

MANAGERIAL STYLES AND COMMUNICATION SENSITIVITY

By

LARRY PAUL GLIDEWELL

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS  
May, 1975

Thesis

1975

G 559m

cop. 2

SEP 12 1975

MANAGERIAL STYLES AND COMMUNICATION SENSITIVITY

Thesis Approved:

*Ailee Johnson*

Thesis Adviser

*Paul Harper*

*Burchard Carr*

*N N Burton*

Dean of the Graduate College

916317

## PREFACE

This study is concerned with discovering the relationship between managerial style and communication sensitivity. Assumptions about managerial styles and sensitivity contained in the literature are explored and tested. A correlation study was run to determine relationships between selection of styles and sensitivity. Data gathered from 279 managers was subjected to analysis of variance and paired comparison of means.

The author wishes to thank his committee members, Dr. Arlee W. Johnson, Dr. Fred Tewell, and Dr. Paul Harper. Special and sincere gratitude is due Dr. Arlee Johnson for his unselfish expenditure of time, patience, and assistance throughout this study.

This study would not have been possible without the cooperation, understanding, and encouragement of Mr. F. Lee Hayden. Because of his faith, commitment and liberal donation of time, this study was completed.

A note of thanks is also due Dr. Bill Warde for his invaluable assistance with the statistical analysis portion of this study.

Mrs. Vicki Maxwell's help in proofreading the draft, and Mrs. Anna Gleason's work and expertise in preparing the final manuscript is gratefully acknowledged.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	1
McGregor's Theory XY . . . . .	2
Research on Theory XY . . . . .	4
Blake and Mouton's Grid Theory . . . . .	5
Task Management 9,1 . . . . .	7
Country Club Management 1,9 . . . . .	7
Impoverished Management 1,1 . . . . .	7
Middle of the Road 5,5 . . . . .	8
Team Management 9,9 . . . . .	8
Grid Research . . . . .	10
Communication Sensitivity and Management Style . . . . .	12
The Problem and Hypotheses . . . . .	15
II. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	17
Research Design . . . . .	17
Research Environment . . . . .	18
The Sample . . . . .	19
Research Variables . . . . .	20
Communication Sensitivity . . . . .	20
McGregor's Theory X - Y . . . . .	21
Blake and Mouton's Grid . . . . .	22
Limitations . . . . .	25
III. RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	27
Statistical Approach . . . . .	27
Findings . . . . .	28
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	29
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	30
Discussion . . . . .	37
Implications for Further Research . . . . .	39
Summary . . . . .	40
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	41
APPENDIX A - COMMUNICATION SELF-REPORT INVENTORY . . . . .	44
APPENDIX B - THEORY XY MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT . . . . .	49
APPENDIX C - MANAGERIAL GRID ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT . . . . .	54

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of XY Acceptance . . . . .	29
II. Paired Comparison of Means for Each XY Quartile . . . . .	30
III. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of 9,9 Acceptance . . . . .	31
IV. Paired Comparison of Means for Each 9,9 Quartile . . . . .	32
V. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of 5,5 Acceptance . . . . .	32
VI. Paired Comparison of Means for Each 5,5 Quartile . . . . .	33
VII. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of 9,1 Acceptance . . . . .	34
VIII. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of 1,9 Acceptance . . . . .	34
IX. Anova Comparing CSRI Scores for Subjects at Varying Levels of 1,1 Acceptance . . . . .	35
X. Paired Comparison of Means for Each 1,1 Quartile . . . . .	35
XI. Correlation of XY Scores and Grid Position Acceptance . . . . .	36

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the dawn of the professional manager, there has been a great deal of controversy concerning what makes a manager effective. In the 1950's many theorists endeavored to identify the personality traits of the "ideal executive." This position presupposes an "executive type." Robert L. Katz (1) recognized the trend in the literature at that time of attempting to identify an executive type:

The assumption that there is an executive type is widely accepted, either openly or implicitly. Yet an executive presumably knows that a company has all kinds of managers for different levels of jobs. The qualities most needed by a shop superintendent are likely to be quite opposed to those needed by a coordinating vice president of manufacturing. The literature of executive development is loaded with efforts to define the qualities needed by executives and by themselves these sound quite rational (p. 90).

What determines an "executive type?" Greiner (2) has identified two schools of thought on the factors that determine a person's effectiveness in the executive role; the "actor" school of thought and the "born-leader" school. The actor school believes that managers are able to "exercise conscious, rational control over their own behavior and to adapt continuously to new cues and role demands placed on them by their organization." The "born-leader" school on the other hand, advocates that:

. . . a leader's style is deeply rooted in his or her personality, which in turn is a complex product of genetic inheritance and the maturation process . . . a highly individualistic, often unconscious, pattern of acting out ingrained values, conflicts, and attitudes acquired over many years (p. 111).

These two schools of thought are in direct conflict. They each comment on the probability of success of management development programs, and predictive aids in selecting an effective leader. Even though they oppose each other on most points and can cite research evidence in support of their own position, they do agree, as Greiner (2) points out:

. . . that knowing more about a manager's assumptions concerning leadership style is vitally important. Every manager carries around in his head certain 'rules of thumb' that guide his behavior in leadership situations (p. 111).

#### McGregor's Theory X-Y

Perhaps the best known and most widely accepted theorist who has explored managerial assumptions is Douglas McGregor (3). He contends:

Behind every managerial decision or action are assumptions about human nature and human behavior. A few of these are remarkably pervasive. They are implicit in most of the literature of organization and in much current managerial policy and practice (p. 5).

McGregor divides these assumptions that managers hold into two sets: Theory X and Theory Y. The managerial assumptions of Theory X are:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike for work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.



3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all (pp. 33-34).

This suggests that managers do not recognize the existence of potential in people and therefore, there is no reason to devote time, effort, and money in discovering how to realize their full potential. The central principle of Theory X is that of direction and control through exercise of authority. It is further implied that employees will accept external direction and control in return for rewards offered the individual through the organizational structure.

The set of assumptions that McGregor (3) has identified for Theory Y are:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means of bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-control and self-direction in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept but also to seek responsibility.
5. The capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized (pp. 47-48).

The key word in Theory Y is integration. The objectives of the organization are best achieved when they are adjusted to the needs and goals of the individual members. The assumptions of Theory Y are dynamic rather than static and suggest that the individual and the organization both prosper through the integration of their goals.

McGregor's (3) theoretical model has been widely accepted. However, it has also been criticized for its lack of empirical support (4). Some, viewing McGregor's model as not including some important variables have attempted to amend his theory (4) (5).

#### Research on Theory X-Y

Studies designed to test the applicability of McGregor's theories include one by Edward Duke (6). He observed one department that for two years was supervised by a Theory X manager followed by two years of supervision by a Theory Y manager. He identified the managers' differing styles by saying "The first manager (Theory X) was 'by-the-book' and unitary, while the second (Theory Y) was participative and creative" (p. 33). In measuring the output of the department during each man's reign he found that the "Y" manager increased the output by 14 per cent while decreasing overtime by 50 per cent. This was, of course, an isolated case. There was no control for extraneous variables (through sample selection or control groups) and no operational definitions for Theory X or Y (neither managers' attitudes or assumptions were assessed).

Louis Allen (4) criticized McGregor's (3) lack of "acceptable scientific evidence that participation in decision making influences productivity or that friendly, relaxed leadership is most effective in getting results" (p. 32). He conducted a survey among 259 middle and upper-level managers to determine their attitudes in relation to the human values central to the Theory X-Y controversy. He concludes:

Far from being insensitive, managers today are both perceptive and realistic about other people. Most do not subscribe to the simplistic, black-or-white extremes of Theory X-Y; rather they believe that both people and situations vary, and that management action must vary with them (p. 33).

The two outstanding criticisms of McGregor's (3) theories are that (A) it is too rigid and excludes other important variables, and (B) there is no evidence that these assumptions actually have an impact upon behavior. Chris Argyris (7) has stated:

A company president may be genuinely committed to Theory Y, but either unwilling or unable to pattern his own behavior accordingly. This problem must be carefully analyzed and eliminated before the gap between theory and behavior undermines the real progress that has been made (p. 55).

#### Blake and Mouton's Grid Theory

The controversy over the relationship between assumptions and behavior led to the development of a behavioral approach toward examining managerial styles and effectiveness. Expanding on the linear continuum concept of McGregor, Robert R. Blake and Jame S. Mouton developed the Managerial Grid (8) as a framework for integrating assumptions and their correlate behaviors. Their model presents seven styles (five distinct styles and two combination styles) of management organized on a grid defined by two axis. The two axis represent degrees of the two interacting variables of the model: (1) concern for people and (2) concern for production. Each axis appears as a nine-point scale with the value "one" representing minimum concern and the "nine" value, maximum concern. Blake and Mouton define production as "whatever it is that organizations engage people to accomplish" (p. 7). Concern for production:

. . . may be seen in the quality of policy decisions, the number of creative ideas that applied research turns into useful products, procedures or processes (pp. 8-9).

Concern for people is expressed through "personal commitment to completing a job . . . accountability based on trust rather than obedience . . . social relations or friendships with associates, etc." (pp. 8-9). McCallister (9) illustrates the concept of "concern for people" with Dr. Blake's story of a supervisor inspecting a tank farm two days before Thanksgiving:

While he was peering down into one of the tanks, his dentures fell out and sank to the bottom. Frantic, he told his boss that he was expecting all his relatives down for the holiday and that he'd be horribly embarrassed, let alone hungry, without any teeth. His sympathetic supervisor drained the tank. A subsequent study showed that considering all the back-up effects of this action, the decision cost the company \$225,000. This is an adequate expression of concern for people (p. 83).

Blake and Mouton (8) are cautious to point out that the five major styles they describe should not be construed as "personality types." They describe the styles as resulting from pressures arising from (A) inside the manager, (B) the immediate external situation, and (C) characteristics of the organizational system including traditional established practices and procedures. They conclude that a style is "a dominant set of assumptions which orient a manager's thinking and behavior" (p. 12). Hence, to McGregor's (3) Theory X-Y they have added the element of observable behavior for the assumptions believed to elicit such behavior.

Of particular interest here are the behaviors associated with each style. The following is Blake and Mouton's (8) description of each managerial position and a summary of the communication behaviors

pertaining to that style.

#### Task Management 9,1

Primary concern here is for the output of the enterprise. People are viewed solely in terms of their contribution to production. Communication is characterized as primarily downward for the purpose of dispensing orders and controlling. Upward communication is limited to reporting results. Two-way communication is disregarded. This manager's approach to conflict is to deal with it promptly before it disrupts production. Direct interpersonal conflict is viewed from a win-lose framework.

#### Country Club Management 1,9

Production is incidental to satisfaction through social relations and good fellowship. The manager's goal is to achieve harmony even though needs for output may suffer as a result. Informal rather than formal communication is emphasized. Negativism is discouraged. Communication upward is positive. Just as disagreement, rejection and frustration are avoided, positive, harmonious relations are sought. Antagonism is not expressed directly, but a third party is utilized. His method of dealing with conflict is to do anything to maintain harmony.

#### Impoverished Management 1,1

This manager gives minimal performance, just enough to satisfy to lowest standards. He disregards equally concern for production or people. His communicative pattern is characterized by isolationism.

The minimal objective of communication becomes knowing the message he is expected to communicate to his subordinates, and to communicate it so that any subsequent criticism does not involve him. He does not attempt to express his thoughts or feelings, and is passive, non-responsive and uninvolved. Avoidance characterizes his response to conflict.

#### Middle of the Road 5,5

This management style is one of compromise. Although equal attention is given to both concerns for people and production, most time is spent to insure that one does not block attainment of the other. Equal weight is given to formal and informal communication. The informal lines are watched closely for information about morale, satisfaction, union-management relations, etc. No dissonance-raising information is released through the formal channel unless people are preconditioned and prepared. Conflict is not confronted head-on, which might impose a win-lose structure to the situation. In a compromise everyone must win a little.

#### Team Management 9,9

In team management the goals of the individual are integrated with those of the organization. Planning, problem-solving, and decision-making are accomplished through group meetings in which all have an equal voice. The 9,9 manager views communication problems as problems of understanding between people. Communication is two-way, seeking equality in input and output. Openness, trust, and leveling are stressed. Conflict is accepted as inevitable, but it has good and bad

outcomes. Confrontation is the team manager's direct approach for dealing with inter/intra-group conflict.

Concerning the use of various styles, Blake and Mouton (8) do not believe that any manager ever uses only one style all the time. They propose that:

. . . each constitutes an alternative way of thinking. Each can be applied for analyzing how a given situation is being or might be managed. Each of the theories in actual practice is found, to some degree, in concrete situations in industrial and government organizations. Equally the kinds of assumptions to be described are universal and, in a certain sense, common throughout various cultures. But the important point here is that when a manager confronts a situation in which work is to be accomplished through people, there are, indeed, a range of alternative ways for him to go about supervising. To increase his managerial competence he needs to know them and to be able to select the best course of action for any given situation from among a number of possibilities (p. 11).

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (10) also offer this "free choice" from a wide range of leadership patterns as the most practical style for a manager. In their model of management, managers (and non-managers) are free to choose from a range of behaviors along a continuum (much like McGregor's (3) within the constraints of the organizational environment and the societal environment). Blake and Mouton (8) also allow for these restraining and defining environments to affect their Grid Model. They state:

Managerial behavior frequently is determined by situational factors such as the organization in which a person operates . . . . When organizational practices are so fixed or rigid as to permit only small variations in individual behavior, the managerial style exhibited may reflect little of a man's personal thinking and much of his organizational beliefs about 'the right way to manage' (p. 13).

Thus, we may infer that organizational styles and patterns would differ for an individual within a different organizational setting. A different setting could be the result of a transfer to a totally different group of people with different objectives and personalities, or the result of a change affecting the original organization. Blake and Mouton (8) believe that environmental change which supports the individual's change in management style may be introduced through classes exploring the concepts and use of the Grid.

### Grid Research

Blake and Mouton (8) have conducted training seminars in applying Grid concepts for organizational development in many major corporations. The first effort to research the impact of this training was conducted by Louis B. Barnes and Larry E. Greiner (11). Their report evaluating the outcome of Blake and Mouton's training for 800 management and technical personnel in the Baytown, Texas plant of Humble Oil and Refining Company in 1963 measured changes in three areas: productivity and profits, practices and behavior, and attitudes and values. The results of the evaluation indicated overall improvement toward the indicated plant objectives in all three areas.

Of particular interest to this researcher were the changes reported for practices and procedure. Managers reported spending 12.4 per cent more time in meetings doing "team problem solving." Furthermore, their employees described them as being "more accessible." In the area of attitudes and values, Barnes and Greiner (11) reported "changes were directly in line with the 9,9 concepts introduced" (pp. 147-149) during the training. This evaluation, however, did not use a pre-test,



post-test design. An ex post facto design that allowed for little control of extraneous variables was used. The changes they reported were measured one year after the Grid laboratories were conducted, two years after the consultant first entered the organization. One might seriously question whether the Grid training was the only or even a major variable influencing the results.

In 1973 Greiner (2) surveyed 318 executives in areas ranging from general management (50 per cent), finance (17 per cent), and marketing (11 per cent). All of the executives were attending management education programs at Harvard Business School. In the survey he attempted

- A. to discover what managers consider to be the concrete characteristic of participative leadership, and
- B. to determine whether they think such a style leads to effective results (p. 115).

He found high agreement on what participative management is:

. . . including one's subordinates in the decision-making process . . . maintain free-flowing and honest communication . . . remains easily accessible . . . stresses development of his subordinates . . . expresses consideration and support . . . is willing to change (p. 114).

In determining what gets results seven of the top ten effective actions listed above were also chosen as those that get results. Greiner (2) summarized his findings:

. . . the executives in this study (are in) concensus on the specific characteristics that comprise a participative style but also general agreement that certain participative leadership characteristics produce more effective results. For the managers whose opinions are represented here, participative leadership appears to be a sound concept, but only if presented as a general model within which individual leaders can exhibit a variety of actions to satisfy different personal and career needs (117).

From the research cited, there does appear to be practical application of both McGregor's (3) and Blake and Mouton's (8) theories. There are strong indications that these theories, if put into practice, do produce more efficient, productive, and satisfying environments. The nature of the research cited, however, does point out that further inquiry is needed to improve the implementation of these theories in real, on-going situations.

### Communication Sensitivity and Management Style

One key element in both McGregor's and Blake and Mouton's Models of effective management is the manager's ability to communicate. Thomas A. Mahoney (12) in assessing predictors of managerial effectiveness stresses the role that communication, especially empathic communication, plays in management:

The manager accomplishes the objectives of his position through the direction and coordination of the efforts of others, a task which calls for communication . . . . Empathic ability--the ability to predict and understand the reactions of others to various ideas and situations--is mentioned frequently in theories of management potential. It is argued that the successful leader must know and understand the feelings and attitudes of his followers, and must use this knowledge in shaping programs and directives to enlist the support of followers (p. 385).

One of the frequent references discussed by Mahoney appeared in an article by Bruce Harriman (13) in which he cites the effect of the lack of communication sensitivity:

One of the privileges of power is the privilege of insensitivity to the negative attitudes of others. If managers are aware of their insensitivity they can improve their job performance in direct proportion to the degree that they receive and respond to upward communication (p. 143).

In a classic article on the "Skills of an Effective Administrator" Robert Katz (1) identifies three inter-related skills that a manager must have to be effective: technical, conceptual, and human skills. In discussing what he determines is the most important of the three, human skills, he says:

The person with highly developed human skill is aware of his own attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs about other individuals and groups; he is able to see the usefulness and limitations of these feelings. By accepting the existence of viewpoints, perceptions, and beliefs which are different from his own, he is skilled in understanding what others really mean by their words and behavior. He is equally skillful in communicating with others in their own contexts what he means by his behavior.

Such a person works to create an atmosphere of approval and security in which subordinates feel free to express themselves without fear of censure or ridicule by encouraging them to participate in the planning and carrying out of those things which directly affect them. He is sufficiently sensitive to the needs and motivations of others in his organization so that he can judge the possible reactions to, and outcomes of various courses of action he may undertake. Having this sensitivity, he is able and willing to act in a way which takes these perceptions by others into account (pp. 91-93).

The vital link between Grid management style and communication patterns has already been emphasized. As much space as Blake and Mouton (8) devoted to describing communicative behavior of the different styles, however, little attention was paid to the change in the styles of the Humble managers in the Barnes and Greiner (11) study, other than time spent in meetings. The empathic skill that Mahoney (12) has described, that Blake and Mouton (8) attribute to the "Team Manager," and that appears in the effective managers' inventory of skills proposed by Katz (1), would appear to be a neglected area in testing the models of effective management. Mahoney (12) describes attempts at measuring communication empathy:

Various attempts have been made to measure empathy and measure the relationship between these measures and managerial effectiveness. Thus far, these attempts have had little success, either because the measures developed are not truly measuring empathic ability, or because empathy is not important in the prediction of managerial effectiveness (p. 256).

What, then, is sensitive versus non-sensitive communication?

Assuming that sensitivity is as important a factor in management as the theorists have indicated, one cannot train managers to be more sensitive communicators without first defining that behavior in a measurable form. Henry Clay Smith (14) comments on this problem:

Goals without measures of goal achievement are of dubious worth. Without measures we cannot select those who need training most, design programs to enhance goal achievement, give trainees knowledge of the progress they are making, or evaluate the effectiveness of training (p. 3).

Toward defining effective communication, Rogers and Rothlisberger (15) in their famous article "Barriers and Gateways to Communication" identified two patterns of interpersonal communication. The first, non-sensitive, pattern describes communication failure resulting from not accepting information as being "fact, true or valid." The goal of this pattern is to seek congruity between "opinions, ideas, facts, or information." The second, sensitive, pattern attributes faulty communication to an inhibition to express feelings or differences that may not be accepted.

Neal (16) defined sensitivity in terms of the second pattern above. He says a sensitive communicator displays a pattern of interaction characterized by acceptance, trust, empathy, flexibility, concern for others, and a non-verbal orientation. Henry Clay Smith (14) has defined sensitivity as "the ability to predict what an individual will feel, say, and do about you, yourself, and others" (p. 25).

Hughey and Johnson (17) describe communication sensitivity as the ability to "take into account . . . size up . . . (and) evoke an appropriate response" (p. 382). They cite the following as being supported by existing research:

1. The communication attitudes and behaviors self-disclosed by more sensitive communicators differ from the characteristics self-disclosed by less sensitive communicators.
2. People possessing more sensitive patterns of communication are better able to predict how others will respond in various situations than those possessing less sensitive patterns of communication.
3. People participating in communication encounters with more sensitive communicators report that they receive more satisfaction from the encounters than people participating in encounters with less sensitive communicators (p. 383).

Robert Hall (18) in researching the relationship between the Transactional Analysis (ego gram) model, communication sensitivity and managerial decision-maker types, concluded that a "sensitive communicator does actually perform certain managerial functions (decision making) more effectively" (p. 24). He recommended sensitivity training for managers as a tool to reduce grievances and turnover.

#### The Problem and Hypotheses

In reviewing the theories and research present in the existing literature, it appears that there is a strong relationship between effective managerial styles and communication sensitivity. The Theory X manager was described as authoritative while the Theory Y manager was labelled participative. Theories X and Y, respectively, seem to be well correlated to Rogers and Rothlisberger (15) two communication patterns. The Y manager could be expected to display more sensitive behavior than a manager holding the assumptions of

Theory X. Also, two Grid styles are described by Blake and Mouton (8) that appear to differ from the others in terms of their communication patterns. The communicative styles of the Country Club and Team Managers are described expressing a high concern for people. The Team manager, especially, is characterized as seeking an understanding between people, and striving for openness, trust and leveling (8). These descriptions include elements communication theorists and researchers have attributed to sensitive communicators. The research problem that this study is concerned with, then, is "What is the relationship between communication sensitivity and managerial styles?"

In order to answer the question, the following hypotheses are forwarded:

1. Managers with a strong Theory Y tendency will be significantly more sensitive communicators than managers that have a strong Theory X tendency.
2. Managers with a strong 9,9 pattern and/or a strong 1,9 pattern will be more sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles, and managers with strong 1,1; 5,5; and 9,1 patterns will be significantly less sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research procedures followed for this study. The research design, sample, variables, research environment and limitations of the study will be discussed.

#### Research Design

The research design used in this study can best be described as a correlational design. Runkel and McGrath (19) discuss the risk involved with this design. Even though two variables covary, there may be no causal relationship. A third variable, not considered in the study, may be the causal agent that brings about the covariation. In short, one can never be sure that the relationship between two variables is a result of one of the variables affecting the other.

This research design was chosen for this study because of its advantage in studying real and ongoing situations. The manipulation of these variables in a laboratory setting would be difficult because of their presumed inherent non-manipulative quality. Thus, the decision was made to study the variables as found in a natural environment opposed to manipulating them in a laboratory setting.

### Research Environment

Subjects' responses to the measuring instruments were obtained during a four to six hour instructional module on management styles. This module was a portion of management related courses conducted by the Department of Short Courses, University of Oklahoma. All three instruments were administered at the same time early in the course module after a rationale and explanation were given. The instructors for the courses explained that it was necessary for the participants to fill out the questionnaires dealing with management styles so they would be able to discover where their own style fit into the two models to be discussed and studied in the module. The third instrument, they were told, was necessary because of research being done at the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education that would have a bearing upon future content for this and other courses. All instruments were administered before any discussion of the theories. It was assumed that the participants were not familiar with any of the theories prior to this time.

Participants for this study came from two groups. The larger group was sampled during training on appraisal interviewing and management conducted for the City of Tulsa. The course was held for city personnel at the Civic Center, December 2 through 9, 1974. The second group was sampled at the Farmers Home Administration, U.S.D.A. National Training Center, Norman, Oklahoma, between September, 1974 and January, 1975.

The FHA Training Center is a resident instruction facility used for a variety of employee training courses. The courses are facilitated for groups of up to thirty people. Three separate courses for



three different groups may be conducted simultaneously in the Center. Integrated facilities are provided for living, learning, and administrative functions. Participants are flown to the Center for each week of the two-week program (usually offered twice a month) as an in-service requirement by the Civil Service Commission. All subjects used for this study were attending a supervisory development course. They completed the measurement instruments used for this study early in the first week of the course.

The courses for the City of Tulsa were conducted at the request of the Personnel Department to aid in the implementation of a new performance evaluation and counseling program. The 12-hour training course developed by the Department of Short Courses was tailored to equip managers to implement the program. The management module was included to aid the managers and supervisors in determining where this program would fit into their own management style. The two other, four-hour modules dealt with "Determining Behavior Appropriate for Appraisal," and "Appraisal Interviewing Techniques." Elected officials and department heads in the various departments throughout the City of Tulsa were requested to attend the training sessions by the City's Training Director with authorization of the City's Board of Commissioners.

#### The Sample

Two hundred seventy-nine managers were sampled. The sample included forty-five County Supervisors with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farmers Home Administration. These subjects, all male, represented counties in 23 states and one territory. The remaining

234 subjects were City of Tulsa personnel. Of these, 145 non-uniformed managers and supervisors ranging from City Commissioners to upper and mid-level administrative management to first line supervisors in all departments (water, sewer, streets, airport, maintenance, refuse, parks, etc.). The rest of the 234 City of Tulsa employees consisted of uniformed and plainclothed police supervisors, and uniformed fire supervisors. The subjects in this study were evenly distributed along a normal adult employment age range.

### Research Variables

#### Communication Sensitivity

The variable of communication sensitivity was measured by the Communication Self-Report Inventory (CSRI) (see Appendix A). Neal (16) suggests on page 14 that the CSRI is the only known self-report inventory for communication sensitivity. It was designed to measure the sensitivity of an individual in both communicator and communicatee roles.

The CSRI was constructed from responses of over 100 people asked to characterize the behavior of sensitive communicators (16). The items that were determined to be based on theories of sensitive communication were then submitted to 100 judges to determine face validity. The same items were also rated by separate judges on social desirability. Surviving statements were arranged in a forced-choice format, and submitted to item analysis. The current CSRI used in this study has 20 such forced-choice items (see Appendix A).

According to Hall (18) the CSRI form used in this study has a Kuder-Richardson -20 reliability estimate of .80 with speech students at Oklahoma State University. Roberts (20) reports that the instrument has predictive validity in that high-insight individuals attain significantly higher CSRI scores than low-insight individuals. Neal (16) found that individuals with high CSRI scores also scored high on a test of non-verbal perception while individuals with low scores did not. Neal also found that the CSRI has concurrent validity with demographic, personality and nonverbal inventories. These studies indicate that the CSRI does correlate with actual behavior in their respective situations and has some predictive ability in doing so.

#### McGregor's Theory X - Y

Tendency toward holding beliefs associated with Theory X or Theory Y was measured by the "Managerial Attitudes" instrument. This instrument was designed by Robert N. Ford for in-house consulting and training at American Telephone and Telegraph (see Appendix B). Pfeiffer and Jones (21) report that the current ten-item instrument has been reduced from a longer scale. The items were selected on the basis of their application to a wide variety of training enterprises. This instrument has been used extensively by consultants and trainers at the University of Oklahoma. The participant responds to ten questions describing behaviors a manager could use in relation to subordinates. For each of the ten behaviors the respondent indicates one of four choices describing what effort he would make in accomplishing or avoiding that particular behavior.

Each behavior is taken from McGregor's (3) dual management theory

model. Answers are coded in a flip-flop pattern either 1, 2, 3, 4 or 4, 3, 2, 1 in value corresponding to the theory they represent (see Appendix B). The total score is expressed in terms of a number within a 10 to 40 range. The X - Y continuum accompanying the instrument is calibrated in increments of 10, with 10 representing strong Theory X tendency, and 40 representing strong Theory Y tendency.

The instrument is considered to have face validity. The items have been examined by 10 management trainers in the Department of Short Courses, Business and Industrial Services, Health Studies, and Advanced Studies, at the University of Oklahoma. They all indicated that the instrument was valid. Fisher (22) estimates that 10,000 government employees of supervisory and managerial rank from all levels of government have taken both this instrument and the Grid instrument (to be discussed) as of 1973. Most of those individuals were employees of the U. S. Postal Service, Farmers Home Administration, U. S. Army, Air Force, and Navy, and several from local governments.

#### Blake and Mouton's Grid

The variable of Grid positions was measured by the Grid Analysis instrument developed by E. W. Mumma after Blake and Mouton's (8) Grid instrument published in Chapter I of The Managerial Grid (see Appendix C). Mumma originally presented this instrument in an exercise conducted at the Twenty-fourth Conference, Texas Personnel and Management Association.

Blake and Mouton (8) identified six key elements related to Grid positions. They are: Decisions, Conviction, Conflict, Emotions (Temper), Humor, and Effort. Their self analysis instrument presented

two parts, Managerial Styles and Elements. A paragraph describing each one of the five major managerial styles (discussed in Chapter I of this thesis) is given, and the respondent is asked to rank order the paragraphs from most to least typical, one being the most typical, five the least typical. Each element is followed by five sentences which represent the attitude of the five major Grid positions. In Chapter X of The Managerial Grid Blake and Mouton (8) present instructions for comparing rankings with statistical data provided concerning the career accomplishments of 716 managers examined and their managerial styles. Comparison is invited with the styles of those managers Mouton identified as demonstrating high "career accomplishment." Career accomplishment is measured by the "Managerial Achievement Quotient" (MAQ). The MAQ reflects an individual's age, position (level) in his organization, length of time within that organization, combined in a weighted formula that yields a single number between one and one hundred. This number allows all managers to be compared on the basis of their relative advancement. Mouton (8) compared the 716 manager's MAQ with their managerial style and found that "the greater an individual's career accomplishment, the more likely his style of approach is 9,9 and 9,1, and the less likely his approach 5,5 or 1,9" (p. 55).

Fisher (22, pp. 23-24) found that the revised (Mumma) self-analysis instrument used in the current study examined the attitude of the respondent concerning five major concepts: (1) responsibility, (2) decisions, (3) conflict with superiors or peers, (4) conflict with subordinates, and (5) dealing with creativity among workers. The original self-analysis exercise elements have undergone the following

changes:

1. "Decisions" is still present with modest revision of the wording of the five alternatives.
2. "Convictions" has been exchanged for "Conflict with Superiors or Peers," but the intent of the five alternatives are essentially the same.
3. "Conflict" has been modified to indicate "Conflict with Subordinates" only.
4. "Emotions (Temper)" has been omitted.
5. "Humor" has been omitted.
6. "Effort" has been omitted.
7. "Responsibility" has been added.
8. "Dealing with Creativity" has been added.

The main advantage in this revised instrument is that the respondent is able to graph his own scores in order to see which styles he accepts, which styles he rejects, and to what degree or extent.

Fisher (22) points out the disadvantage of this instrument is that it is very possible to score his instrument incorrectly because of the complicated procedure of transposing and coding the original answers to the scoring sheet and adding both positive and negative integers together to obtain a score. This was compensated for in this study by performing an arithmetical check on all scores figures by participants. Those not totalling zero were discarded and not included in this study.

### Limitations

All three instruments used in this study are self-report instruments which require the respondent to make a judgement about himself. Several studies support the reliability and validity of self-report tests (23), (24), (25), (26), (20), (27), (28). Cronback (23) states that honesty and objectivity are the two greatest obstacles to effective self-report instruments. Also, people might respond on the basis of social desirability rather than on the basis of their own attitudes or behavior. It should be noted that the CSRI has equally weighted distractors on social desirability.

All instruments also contain forced choice items. Kerlinger (29) states that forced choice items allow the researcher to overcome to an extent the response set and social desirability difficulties of objective measurement methods.

As was discussed previously, certain limitations of this study stem from the research design chosen. Even if there is covariance indicated, a causal relationship cannot be assumed.

Because intact groups were used in the training situations there is difficulty in generalizing from the groups sampled to the general population. The groups were formed for reasons other than research. They do not represent a random or selected sample.

The subjects were sampled during a training session removed from their day-to-day locations and activities. This may have a bearing upon the quality of the subjects' responses.

Despite the limitations indicated, the study did allow for the inobstrusive observation of a large number of managers in a more

natural setting than a laboratory. The use of the instruments selected allowed many different instructors to sample different groups. They also allowed the course participants to quickly assess their own managerial styles for training purposes. The advantages of the compromises in research design and methodology used for this study were judged to outweigh the disadvantages.



## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis. The statistical approach and analysis used are explained. Results are discussed pertaining to each hypothesis. Reasons are forwarded for support and lack of support for hypothesized relationships. In addition, indications for further research are discussed.

#### Statistical Approach

This study involved 11 groups of subjects. Nine groups contained managers from the City of Tulsa, and two groups contained FHA County Supervisors. Means for all 11 groups were compared to determine impact of the organization on the managerial styles. An analysis of variance run on the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) program (31) revealed only one significant difference among the groups. This difference occurred in the acceptance of the 1,1 managerial style. A visual inspection of the means with respect to the 1,1 style revealed that the difference occurred within the City of Tulsa groups and was not a difference between the FHA and Tulsa groups. The decision was thus made to proceed with a combination of all 11 groups for all other analyses.

The major statistical analysis was then performed in order to test the hypotheses. All subjects were divided into quartiles based

on subjects' scores for XY, and each Grid position (1,1; 5,5; 1,9; 9,9). The quartiles did not contain equal sample size due to the SAS program's differentiation in determining quartile breaks. Tied scores were placed in either the higher or lower quartiles depending upon which quartile contained the majority of the scores. One-way analysis of variance (one by four) using CSRI scores as the dependent variable were then run. When the F scores obtained indicated the likely existence of differences among the four groups with respect to CSRI scores the means of the four groups were compared using the Least Significant Difference (LSD) statistic. This statistic has the advantage of increasing the likelihood of finding differences which do exist. However, it also has the disadvantage of increasing the alpha ( $\alpha$ ) level above the specified level in those cases where ordered (ranked) means are more than one step apart (32).

### Findings

The research problem addressed by this study was: What is the relationships indicated between communication sensitivity and managerial styles? Hypotheses were formulated to answer this question. First, managers with a strong Theory Y tendency will be significantly more sensitive communicators than managers that have a strong Theory X tendency. The second hypothesis stated that managers with a strong 9,9 pattern and/or a strong 1,9 pattern will be more sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles, and managers with strong 1,1; 5,5; and 9,1 patterns will be significantly less sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles. Findings for each hypothesis are discussed separately.

Hypothesis 1

No support was found for the contention that managers with a strong Theory Y tendency (high XY score) were more sensitive (high CSRI) than Theory X managers (low XY score). A significant difference was found to exist between the first and fourth quartiles at a .05 level of confidence, but a visual inspection reveals an inverse linear relationship between the means. This is opposite to the directly proportional relationship hypothesized.

An analysis of variance was performed to determine differences between means for CSRI scores determined by XY quartiles rankings. The results appear in Table I.

TABLE I  
ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS AT  
VARYING LEVELS OF XY ACCEPTANCE

Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability F
3	82.87622	27.6254071	2.51947	0.0572
275	3015.31733	10.9647903		

Table II displays the means for each quartile group and provides information concerning paired comparisons.

TABLE II  
 PAIRED COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR EACH XY QUARTILE

XY Quartile	Number	CSRI Mean*
1	68	10.6764706
2	61	10.0983609
3	71	9.9577465
4	79	9.1898734

\*A difference between means greater than 1.10188103 is significant at the .05 level.

An inverse linear relationship between XY and CSRI scores apparent in Table II was not expected. No support for Theory Y managers being more sensitive was found.

#### Hypothesis 2

Support was found for managers with a high acceptance of the 9,9 Grid position being more sensitive. Managers with a strong 1,1 acceptance level were shown to be less sensitive than managers who rejected the 1,1 position. However, no support was found for the

hypothesized relationship between sensitivity and the 1,9; 9,1; or 5,5 Grid position.

An analysis of variance was performed to determine differences between means for CSRI scores determined by 9,9 quartile rankings (see Table II). The null hypothesis was rejected at a level of confidence beyond the .01 level.

TABLE III  
ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS  
AT VARYING LEVELS OF 9,9 ACCEPTANCE

Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value	Probability F
3	158.35693	52.7856439	4.93771	0.0027
275	2939.83662	10.6903150		

Means for the first and fourth quartiles were then compared using the Least Significant Differences (LSD) statistic and were found to be significantly different. Differences between all other pairs of means were not significant at the .01 level. The hypothesis that managers with a high 9,9 acceptance are more sensitive than those rejecting 9,9 was supported.

TABLE IV  
 PAIRED COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR EACH 9,9 QUARTILE

9,1 Quartile	Number	CSRI Mean*
1	82	9.073707
2	52	9.9807692
3	91	9.9230769
4	54	11.2777778

\*A difference between means greater than 1.08800220 is significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of variance results for the 5,5 groups indicated a significant difference on the CSRI variable at a level of confidence beyond .05.

TABLE V  
 ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS  
 AT VARYING LEVELS OF 5,5 ACCEPTANCE

Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability F
3	97.92466	32.6415547	2.99187	0.0307
275	3000.26888	10.9100687		

However, none of the paired comparisons proved to be significantly different at the .01 level. Means for quartiles two and four and three and four differ significantly at the .05 level with subjects in quartiles two and three scoring higher on the CSRI variable. Visual inspection of the means suggests a possible quadratic relationship.

TABLE VI  
 PAIRED COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR EACH 5,5 QUARTILE

5,5 Quartile	Number	CSRI Mean*
1	73	10.0000000
2	78	10.5641026
3	37	10.4864865
4	91	9.1538462

\*A difference between means greater than 1.09912872 is significant at the .05 level.

The ANOVA comparing the four 9,1 groups did not show any significant differences. Hence, no support for 9,1 managers being less sensitive communicators was found.

TABLE VII  
ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS  
AT VARYING LEVELS OF 9,1 ACCEPTANCE

Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability F
3	19.09201	6.3640037	0.56838	0.6406
275	3079.10154	11.1967329		

No significant difference was found among the 1,9 groups. The null hypothesis was not rejected, thus the contention that 1,9 managers are more sensitive communicators was not supported.

TABLE VIII  
ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS  
AT VARYING LEVELS OF 1,9 ACCEPTANCE

Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Value	Probability F
3	55.62971	18.5432364	1.67602	0.1709
275	3042.56384	11.0638685		



Finally, the ANOVA comparing the four 1,1 groups did yield a significant difference. A difference was indicated to exist beyond the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE IX  
ANOVA COMPARING CSRI SCORES FOR SUBJECTS  
AT VARYING LEVELS OF 1,1 ACCEPTANCE

Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Probability F
3	110.39018	36.7967261	3.38680	0.0184
275	2987.80337	10.8647395		

A comparison of the means of the four groups showed that there is a difference between the first and fourth quartiles significant at the .01 level. Visual inspection of the means reveals an inverse relationship between acceptance of the 1,1 managerial style and communication sensitivity.

TABLE X  
PAIRED COMPARISON OF MEANS FOR EACH 1,1 QUARTILE

1,1 Quartile	Number	CSRI Mean*
1	66	10.5000000
2	90	10.4777778
3	56	9.5178571
4	67	9.0447761

\*A difference between means greater than 1.09684277 is significant at the .05 level.

The findings for this group do support the hypothesis that managers with a high 1,1 acceptance are not sensitive communicators.

To summarize the above findings, managers with a high level of acceptance for the 9,9 Grid style are more sensitive communicators than the managers who rejected that position. Also, managers with a high level of acceptance for the 1,1 Grid style were shown to be less sensitive communicators than those who rejected that style. Although there appears to be a quadratic relationship between acceptance of the 5,5 managerial style and communication sensitivity, the meaning of such a relationship is difficult to determine. There is no clear relationship indicated between people who accept the 9,1 and 1,9 styles and their sensitivity.

An interesting finding unrelated to the hypotheses of this study was revealed by a correlation study run using the SAS program. As Table XI indicates, there seems to be no correlation between Theory X and Y and the styles defined by the Managerial Grid.

TABLE XI  
CORRELATION OF XY SCORES AND GRID POSITION ACCEPTANCE\*

	GRID STYLES				
	9,9	5,5	9,1	1,9	1,1
Correlation					
Coefficients	-0.008635	0.097498	-0.000612	-0.044244	-0.032324
Probatility	0.8807	0.1001	0.9883	0.5315	0.5976

\*None of these were significant at the .05 level.

## Discussion

The findings of this study do not support a high positive correlation between Theory Y orientation and communication sensitivity. This might lend credence to the argument that the theory excludes important variables and that the assumptions they articulate actually have no impact upon behavior. McGregor's (3) theories' bipolar nature certainly precludes combining various factors. The interaction of two or more factors could have an impact upon communicative behavior that they would not have independently. The continuum design of this model does not allow for that interaction.

Based on the findings of this study portions of Blake and Mouton's (8) theory are upheld. Their description of the impoverished (1,1) manager's communication pattern as not attempting to express thoughts or feelings, passive, non-responsive and uninvolved (p. 93) would appear accurate. Also their description of the Team (9,9) manager's communicative style as being two-way, seeking equality in input and output, stressing trust, leveling and openness would appear to be valid. Perhaps the findings that 9,1; 1,9; and 5,5 styles had no clear relationship to sensitivity and that 9,9 and 1,1 styles did is due to 9,9 and 1,1 being at the extremes at both axis of the model.

The findings concerning the X-Y scores and sensitivity could be explained by the theory that managers who score in the middle of the scale are more flexible. Flexibility and adaptability are important characteristics of sensitive communicators. This theory would be supported by the correlation between high Y acceptance and high sensitivity since the range of Y acceptance scores actually represented the middle of the X-Y continuum. The range of XY scores did

not extend far below the median. Since the sample consisted totally of non-profit oriented government employees, this skewed distribution could be expected.

However, it could be argued that these findings were due to factors other than those proposed by the theories. It is conceivable that the current and popular management theories are not tenable. The assumptions about sensitivity that McGregor (3) and Blake and Mouton (8) make about their preferred management styles could be in error. When considering the lack of empirical validation for either of these theories noted in the review of literature section, questions concerning their validity could be raised. What if there really is an inverse relationship between communication sensitivity and Theory Y acceptance as the findings indicated?

Another possible factor in the failure of this study to support the hypotheses could be the two measuring instruments for managerial style. Neither the XY nor Grid instrument come with extensive empirical support. Their self-report nature lends certain limitations previously discussed. Subjects' verbal responses during the workshop sessions reflected a higher Theory X orientation than the instrument scores indicated. One reason for this discrepancy could be the XY instrument's bias toward Theory Y on social desirability. Several limitations also seem inherent in the Grid instrument. Neither Mumma's nor Blake and Mouton's instruments actually measure a manager's concern for people and concern for production, thus arriving at a score indicative of a particular style. Instead, acceptance or rejection for each style is arrived at independently. The separate acceptance and rejection scores for each style make interpretation of their

relation to sensitivity difficult. A better method would be to have each set of responses refer to a specific situation. It is difficult for respondents to determine which responses best describe his behavior most of the time. A specific reference to a situation in the instrument would prevent one salient example in the respondent's memory overly influencing his response.

#### Implications for Further Research

This study indicates the need for further research in this area. Instruments with different scoring techniques, lower on the social desirability factor, and utilizing a situational approach need to be developed. An instrument that could test the validity of Blake and Mouton's (8) model, that is determination of managerial style based on the interaction of concern for people and concern for production, needs to be developed. More theories of management should be studied in a similar fashion. Likert's managerial assumptions, among others, could also provide a framework for research designs. It would be interesting to continue to explore the relationship between communication sensitivity and effective management.

Rather than comparing data from a battery of instruments related to unvalidated theoretical models of management, a more desirable approach might be to compare communication sensitivity to periodic performance reviews in order to determine the relationship sensitivity has to effective management.

It is hoped that through more research better models of effective management would be created. By continually upgrading the quality of knowledge available about managerial effectiveness and patterns,

trainers and instructors would be better able to make an appreciable impact on organizational effectiveness.

#### Summary

The general purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between managerial styles and communication sensitivity. Two hypotheses were investigated: (1) Managers with a strong Theory Y tendency will be significantly more sensitive communicators than managers that have a strong Theory X tendency, and (2) managers with a strong 9,9 pattern and/or a strong 1,9 pattern will be more sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles, and managers with strong 1,1; 5,5; and 9,1 patterns will be significantly less sensitive communicators than managers rejecting those styles.

The research design employed was a correlation study. Two hundred seventy-nine managers were samples during training sessions. The data was analyzed using analysis of variance and paired comparison of means. The first hypothesis was not confirmed, in fact an inverse relationship was indicated. The second hypothesis was partially confirmed. Findings supported the hypothesized relationship between 9,9 and 1,1 management styles and sensitivity, but no clear relationship was indicated between 1,9 and 9,1 styles and sensitivity. There was a significant relationship indicated between the 5,5 style and sensitivity, but inverse to the relationship hypothesized.

Implications of the findings were discussed and suggestions for further research were made.

#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Katz, Robert L. "Skills of an Effective Manager." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 52, No. 5 (Sept.-Oct., 1973), 90-102.
- (2) Greiner, Larry E. "What Managers Think of Participative Management." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 52, No. 2 (March-Apr., 1973), 111-117.
- (3) McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- (4) Allen, Louis A. "Beyond Theory Y." Management Review, Vol. 63, No. 4 (April, 1974), 31-33.
- (5) Colin, J. M. "After X and Y Comes Z." Personnel Journal, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Jan. 1971), 56-59.
- (6) Duke, Edward E. "A Case Study of Management Technique." Personnel Journal, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Jan. 1972), 111.
- (7) Argyris, Chris. "The CEO's Behavior: Key to Organizational Development." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 52, No. 2 (March-Apr., 1973), 55.
- (8) Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
- (9) McAllister, Joan. "The Pursuit of Excellence." Sales Management: The Magazine of Marketing (March, 1966), 83.
- (10) Tannenbaum, Robert and Warren Schmidt. "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 52, No. 3 (May-June, 1973), 162.
- (11) Barnes, Louis B., Larry E. Greiner, Robert R. Blake, and Jane S. Mouton. "Breakthrough in Organizational Development." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 43, No. 6 (Nov. - Dec., 1964), 133.
- (12) Mahoney, Thomas A. "Predictors of Managerial Effectiveness in Management." Management: A Book of Readings. Koontz and O'Donnell, eds. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968, 385.

- (13) Harriman, Bruce. "Up and Down the Communications Ladder." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 53, No. 5 (Sept.-Oct., 1974), 143.
- (14) Smith, Henry Clay. Sensitivity to People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- (15) Rogers, Carl, and F. J. Rothlisberger. "Barriers and Gateways to Communication." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 30, No. 4 (July-August, 1952), 46-52.
- (16) Neal, William Patrick. "Demographic, Personality and Nonverbal Perception Correlates of Communication Sensitivity." (Unpub. M. A. thesis; The University of New Mexico, 1970.)
- (17) Hughey, Jim D. and Arlee Johnson. Speech Communication: Foundations and Challenges. New York: McMillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.
- (18) Hall, Robert. "The Correlation of Managerial Characteristics and Ego Grams." (Unpub. manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1974.)
- (19) Runkel, Philip J., and Joseph E. McGrath. Research on Human Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1972.
- (20) Roberts, Jane. "An Investigation of the Relationship of Communication Behavior and Insight." (Unpub. manuscript, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico, 1969.)
- (21) Pfeiffer, J. W. and J. E. Jones, eds. The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, 1972.
- (22) Fisher, Larry. "Alternatives to a Grid Self Analysis Instrument for Training." (Unpub. manuscript, University of Oklahoma, Norman, 1973), 20-21.
- (23) Cronback, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- (24) Taylor, Janet A. "A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48 (1953), 285-290.
- (25) Buss, A. H., M. Weiner, A. Durkee, and M. Baer. "The Measurement of Anxiety in Clinical Situations." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19 (1955), 125-129.
- (26) Kendall, E. "The Validity of Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18 (1954), 529-532.



- (27) Roberts, Jane. "An Investigation of the Relationship of Communication Behavior and Insight." (Unpub. manuscript, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, 1969.)
- (28) Glessner, E. Goldine, and G. Ulett. "The Saslow Screening Test as a Measure of Anxiety-Proneness." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 8 (1952), 279-283.
- (29) Kelly, E. L., and D. W. Fiske. The Prediction of Performance in Clinical Psychology. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1951.
- (30) Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- (31) Barr, Anthony James, and James Howard Goodnight. "Users Guide to the Statistical Analysis System." Raleigh, N. C.: North Carolina State University, 1974.
- (32) Winer, B. F. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1972.

APPENDIX A

COMMUNICATION SELF-REPORT INVENTORY

## THE OSU CONVERSATION SELF REPORT INVENTORY

On the following pages are twenty (20) items concerning the way a person feels about and behaves in the most common of all communication situations--THE CONVERSATION. We would like for you to read each item and decide which of the four alternatives is most characteristic of your own feelings and behavior.

Since different people think different things about the items, NO ALTERNATIVE IS NECESSARILY MORE CORRECT THAN ANY OTHER. We simply want to know which alternative YOU consider best typifies your ACTUAL CONVERSATION FEELINGS AND BEHAVIOR.

Our purpose is to catalog the similarities and differences in conversational patterns among various people. Your particular responses will be pooled with those of others, thus insuring anonymity.

In responding to the Inventory, please follow these directions:

1. For each item you are asked to select the ONE alternative which is MOST TYPICAL of your ACTUAL FEELINGS AND BEHAVIOR in a conversation. Be sure and answer every question, even if the preference for one alternative over the others is very slight.
2. After you have selected the one alternative, "X" the number which which appears beside your chosen response.

There is no time limit, but work as rapidly as you can.

Thank you for your cooperation.

THE FOLLOWING 17 ITEMS REFER TO MOST CONVERSATIONS YOU HAVE BEEN IN

1. When there is a difference of opinion, I believe most conversations are successful when:
    1. each speaker is direct and to the point.
    2. an exchange of feelings on the matter takes place.
    3. people change their minds on the topic in one way or another.
    4. people agree on the issues in question.
  2. In most conversations, I relate myself to the other person by:
    1. making certain I am directly facing him.
    2. acting as if I like the other person whether I do or not.
    3. speaking with a pleasant tone of voice.
    4. accepting his ideas and building on them.
  3. In most conversations, when controversial topics are being talked about:
    1. I try to control my emotions by maintaining a calm outward appearance.
    2. I find it difficult to disagree with another person by expressing my real opinions on the matter.
    3. I am able to disagree in an agreeable way.
    4. I become very biased when certain subjects are brought up.
  4. In most conversations:
    1. I often tend to ramble.
    2. I don't give much weight to information from a person I consider inexperienced.
    3. I am concerned about how the other person will receive what I have to say.
    4. I place more reliance on the words I use to convey meaning than I do my vocal, facial, and hand expressions.
  5. In most conversations:
    1. I nod my head to indicate I understand the other person.
    2. I feel I can learn something from the other person if I really listen.
    3. I feel I am usually understood by others.
    4. I often find it difficult to accept other people's ideas.
  6. In most conversations:
    1. I am more concerned with the words a speaker uses than the emphasis in his voice and expression on his face.
    2. I depend on the speaker's vocal, facial, and hand expressions to explain the largest part of his meaning.
    3. I am distracted by a person's mannerisms, such as excessive eye-blinking.
    4. I consciously modulate the tone of my voice.
- 

BE SURE AND ANSWER EVERY QUESTION EVEN IF THE PREFERENCE FOR ONE ALTERNATIVE OVER THE OTHERS IS VERY SLIGHT.

7. In most conversations:
  1. I'm usually in the background and seldom in the "spot light."
  2. I'm filled with nervous energy.
  3. I look the other person directly in the eye when we talk.
  4. I show enthusiasm for the other person and his ideas.
  
8. In most conversations:
  1. I try to abstain from letting others know what I think about what is being said.
  2. I find myself using other people's ideas without indicating the source of them.
  3. I listen to a person even if I think he doesn't really have anything to say.
  4. I speak in a crisp, business-like manner.
  
9. In most conversations:
  1. I avoid repeating what I've said before.
  2. I find it very easy to mentally experience whatever the other person is describing.
  3. I fail to really explain my views.
  4. I appear to be indifferent about what's going on.
  
10. When I have important things to do and someone starts a conversation, I most often:
  1. become quiet and uncommunicative.
  2. tell him, "I'm busy now, contact me later."
  3. try to see things from the other person's viewpoint.
  4. try to hurry things along so we can get the conversation over with.
  
11. In most conversations:
  1. I express interest in the subject at hand.
  2. I accurately "size-up" what is really going on.
  3. I can make the other person think I'm listening while I'm really thinking of something else.
  4. I react to the words the speaker uses rather than the ideas he expresses.
  
12. In most conversations, when personal matters concerning the other person are being discussed:
  1. I convey truthful information and expect others to do the same.
  2. I hold to my views steadfastly.
  3. I show a disregard for social convention.
  4. I am able to remain open-minded throughout the conversation.
  
13. In most conversations:
  1. my ability to improvise is a real asset.
  2. I use quite a bit of slang.
  3. my posture is very relaxed.
  4. I am eager to listen.

---

BE SURE AND ANSWER EVERY QUESTION EVEN IF THE PREFERENCE FOR ONE ALTERNATIVE OVER THE OTHERS IS VERY SLIGHT.

14. In most conversations:
1. I look directly at the other person.
  2. I try to help the other person out by correcting the language he uses.
  3. I am rather easily distracted from what the speaker is saying by other things occurring at the same time.
  4. I try to involve the other person as much as possible.
15. In most conversations:
1. I tend to "tune out" on people I can't trust.
  2. I am very objective about the views I express.
  3. I let my expectations become apparent to other people.
  4. I avoid prejudging what the other person is saying.
16. In most conversations:
1. I use words that are meaningful in terms of the other person's background.
  2. I don't talk when subjects come up that I don't know about.
  3. I believe a large vocabulary helps conversational effectiveness.
  4. I am conscious of my posture.
17. In most conversations:
1. I ask the other person for his ideas frequently.
  2. I use a great deal of vocal expression.
  3. I use my hands a lot to help express my meanings.
  4. I try to keep my hand movements inobtrusive.

THE FOLLOWING 3 ITEMS REFER TO MANY CONVERSATIONS YOU HAVE BEEN IN:

18. In MANY conversations, I actually:
1. have a hard time understanding others.
  2. tend to get bored.
  3. invite criticism from the other person.
  4. tend to get hostile.
19. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that:
1. I use varied and interesting vocabulary words.
  2. I am considerate of other people's communicative faults.
  3. I am critical of the views others express.
  4. I over-react when certain subjects are brought up.
20. In MANY conversations, various people have indicated in one way or another that:
1. I have good vocal quality.
  2. I'm adaptable.
  3. I appear to be neat and well-groomed.
  4. I express my ideas in a dynamic manner

---

BE SURE AND ANSWER EVERY QUESTION EVEN IF THE PREFERENCE FOR ONE ALTERNATIVE OVER THE OTHERS IS VERY SLIGHT.

APPENDIX B

THEORY XY MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

## ANALYSIS

Instructions: For each of the statements below (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) select the alternative which is most characteristic of your attitudes, or actions and place a 1 by that alternative, then place a 2 by the attitude or action which is second most characteristic of you and so on until you have ranked all five alternatives under each statement. Indicate your answers on these pages in the spaces provided.

1. As a supervisor my major responsibility:
  - A. is to see to it that production goals are achieved.
  - B. is to see to it that harmonious relationships between people are established in the work situation.
  - C. is to see that established procedures are carried out.
  - D. is to find a balance so that a reasonable degree of production can be achieved without destroying morale.
  - E. is to attain effective production through participation and involvement of people and their ideas.
  
2. In making decisions concerned with work problems, I mainly:
  - A. avoid or refer problems to others for decisions.
  - B. try to encourage decisions, based on understanding and agreement, which are the result of debate and deliberation by those who have relevant facts and knowledge to contribute.
  - C. depend upon my own skills, knowledge, and past experience for making decisions.
  - D. look for decisions which to a large extent reflect the ideas and opinions of others.
  - E. get a reading on how others think and then make the final decisions myself.
  
3. When I find myself in conflict with my superiors or peers, I usually:
  - A. take a stand and try to get my own points across.
  - B. keep my mouth shut.



- \_\_\_\_\_C. try to find out what the others think before I express myself.
- \_\_\_\_\_D. try to work for a reasonable compromise.
- \_\_\_\_\_E. communicate my feelings and the information I have available so that a basis for understanding can be established.
4. When I find myself in conflict with my subordinates, I usually:
- \_\_\_\_\_A. allow a cooling off period until a blending of different positions is possible.
- \_\_\_\_\_B. try to smooth over the trouble and do something to release the tension that has built up.
- \_\_\_\_\_C. try not to get involved further by avoiding the issue.
- \_\_\_\_\_D. use my position to halt the conflict.
- \_\_\_\_\_E. bring the people together who are involved in order to work out the differences.
5. As far as creativity is concerned, I go on the assumption that innovation:
- \_\_\_\_\_A. is most encouraged by a supervisor who accepts uncritically any ideas that his subordinates present.
- \_\_\_\_\_B. is most encouraged by a supervisor who creates competition around his employees by the use of the rewards and promotions he can offer.
- \_\_\_\_\_C. is most encouraged by a supervisor who creates conditions wherein "brainstorming" or other such devices can be used.
- \_\_\_\_\_D. is most encouraged by a supervisor who defines and communicates problems that need solution and establishes conditions for experimentation and feedback on results.
- \_\_\_\_\_E. is something that no supervisor can encourage or hinder by his actions; it is unrelated to the conditions of any specific work situation.

Exercise used by E. W. Mumma, Twenty-fourth Conference, Texas Personnel and Management Association. Based on Grid Theory of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton

## ASSUMPTIONS

## Theory X Assumptions About Human Behavior

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike for work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.

## Theory Y Assumptions About Human Behavior

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means of bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept but also to seek responsibility.
5. The capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of prganizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.



APPENDIX C

MANAGERIAL GRID ASSESSMENT

INSTRUMENT

## MANAGERIAL ATTITUDES

Directions: The following are various types of behavior which a manager could use in relation to subordinates. Read each item carefully and then put a check mark in one of the columns to indicate what you would do.

If I were the manager I would:

	Make a great effort to do <u>this</u>	Tend to do <u>this</u>	Tend to avoid doing <u>this</u>	Make a great effort to avoid <u>this</u>
1. Closely supervise my subordinates to get better work from them	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Set the goals and objectives for my subordinates and sell them on the merits of my plans	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Set up controls to assure that my subordinates are getting the job done	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Encourage my subordinates to set their own goals and objectives	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Make sure that my subordinates' work is planned out for them	_____	_____	_____	_____

If I were the  
Manager I would:

	Make a great effort to do <u>this</u>	Tend to do <u>this</u>	Tend to avoid doing <u>this</u>	Make a great effort to avoid <u>this</u>
6. Check with my subordinates daily to see if they need any help	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Step in as soon as reports indicate that the job is slipping	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Push my people to meet schedules if necessary	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Have frequent meetings to keep in touch with what is going on	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Allow subordinates to make important decisions	_____	_____	_____	_____

VITA<sup>2</sup>

Larry Paul Glidewell

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: MANAGERIAL STYLES AND COMMUNICATION SENSITIVITY

Major Field: Speech

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, March 14, 1951, the son of Mr. and Mrs. D. K. Glidewell.

Education: Graduated from Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma, in May, 1969; received Bachelor of Science degree in Speech Communication from Oklahoma State University in 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Undergraduate and Graduate teaching assistant, Speech Department, Oklahoma State University, 1973-1974; State Intern, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1974; Program Development Consultant, University of Oklahoma, 1974-1975.