. A total of 98 people watched and evaluated the scenarios. A larger sample would have been more beneficial and this could have led to more reliable results. If this study was to be performed again, a total of at least 200 respondents would be the goal. This way results could be more reliable and possibly other statistical tests such as factor analysis could have been performed, resulting in even more data.

The third limitation would be the fact that all 98 respondents came from only one corporation. This may skew the results somewhat since they are all from one type of corporate culture, hence they may perceive the scenarios in a different fashion than another corporation. It would have been a much better idea to test at least three different companies, possibly each being a different size. Even better would be if each was in a different city in different parts of the country.

A final limitation would be that the Rater of Alter Competence (RAC) scale used was slightly modified from the original for this particular study. The original RAC scale was noted to be reliable and valid, however since the RAC scale used in this study was modified, reliability and validity measures are not available for this scale. Any future research performed using this study's modified RAC would lead to the establishment of reliability and validity measurements.

The limitations listed above are important to note, however some significant information was produced from this study that could lead to future research.

The first obvious future research that could come from this study is replication. Replicate the study using more subjects, better scenarios, and more than one company. More positive and negative scenarios could also be added, expanding the study. This would broaden the results. The only problem with adding more scenarios is the time factor. It would take more time for the subjects to view the scenarios and answer the questions pertaining to each one. If the test becomes too long, there will be a risk of people not wanting to participate in the study or they may lose interest part way through. However, replication of the study with many of the above suggestions (excluding more scenarios) could possibly provide additional support for this study's conclusions. And more replication of the modified RAC scale used in this study will establish reliability and validity measurements for the scale.

A second future research area would be to explore the finding that females were perceived at the extremes in the present study. In the two scenarios that had female supervisors, one positive and one negative, the females were either seen as more positive or more negative than the male supervisor in the other two corresponding scenarios. The implication of this result is very important to both corporate America and the field of communication.

Another area of future research could be more in depth exploration and analysis of positive compliance gaining strategies and negative compliance gaining strategies. One could look for degrees of positive or negative and examine effects of those different levels. The present study has already shown there can be a significant difference within the positive and negative compliance gaining strategies themselves. This is an area that needs further exploration.

The demographic issues examined in the present study could also be a source of future research. This research study has shown how some demographic factors may affect the perceptions of the positive compliance gaining strategies. These possible relationships need to be further explored.

A final future research suggestion is to explore other aspects of the gender issue. One study could have the compliance gaining scenarios populated entirely by same sex actors and then compare perceptions of male and female viewers. Another study could be done using only female subordinates in the scenarios. Many different scenarios can be explored dealing with gender.

If taken at face value, this research study has several important implications for organizations and for the field of communication, especially in terms of the possible link between the use of compliance gaining strategies and the user's perceived communication competence. Another important implication is that women supervisors may be perceived at the extremes in terms of positive or negative compliance gaining behaviors.

References

Bate, B. (1988). *Communication and the sexes*. Harper and Row Publishers, New York.

Berger, C. (1985). Social power and interpersonal communication. In M.L. Knapp and G.R. Miller (Eds), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 439-499). Beverly Hills, CA. Sage Publishing.

Boster, F. & Stiff, J. (1984). Compliance gaining message selection behavior. *Human Communication Research.* 10, 539-556.

Cegala, D.J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communication competence. *Communication Education,* 30, 109-121.

Cegala, D.J. & Waldron, V.R. (1992). A study of the relationship between communicative performance and conversation participants thoughts. *Communication Studies,* 43,105-123.

Chapman, M. (1991). *Perceptions of communication competencies of male and female managers*. University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Clark, R.C. (1979). The impact of self-interest and desire for liking on the selection of communication strategies. *Communication Monographs,* 49, 157-173.

Cody, M.J., Jordan, W.J., & Woelfel, M.L. (1983). Dimensions of compliance-gaining situations. *Human Communication Research,* 9, 99-113.

Dahl, R. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral Science,* 2 201-218.

de Turck, M. (1985). A transactional analysis of compliance-gaining behavior: effects of noncompliance, relational contexts, and actors' gender. *Human Communication Research,* 12, 54-78.

Dillard, J.R., (1988). Compliance-gaining message-selection: What is our dependent variable? *Communication Monographs,* 55, 162-183.

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations: on power involvement and their correlates.* New York: The Free Press.

French, J. & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group Dynamics.* (pp. 607-623). New York: Harper & Row.

Garko, M. (1990). Perspectives on and conceptualizations of compliance and compliance-gaining. *Communication Quarterly,* 38, 138-157.

Harriman, A. (1985). *Women/Men/Management.* New York, NY: Praeger.

Harper, N.L. & Hirokawa, R.Y. (1988). A comparison of persuasive strategies used by female and male managers I: and examination of downward influence. *Communication Quarterly,* 36, 157-168.

Hirokawa, R.Y., Kodama, R.A., & Harper, N.L. (1990). Impact of managerial power on persuasive strategy selection by female and male managers. *Management Communication Quarterly,* 4, 30-50.

Johnson, G.M. (1988). *Subordinate perceptions of superior's competence related to superior's use of compliance gaining tactics.* Ann Arbor, MI. University Microfilms International.

Johnson, G.M., (1992). Subordinate perceptions of superior's communication competence and task attraction related to superior's use of compliance-gaining tactics. *Western Journal of communication,* 56, 54-67.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kipnis, D. (1976). *The Powerholders.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M. & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 65, 440-452.

Littlejohn, S. (1992). *Theories of Human Communication.* Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lont, C. & Friendly, C.A. (1989). *Beyond boundaries: Sex and gender diversity in communication.* George Mason University Press, Fairfax, Virginia.

Marwell, G. & Schmitt, D. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry,* 30, 350-364.

McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. *Communication Education,* 31, 1-7.

McCroskey, J.C. (1984). Communication competence: The elusive construct. In R.N. Bostrom (Ed). Competence in communication: A multidisciplinary approach (pp. 259-268). Beverly Hills, CA. Sage.

McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports,* 5, 108-113.

McFall, R.M. (1982). A review and reformulation of the concept of social skills. *Behavioral Assessment,* 4, 1-33.

McLaughlin, M.L., Cody, M.J., & Robey, C.S. (1980). Situational influences on the selection of strategies to resist compliance-gaining attempts. *Human Communication Research,* 7, 14-36.

Miller, G., Boster, F., Roloff, M., & Seibold, D. (1977). Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. *Communication Monographs,* 44, 37-51.

Monge, P., Backman, C., Dillard, J., & Eisenberg , E. (1982). Communication competence in the work place: Model testing and scale development. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook, 5* (pp. 505-529). New Brunswick, N.J.: Tansaction.

Nielson, J. (1978). *Sex in Society*. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

O'Keefe, D., & Delia, J. (1979). Construct comprehensiveness and cognitive complexity as predictors of the number of and strategic adoption of arguments and appeals in a persuasive message. *Communication Monographs,* 46, 231-240.

Phillips, R.B. (1984). A competent view of "competence." *Communication Education,* 33, 25-36.

Podsakoff, P.M., (1982). Determinants of a supervisor's use of rewards and punishments: A literature review and suggestions for further research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 29, 58-83.

Putnam, L.L. & Fairhurst, G. (1985). Women and organizational communication: Research directions and new perspectives. *Women and Management*, 9, 2-6.

Rubin, R.B. (1982). Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. *Communication Education,* 31, 19-32.

Rubin, R.B. (1990). Communication competence. In G.M. Phillips and J.T. Wood (Eds.) Speech communication: Essays to commemorate the 75the anniversary of the Speech Communication Association (pp. 94-129). Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rubin, R.B. & Henzl, S.A. (1984). Cognitive complexity, communication competence and verbal ability. *Communication Quarterly,* 32, 263-270.

Rubin, R.B., Martin, M.M., Bruning, S.S., and Powers, D.E. (1993). Test of a Self-Efficacy model of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication Quarterly,* 41, 210-220.

Spitzberg, B.H., (1988). Communication competence: Measures of perceived effectiveness. In C.H. Tardy (Ed.), *A Handbook for the study of human communication: Methods and instruments for observing, measuring, and assessing communication processes* (pp. 67-106). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Cupach, W.R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Cupach, W.R. (1989). Handbook of interpersonal competence research. New York: Spinger-verbeg.

Spitzberg, B.H. & Hecht, M.L. (1984). A component model of relational competence. *Human Communication Research,* 10, 195-213.

Wheeless, L., Barraclough, R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. *Communication Yearbook, 7,* 105-145.

Wheeless, V.E. & Berryman-Fink, C. (1985). Perceptions of women mangers and their communicator competencies. *Communication Quarterly*, 33, 137-148.

Wiemann, J. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communication competence. *Human Communication Research,* 3, 195-213.

Wiseman, R.& Schenck-Hamlin, W. (1981). A multi-dimensional scaling and validation of an inductively derived set of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Monographs,* 48, 251-270.

Appendix A

Scenario Scripts

Scenario 1

Alex an account manager for a medium sized corporation was approached by his superior, Doug, who is the regional manager for the same company.

"Hi Alex, how are you today?"

"Great!"

"That is good to hear, because I am about to make your day even better. I was just notified that you are going to receive the award for employee of the year in the marketing department."

"Really? That is great! I am honored to be chosen."

"Yes, that is quite an honor Alex and you should be proud."

"I am very proud. Thank you for telling me."

"You are welcome. By the way, there is a new manager trainee that has just been hired and I would like you to train her. There is no increase in pay and you may have to work longer hours, but I would like you to do it. So what do you think?"

"Sure, I'll do it."

"Thanks a lot Alex. And once again congratulations."

"You are welcome and thank you.

Scenario 2

Jeff, an account manager for a local firm is approached by his supervisor Jill Brown.

"Jeff, we need to talk."

"Okay, what is it?"

"Do you remember the memo that was circulated about using the phone for personal use on company time?"

"Yes."

"Well the memo states you are not to use the phones for personal use unless it is an emergency. You have been using the phones throughout the day for personal use on company time. Either you stop this or I will put it in your personal file."

"Just for that? Using the phone?"

"Yes, Jeff. This is a company rule and you need to start obeying it and if you do not I will put it in you personal file and this will have a negative effect on your annual review, which may have an adverse effect on future pay raises and promotions. Do you understand?"

"Yes I do."

"Good, I am glad we got this cleared up."

Scenario 3

Trevor, a marketing account manager, is considered to be the best account manager in the company he works for. He has already been given an overabundant amount of responsibility, more than anyone in the department.

Mr. Tom Blake, Trevor's supervisor, approaches on a weekday morning.

"Hey Trevor how are you today?"

"Oh, pretty good."

"Trevor the company is starting a quality program and I need you to sit on the panel at least once a week. You will give suggestions and come up with proposals."

"Well Mr. Blake, I am not really interested, I am way too busy as it is now."

"Trevor I want you to sit on the panel, you can offer a lot. You are the best."

"That is fine, but I am so swamped right now. Why can't some of my other peers handle it? Why does everything get piled on me?"

"Trevor the best candidate is needed and you are that candidate."

"I understand, but I would prefer someone else take care of it."

"Listen Trevor, if you do not take this additional responsibility, people like the Vice President of the marketing department and the Senior Vice President will lose confidence in you and be less interested in you and this could cause them to forget about you when the promotions come around. So, in order to keep powerful people like that interested in you, I strongly urge you to take this on."

"Oh, all right, I will do it."

"Thanks Trevor. That is a good move."

Scenario 4

Mark is a middle level manager for a large corporation. He controls part of the Western region for the corporation and his supervisor is Karen Atkins.

Karen approaches Mark in the late afternoon on a weekday.

"Mark, could I talk to you for a minute?"

"Sure, what is it?"

"Well out area needs a couple of people to work on Thanksgiving day from 8:00 am to 1:00 PM. I was wondering if you could do this."

"To tell you the truth, Karen, I really do not want to work on a holiday."

"I realize that Mark, but we really need you."

"I know but it is a holiday and I want the day off, just like we are supposed to."

"I understand. How about a guarantee that you will receive an extra $100 and one extra day of paid vacation that can be used at any time?"

"$100 and an extra day of vacation? Really?"

"Yes, Mark we really need you."

"Okay Karen, you persuaded me. I will do it."

"Great. Thanks Mark."

"You are welcome."

Appendix B

RATER OF ALTER COMPETENCE QUESTIONNAIRES

Scenario 1
Please place a check by the **one** strategy you think **best** describes the strategy used by the supervisor.

____ ***Attributing Negative Feelings*** - Telling the other person how bad he/she will feel if there is noncompliance.

____ ***Negative Altercasting*** - Associating noncompliance with people with bad qualities.

____ ***Promising*** - Promising a reward for a compliance

____ ***Pregiving*** - Giving a reward before asking for compliance.

____ ***Positive Altercasting*** - Associating compliance with people with good qualities.

____ ***Showing Positive Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked by others if he/she complies.

____ ***Showing Negative Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked less by others if he/she does not comply.

____ ***Threatening*** - Indicating that punishment will be applied for noncompliance.

Circle your opinion to each of the following statements concerning the supervisor. (Doug).
SD = Strongly Disagree, MD = Mildly Disagree, U = Undecided, MA = Mildly Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

SD MD U MA SA 1. He was versatile

SD MD U MA SA 2. He was sympathetic

SD MD U MA SA 3. He was likable

SD MD U MA SA 4. He gave positive feedback

SD MD U MA SA 5. He was trustworthy

SD MD U MA SA 6. He was assertive

SD MD U MA SA 7. He was a good listener

SD MD U MA SA 8. He was supportive

SD MD U MA SA 9. He appeared tired and sleepy

SD MD U MA SA 10. He was awkward in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 11. He spoke too rapidly

SD MD U MA SA 12. He was confident

SD MD U MA SA 13. He ignored the subordinate's feelings

SD MD U MA SA 14. He lacked self confidence

SD MD U MA SA 15. He spoke too slowly

SD MD U MA SA 16. He could easily put himself in another person's shoes

SD MD U MA SA 17. His voice was monotone and boring

SD MD U MA SA 18. His facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained

SD MD U MA SA 19. He was adaptable

SD MD U MA SA 20. He had an accurate self-perception

SD MD U MA SA 21. He was easy to confide in

SD MD U MA SA 22. He was respectful

SD MD U MA SA 23. He understood the subordinate

SD MD U MA SA 24. He paid attention to the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 25. He was sensitive to the subordinate's needs and feelings in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 26. He was polite

SD MD U MA SA 27. He was cooperative

Scenario 2

Please place a check by the **one** strategy you think **best** describes the strategy used by the supervisor (Ms. Brown).

____ ***Attributing Negative Feelings*** - Telling the other person how bad he/she will feel if there is noncompliance.

____ ***Negative Altercasting*** - Associating noncompliance with people with bad qualities.

____ ***Promising*** - Promising a reward for a compliance

____ ***Pregiving*** - Giving a reward before asking for compliance.

____ ***Positive Altercasting*** - Associating compliance with people with good qualities.

____ ***Showing Negative Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked less by others if he/she does not comply.

____ ***Showing Positive Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked by others if he/she complies.

____ ***Threatening*** - Indicating that punishment will be applied for noncompliance.

Circle your opinion to each of the following statements concerning the supervisor.
SD = Strongly Disagree, MD = Mildly Disagree, U = Undecided, MA = Mildly Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

SD MD U MA SA 1. She was versatile

SD MD U MA SA 2. She was sympathetic

SD MD U MA SA 3. She was likable

SD MD U MA SA 4. She gave positive feedback

SD MD U MA SA 5. She was trustworthy

SD MD U MA SA 6. She was assertive

SD MD U MA SA 7. She was a good listener

SD MD U MA SA 8. She was supportive

SD MD U MA SA 9. She appeared tired and sleepy

SD MD U MA SA 10. She was awkward in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 11. She spoke too rapidly

SD MD U MA SA 12. She was confident

SD MD U MA SA 13. She ignored the subordinate's feelings

SD MD U MA SA 14. She lacked self confidence

SD MD U MA SA 15. She spoke too slowly

SD MD U MA SA 16. She could easily put herself in another person's shoes

SD MD U MA SA 17. Her voice was monotone and boring

SD MD U MA SA 18. Her facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained

SD MD U MA SA 19. She was adaptable

SD MD U MA SA 20. She had an accurate self-perception

SD MD U MA SA 21. She was easy to confide in

SD MD U MA SA 22. She was respectful

SD MD U MA SA 23. She understood the subordinate

SD MD U MA SA 24. She paid attention to the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 25. She was sensitive to the subordinate's needs and feelings in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 26. She was polite

SD MD U MA SA 27. She was cooperative

Scenario 3

Please place a check by the **one** strategy you think **best** describes the strategy used by the supervisor (Mr. Blake).

____ ***Attributing Negative Feelings*** - Telling the other person how bad he/she will feel if there is noncompliance.

____ ***Negative Altercasting*** - Associating noncompliance with people with bad qualities.

____ ***Promising*** - Promising a reward for a compliance

____ ***Pregiving*** - Giving a reward before asking for compliance.

____ ***Positive Altercasting*** - Associating compliance with people with good qualities.

____ ***Showing Negative Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked less by others if he/she does not comply.

____ ***Showing Positive Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked by others if he/she complies.

____ ***Threatening*** - Indicating that punishment will be applied for noncompliance.

Circle your opinion to each of the following statements concerning the supervisor.
SD = Strongly Disagree, MD = Mildly Agree, U = Undecided, MA = Mildly Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

SD MD U MA SA 1. He was versatile

SD MD U MA SA 2. He was sympathetic

SD MD U MA SA 3. He was likable

SD MD U MA SA 4. He gave positive feedback

SD MD U MA SA 5. He was trustworthy

SD MD U MA SA 6. He was assertive

SD MD U MA SA 7. He was a good listener

SD MD U MA SA 8. He was supportive

SD MD U MA SA 9. He appeared tired and sleepy

SD MD U MA SA 10. He was awkward in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 11. He spoke too rapidly

SD MD U MA SA 12. He was confident

SD MD U MA SA 13. He ignored the subordinate's feelings

SD MD U MA SA 14. He lacked self confidence

SD MD U MA SA 15. He spoke too slowly

SD MD U MA SA 16. He could easily put himself in another person's shoes

SD MD U MA SA 17. His voice was monotone and boring

SD MD U MA SA 18. His facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained

SD MD U MA SA 19. He was adaptable

SD MD U MA SA 20. He had an accurate self-perception

SD MD U MA SA 21. He was easy to confide in

SD MD U MA SA 22. He was respectful

SD MD U MA SA 23. He understood the subordinate

SD MD U MA SA 24. He paid attention to the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 25. He was sensitive to the subordinate's needs and feelings in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 26. He was polite

SD MD U MA SA 27. He was cooperative

Scenario 4

Please place a check by the one strategy you think best describes the strategy used by the supervisor (Mrs. Atkins).

____ ***Attributing Negative Feelings*** - Telling the other person how bad he/she will feel if there is noncompliance.

____ ***Negative Altercasting*** - Associating noncompliance with people with bad qualities.

____ ***Promising*** - Promising a reward for a compliance

____ ***Pregiving*** - Giving a reward before asking for compliance.

____ ***Positive Altercasting*** - Associating compliance with people with good qualities

____***Showing Negative Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked less by others if he/she does not comply.

____ ***Showing Positive Esteem*** - Saying that the person will be liked by others if he/she complies.

____ ***Threatening*** - Indicating that punishment will be applied for noncompliance.

Circle your opinion to each of the following statements concerning the supervisor.
SD = Strongly Disagree, MD = Mildly Agree, U = Undecided, MA = Mildly Agree, SA = Strongly Agree.

SD MD U MA SA 1. She was versatile

SD MD U MA SA 2. She was sympathetic

SD MD U MA SA 3. She was likable

SD MD U MA SA 4. She gave positive feedback

SD MD U MA SA 5. She was trustworthy

SD MD U MA SA 6. She was assertive

SD MD U MA SA 7. She was a good listener

SD MD U MA SA 8. She was supportive

SD MD U MA SA 9. She appeared tired and sleepy

SD MD U MA SA 10. She was awkward in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 11. She spoke too rapidly

SD MD U MA SA 12. She was confident

SD MD U MA SA 13. She ignored the subordinate's feelings

SD MD U MA SA 14. She lacked self confidence

SD MD U MA SA 15. She spoke too slowly

SD MD U MA SA 16. She could easily put herself in another person's shoes

SD MD U MA SA 17. Her voice was monotone and boring

SD MD U MA SA 18. Her facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained

SD MD U MA SA 19. She was adaptable

SD MD U MA SA 20. She had an accurate self-perception

SD MD U MA SA 21. She was easy to confide in

SD MD U MA SA 22. She was respectful

SD MD U MA SA 23. She understood the subordinate

SD MD U MA SA 24. She paid attention to the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 25. She was sensitive to the subordinate's needs and feelings in the conversation

SD MD U MA SA 26. She was polite

SD MD U MA SA 27. She was cooperative

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions by placing a check in the blank in front of the responses that describe you.

____ Male ____ Female

Age

____ Below 20

____ 21-25

____ 26-30

____ 31-35

____ 36-40

____ 41-45

____ 46-50

____ Over 50

In your job, you are classified as;

____ Customer Service Representative

____ Customer Service Manager

____ Secretary

____ Human Resource Representative

____ Marketing Representative

____ Sales Representative

____ District Manager

____ Regional Manager

____ Human Resource Manager

____ Marketing Manager

____ Other (please specify) _____

Do you have organizational responsibility for one or more subordinates?

____ Yes ____ No