Journal of Business Communication

http://job.sagepub.com

Published by:

$SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

Association for Business Communication

THE LINK BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE, COMMUNICATOR COMPETENCE, AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Paul E. Madlock
West Virginia University

The current study examined the influence of supervisor communicator competence and leadership style on employee job and communication satisfaction. Participants were 220 individuals (116 men and 104 women) working full-time for a variety of companies in the Midwest. The findings indicated a strong relationship between supervisors' communicator competence and their task and relational leadership styles, with supervisor communicator competence being a stronger predictor of employee job and communication satisfaction. More specifically, the findings indicated that supervisor communicator competence accounted for 68% of the variance in subordinate communication satisfaction and nearly 18% of the variance in subordinate job satisfaction. More important, these findings provide an association between communication, leadership, and employee job and communication satisfaction.

Keywords: *leadership style; supervision; communicator competence; communication satisfaction; job satisfaction*

The link between leadership and competent communication has received limited attention by business and communication scholars alike. According to Holladay and Coombs (1993), leadership is a behavior enacted through communication. Specifically, Holladay and Coombs suggested that communication shapes the perceptions of a leader's charisma, and communication can be divided into the content of the leader's messages and the presentation of those messages. Similarly, messages sent by leaders are considered to contain both affective and cognitive strategies (Hall & Lord, 1995), and when leaders effectively communicate their vision, they win the confidence of followers, which in turn aids in communication satisfaction between the leader and follower (Pavitt, 1999).

Paul E. Madlock is a PhD student in the Department of Communication Studies at West Virginia University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paul E. Madlock, West Virginia University, Department of Communication Studies, P.O. Box 6293, 108 Armstrong Hall WVU, Morgantown, WV 26506-6293; phone: 304-293-3905; fax: 304-293-8667; e-mail: pmadlock@mix.wvu.edu.

Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) suggested that subordinates who perceive their supervisors' behaviors to exhibit both relationship orientation and task orientation report being the most satisfied.

Based on previous research, leadership appears to be enacted through communication in such a way that it contains a relational (affective) and task (content) component. Additionally, when leaders communicate effectively, their followers experience greater levels of satisfaction. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to examine the influence of supervisor task leadership style, relational leadership style, and communicator competence on employee job and communication satisfaction. This examination is of value in that it extends prior research in three ways. First, the current study examines the link between communicator competence and leadership styles. Second, this study highlights the specific influence of both task and relational leadership and, third, offers insight into the influence that supervisor task leadership, relational leadership, and communicator competence have on subordinate job and communication satisfaction. The variables of communicator competence, leadership, communication satisfaction, and job satisfaction are discussed in more detail below.

> Thus, the purpose of the current study was to examine the influence of supervisor task leadership style, relational leadership style, and communicator competence on employee job and communication satisfaction.

Communicator Competence

Harris and Cronen's (1979) research indicated that competent individuals must not only achieve their goals (be effective) but also do so appropriately. In following with this notion, communication competence has been conceptualized to encompass elements of knowledge, motivation, skill, behavior, and effectiveness (Spitzberg, 1983). Spitzberg and Cupach (1981) stated, "Competent interaction can be viewed as a form of interpersonal influence, in which an individual is faced with the task of fulfilling communicative functions and goals (effectiveness) while maintaining conversational and interpersonal norms (appropriateness)" (p. 1).

Cushman and Craig (1976) argued that communicator competence involves the ability of individuals to display competencies in areas such as listening and negotiating. More recently, Salacuse (2007) indicated that as a result of changing work environments in which employees are more educated and intelligent than past generations, leaders are now required to lead by negotiation. Specifically, Salacuse noted that in order for leaders to persuade people to follow their vision, they need to communicate effectively by appealing to the interests of the followers. In that competent communicators must employ communicative resources such as language, gestures, and voice (Stohl, 1984), and in order for supervisors to be perceived as competent communicators, they must share and respond to information in a timely manner, actively listen to other points of view, communicate clearly and succinctly to all levels of the organization, and utilize differing communication channels (Shaw, 2005).

Despite the vast amounts of research focused on competent communication, there appears to be a lack of prior research directly examining the relationship between supervisor communicator competence and supervisor task and relational leadership styles. However, there does appear to be a limited amount of research examining the influence of supervisors' communicator competence on employee outcomes.

One such study was that of Berman and Hellweg (1989), whose findings indicated that the perceived communicator competence of a supervisor was related to their subordinate's satisfaction with that supervisor. Another example was a study by Myers and Kassing (1998), who examined the relationship between subordinate perceptions of their supervisor's communication skills, including communicator competence, and the subordinate's level of organizational identification. Myers and Kassing's findings indicated that supervisor communication competence was a significant predictor of subordinate organizational identification. A more recent example was a study by Sharbrough, Simmons, and Cantrill (2006), who examined the impact of motivational language on a number of outcomes. Specifically, Sharbrough et al. found positive relationships between a leader's use of motivational language and their perceived effectiveness, their communication competence, and their subordinates' job and communication satisfaction.

The current study differs from the prior examples in two significant ways. First, the current study examined the influence of a supervisor's communicator competence, task, and relational leadership on subordinates' job and communication satisfaction. Second, the current study also examined the influence that a supervisor's task and relational leadership style has on being perceived as a competent communicator. The following

section highlights the importance of leadership in organizations and offers support for the inclusion of leadership in the current study.

Leadership

Leadership has been defined in a number of ways, such as the ability to guide followers toward shared goals (Bryman, 1992), as a form of influence (Hersey, 1984), and as simply something a leader does (Fleishman, 1973). Specific to the current study, Pfeffer and Salancik (1975) indicated that leaders exhibit task- and relational-oriented behaviors. Additionally, Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) indicated that employees are most satisfied when they perceive their supervisors as exhibiting both relational- and task-oriented behaviors.

A conceptualization of leadership that is composed of task and relational behaviors is considered as the styles approach to leadership. The Ohio State and Michigan studies were strong representatives of the styles approach. The Ohio State studies (Hemphill & Coons, 1957) identified two types of behaviors explaining what leaders do: Leaders provide structure and nurture subordinates. At nearly the same time, the Michigan studies (Cartwrite & Zander, 1960; Likert, 1961, 1967) identified the behaviors of effective leaders to contain employee-oriented behaviors and production-oriented behaviors.

Prior research has examined the effects of leadership style in relation to group satisfaction (Anderson, Madlock, & Hoffman, 2006), effective communication skills (Fairhurst, 1993; Mintzberg, 1994), interpersonal communication (Quick & Macik-Frey, 2004), and rapport building (Campbell, White, & Johnson, 2003). As such, there appears to be a gap in the research relative to the examination of the task and relational leadership style and communicator competence. This gap in the research also extends to the relationship between task and relational leadership style and employee outcomes of job and communication satisfaction. Thus, communication satisfaction, as discussed below, was included in the current study.

Communication Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction has been an area examined by business and communication scholars primarily because satisfaction has been positively related to job performance (Gruneberg, 1979). A conceptualization of communication satisfaction was offered by Crino and White (1981), who argued that organizational communication satisfaction involves an individual's

satisfaction with various aspects of the communication occurring in the organization, whereas Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) demonstrated that organizational members' communication satisfaction is associated with the amount of information available to them. Although communication provides employees with information that clarifies work tasks and may contribute to communication satisfaction, Anderson and Martin (1995) found that employees engage in communication interactions with coworkers and superiors to satisfy interpersonal needs of pleasure and inclusion. Thus, employee communication satisfaction appears to involve a task and relational dimension.

Prior research indicates that interpersonal interactions involving the exchange of information and affect between coworkers and between employees and their supervisors can have significant effects on the employees' psychological job outcomes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout (e.g., Pincus, 1986; Postmes, Tanis, & de Wit, 2001; Ray & Miller, 1994). Generally, as employees experience more positive communication relationships, they also experience more positive job outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction

The most common factors leading to worker stress and dissatisfaction are those emanating from the nature of the job itself, within which interpersonal relationships between employees and supervisors take place (Barnett & Brennan, 1997; Rodwell, Kienzle, & Shadur, 1998). According to Korte and Wynne (1996), a deterioration of relationships in organizational settings resulting from reduced interpersonal communication between workers and supervisors negatively influences job satisfaction and sometimes leads to employees leaving their jobs.

Early work by Taylor (1970) suggested that worker satisfaction may be attributed to the highest possible earnings with the least amount of fatigue, whereas Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction from an employee's standpoint as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state from the appraisal of one's job or experiences" (p. 1297). Taylor's classical theory prompted a number of studies that revealed differing factors behind job satisfaction. Some of these factors found to mediate job satisfaction include supervisors' displays of nonverbal immediacy (Madlock, 2006b; Richmond & McCroskey, 2000), humor (Avtgis & Taber, 2006), communication satisfaction (Hilgerman, 1998), effects of gender (Madlock, 2006a), and supervisors' communication style (Richmond, McCroskey, Davis, & Koontz, 1980).

The literature reviewed for this study appears to support the notion that communication between employees and supervisors has an influence on the employees' job satisfaction. Based on the research reviewed and the gap in prior research relevant to the influence that supervisor communicator competence, task leadership style, and relational leadership style have on employee job and communication satisfaction, the following hypotheses and research questions were advanced.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant and positive relationship between supervisor communication competence and employee job and communication satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant and positive relationship between supervisor relational leadership style and employee job and communication satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant and positive relationship between a supervisor's task leadership style and employee job and communication satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a significant and positive relationship between a supervisor's task and relational leadership style and communication competence.

Research Question 1a: Which behavior displayed by a supervisor—task leadership, relational leadership, or communicator competence—will serve as a greater predictor of employee communication satisfaction?

Research Question 1b: Which behavior displayed by a supervisor—task leadership, relational leadership, or communicator competence—will serve as a greater predictor of employee job satisfaction?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 220 working adults (52.7% male, $n = 116$; and 47.3% female, $n = 104$), with a range in tenure from 1 to 40 years ($M = 8.6$, $SD = 10.0$). Of the participants, 112 reported working for a female supervisor and 108 reported working for a male supervisor. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 64 ($M = 34.5$, $SD = 14$), whereas supervisors' ages ranged from 22 to 75 ($M = 42.6$, $SD = 10.7$). Participants reported working for a variety of organizations including education (7.0%), government (15.0%), service (47.3%), high tech (7.1%), manufacturing (14.9%), civil service (4.2%), and other (4.5%).

The literature reviewed for this study appears to support the notion that communication between employees and supervisors has an influence on the employees' job satisfaction.

Procedures

A network sample was obtained for the current study in which students enrolled in an advanced organizational communication course at a large Midwest university contacted employees to participate in the study. The students were instructed to deliver the questionnaire to full-time working adults. Participants were approached in non-work settings so as to preserve the anonymity of both the participants and their organization. The questionnaire utilized for the study was composed of a variety of instruments, including scales measuring subordinates' perceptions of their supervisors' communication behaviors (see appendix for a copy of the scales used in the study). One important note is that all the responses to the survey questions were based on the perceptions of the subordinate. A quantitative methodological approach was utilized for the current study in an effort to maximize the generalizability of the findings based on the size and diversity of the sample. The institutional review board granted exempt status due to the limited risk involved with the study and the assurance of confidentiality and anonymity for the participants because a self-addressed stamped envelope was provided by the author as a means for the participants to return the completed questionnaire.

Measures

The measures utilized in the current study were chosen for two primary reasons. First, they have yielded consistently strong reliabilities across a number of prior studies. Second, the measures tapped into the attitudes and behaviors that were relevant to the current study. For example, the Leadership Style Questionnaire by Northouse (2001) measures both the task and relational leadership styles, which coincide with the behaviors associated with a competent communicator. As such, the Communicator

Competence Questionnaire developed by Monge, Backman, Dillard, and Eisenburg (1982) appears to tap into the conceptualization of competent supervision forwarded by Shaw (2005), suggesting that in order for supervisors to be perceived as competent communicators, they must share and respond to information in a timely manner, actively listen to other points of view, communicate clearly and succinctly, and utilize differing communication channels.

Communicator competence was measured by the 12-item Communicator Competence Questionnaire developed by Monge et al. (1982). The items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Prior research reported scale reliability of .93 (Madlock, 2006a). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .90 ($M = 41.13$, $SD = 6.71$).

Job satisfaction was measured by the 8-item Abridged Job In General (AJIG) scale (Russell et al., 2004). A 5-point Likert-type response measure (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) was used in the current study instead of the original scale formatting (e.g., using 0 for "no," 1 for "?," and 3 for "yes") to ensure overall consistency throughout the questionnaire. The scale is composed of single words to short statements regarding employees' overall perception of their job (e.g., good, better than most, undesirable). The AJIG scale was found to have prior reliability of .87 (Russell et al., 2004). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .92 ($M = 24.0$, $SD = 2.41$).

Communication satisfaction was measured by the 19-item Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) developed by Hecht (1978). A 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) was used. A slight modification was made to the original scale with a lead-in sentence ("When communicating with my supervisor, I feel . . .") preceding each statement. Prior studies reported reliabilities ranging from .72 to .93 and strong validity (Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994). Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .94 ($M = 69.60$, $SD = 14.22$).

Leadership style was measured by the 20-item Leadership Style Questionnaire developed by Northouse (2001). The instrument measures the task and relational leadership styles and, when summed, represents a general leadership profile. A 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) was used in the study. Prior research reported scale reliabilities ranging from .92 to .95 (Anderson et al., 2006). Cronbach's alpha for the current study found that total leadership style was .93 ($M = 73.56$, $SD = 13.56$), task leadership style was .90 ($M = 37.13$, $SD = 7.17$), and relational leadership style was .92 ($M = 36.43$, $SD = 7.75$).

Table 1.   Pearson Correlations Among Variables

	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Communication satisfaction	—				
2. Job satisfaction	.40	—			
3. Task leadership style	.55	.24	—		
4. Relational leadership style	.78	.29	.65	—	
5. Communicator competence	.82	.42	.51	.76	—

Note: All correlations are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

RESULTS

The first hypothesis predicted significant and positive relationships between supervisor communication competence and employee job and communication satisfaction. Results of three Pearson correlations supported the hypothesis by indicating statistically significant positive relationships between the predictor and criterion variables. A strong relationship was found between supervisor communicator competence and employee communication satisfaction, whereas a moderate relationship was found between supervisor communicator competence and employee job satisfaction. Table 1 contains the correlational analysis results.

The second hypothesis predicted significant and positive relationships between supervisor relational leadership style and employee job and communication satisfaction. The results of Pearson correlations supported the hypothesis by indicating statistically significant positive relationships between the predictor and criterion variables. Specifically, a strong relationship was found between supervisor relational leadership style and employee communication satisfaction, whereas a weak relationship was found between supervisor relational leadership style and employee job satisfaction. Table 1 contains the correlational analysis results.

A strong relationship was found between supervisor communicator competence and employee communication satisfaction, whereas a moderate relationship was found between supervisor communicator competence and employee job satisfaction.

The third hypothesis predicted significant and positive relationships between supervisor task leadership style and employee job and communication satisfaction. The results of Pearson correlations supported the hypothesis by indicating statistically significant positive relationships between the predictor and criterion variables. A strong relationship was found between supervisor task leadership style and employee communication satisfaction, whereas a weak relationship was found between supervisor task leadership style and employee job satisfaction. Table 1 contains the correlational analysis results.

The fourth hypothesis predicted significant and positive relationships between supervisors' task and relational leadership style and their communicator competence. The results of Pearson correlations supported the hypothesis by indicating statistically significant positive relationships between the predictor and criterion variables. A strong relationship was found between both supervisor task and relational leadership style and supervisor communication competence. Table 1 contains the correlational analysis results.

Research Question 1a concerned which supervisor behavior—task leadership style, relational leadership style, or communication competence—would serve as a greater predictor of employee communication satisfaction. Using multiple regression, employee communication satisfaction was regressed on a linear combination of the three predictor variables. Results indicated that supervisor communicator competence accounted for 68% of the variance in employee communication satisfaction, whereas the equation containing both supervisor communicator competence and relational leadership style accounted for 74% of the variance in employee communication satisfaction. The addition of supervisor task leadership style did not contribute to the variance accounted for in employee communication satisfaction, $F(3, 219) = 200.26$, $p < .001$. Supervisors' communication competence was found to be a greater predictor of employee communication satisfaction, $\beta = .55$, $p < .001$, than was relational leadership style, $\beta = .37$, $p < .001$, and supervisor task leadership style was not found to be a significant predictor of employee communication satisfaction.

Research Question 1b concerned which supervisor behavior—task leadership style, relational leadership style, or communication competence—would serve as a greater predictor of employee job satisfaction. Using multiple regression, employee job satisfaction was regressed on a linear combination of the three predictor variables. Results indicated that supervisor communicator competence accounted for 17.8% of the variance in employee job satisfaction, whereas the equation containing both supervisor communicator

competence and relational leadership style accounted for 18% of the variance in employee job satisfaction. The addition of supervisor task leadership style did not contribute to the variance accounted for in employee communication satisfaction, $F(3, 219) = 15.78$, $p < .001$. Supervisors' communication competence was found to be a predictor of employee job satisfaction, $\beta = .47$, $p < .001$, whereas task and relational leadership style were not found to be significant predictors of employee job satisfaction.

Post Hoc Analysis

Based on the findings, supervisors' communication competence appears to have a greater influence on employee outcomes than does supervisors' leadership style. However, a question yet to be examined is which of the two leadership styles (task or relational) would be a greater predictor of communicator competence. Using multiple regression, supervisor communication competence was regressed on a linear combination of the two predictor variables. Results indicated that a combination of supervisor task and relational leadership style accounted for 59% of the variance in supervisors' communication competence, $F(2, 219) = 154.91$, $p < .001$. However, relational leadership style was found to be a greater predictor of supervisors' communication competence, $\beta = .65$, $p < .001$, than was task leadership style, $\beta = .16$, $p = .006$.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to extend and support prior research by examining the influence of supervisors' task leadership style, relational leadership style, and communication competence on employee job and communication satisfaction. This study also sought to extend prior research by providing a link between communication competence and task and relational leadership style.

The current study validates the notion forwarded by Castaneda and Nahavandi (1991) indicating that employee satisfaction was highest when employees perceived their supervisors to be exhibiting both relational- and task-oriented behaviors. The current study found both task and relational leadership style to be positively related to subordinate job and communication satisfaction, with strong relationships indicated between leadership style and employee communication satisfaction. These findings are unique to leadership research in that they specifically indicate which leadership style, task or relational, has the greatest influence on subordinate outcomes.

Another finding relevant to the current study is that the strongest relationships were found between supervisors' communication competence and both employee job and communication satisfaction. This finding extends the research of Sharbrough et al. (2006) in that it directly assessed the relationship between supervisors' communication competence and employee outcomes, whereas Sharbrough et al. assessed the perceptions of supervisors' communication competence based on their use of motivational language. This finding is also of importance to organizations in that prior research has indicated a link between employee satisfaction and performance in such a way that increased levels of employee satisfaction have been associated with increased performance (Gruneberg, 1979). Thus, the current study provides organizations with an area of focus (i.e., supervisor communication competence and leadership styles) in order to maximize their employee satisfaction and potentially increase the performance of their employees.

> Thus, the current study provides organizations with an area of focus (i.e., supervisor communication competence and leadership styles) in order to maximize their employee satisfaction and potentially increase the performance of their employees.

A third finding of importance from the current study was that supervisors' communication competence was found to be the greatest predictor of employee job and communication satisfaction. Although supervisors' relational leadership style was found to be a predictor of subordinate communication satisfaction, task leadership style was not found to be a predictor of either subordinate job or communication satisfaction. These findings are of value because they support the research findings of Pincus (1986), who indicated that the behaviors of supervisors have an important influence on their employees' job and communication satisfaction. These findings also extend the research of Pincus by indicating specific communicative behaviors exhibited by supervisors that appear to influence employee job and communication satisfaction.

Another interesting finding of the current study is based on the possible link between leadership styles and communication competence. This

finding is of value because it emphasizes the importance that communication has on leadership. Further, the findings support the notion that leadership may be considered a form of competent communication composed of messages containing both affective and cognitive strategies (Hall & Lord, 1995).

A final area of interest relative to the current study involves its possible contributions to industry. Given the negative outcomes that result from low levels of employee job and communication satisfaction such as absenteeism (Alder & Golan, 1981; Blau, 1985; Iverson & Deery, 2001) and turnover (Porter & Steers, 1973), the current study identified specific supervisor behaviors that appear to have a strong effect on employee job and communication satisfaction. With that, organizations may want to develop supervisory training programs in order to enhance the communicative behaviors of supervisors, which in turn may result in greater employee satisfaction and increased performance.

Future Direction and Limitations

While supervisors' communication competence accounted for the greatest variance and was found to be the greatest predictors of employee job and communication satisfaction, future researchers may want to provide further support for this association between communication satisfaction competence and leadership. The current findings provided a starting point for researchers to expand upon this association and develop a causal link between leadership and communicator competence beyond the limited scope of the current study. Further, researchers may also want to include a qualitative component to provide a richer understanding as to the actual reasons employees attribute to perceiving their supervisor as a competent communicator.

A limitation of the current study is that it was primarily a correlational study. This limitation only allows for associations to be made between the variables. Additionally, directionality would have been of value in determining which behaviors elicited the others. For example, do satisfied employees perceive their supervisors as more communicatively competent and as effective leaders as a result of their being satisfied, or do the leadership and competent communicative behaviors of the supervisor actually account for the employee satisfaction? For example, the suggestion that companies train supervisors to be better communicators may not necessarily cause employees to experience greater satisfaction. Nonetheless, the findings of the current study do suggest that supervisors who are communicatively competent are likely to be perceived as leaders by their subordinates, which in turn may result in positive employee and organizational outcomes.

APPENDIX
Scales Used in the Study

A. Demographic Questions

Please provide the following information:

1. I am a man _____ woman _____.
2. I am _____ years old.
3. Years worked _____.
4. Is your immediate supervisor a man or woman? (please circle)
5. My immediate supervisor is approximately _____ years old.
6. Which best describes your organization? (circle one):

High Tech   Manufacturing   Service   Education   Civil Service   Government   Other _____

B. Communication Satisfaction Scale

Directions: The following statements concern communicating at work. In responding, think of the communication relationship you have with your immediate supervisor. Choose the number that best describes how you feel.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5	4	3	2	1

When communicating with my immediate supervisor, I feel . . .

_____   7. he or she lets me know that I am communicating effectively.
_____   8. nothing is ever accomplished.
_____   9. I would like to continue having conversations like ours.
_____ 10. he or she genuinely wants to get to know me.
_____ 11. very dissatisfied with our conversations.
_____ 12. like I have something else to do.
_____ 13. I am able to present myself as I want him or her to view me.
_____ 14. he or she shows me that he or she understands what I say.
_____ 15. very satisfied with our conversations.
_____ 16. he or she expresses a lot of interest in what I have to say.
_____ 17. I do NOT enjoy our conversations.
_____ 18. he or she does NOT provide support for what he or she says.
_____ 19. that I can talk about anything with my immediate supervisor.
_____ 20. that we each get to say what we want.
_____ 21. that we can laugh easily together.
_____ 22. conversations flow smoothly.
_____ 23. he or she changes the topic when his or her feelings are brought into the conversation.
_____ 24. he or she frequently said things that add little to the conversation.
_____ 25. we often talk about things that I am NOT interested in.

C. Job Satisfaction Scale

Directions: Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? Please indicate your response by writing the number that best describes how you feel about the statement.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5	4	3	2	1

_____ 26. Good
_____ 27. Undesirable
_____ 28. Better than most

_____ 29. Disagreeable
_____ 30. Makes me content
_____ 31. Excellent
_____ 32. Enjoyable
_____ 33. Poor

D. Communicator Competence Questionnaire

Directions: In this series of questions, I would like you to describe how your supervisor communicates. Think about his or her behavior in general, rather than about a specific situation. Please indicate your response by writing the number that best describes how you feel about the statement.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5	4	3	2	1

My immediate supervisor . . .
_____ 34. has a good command of the language.
_____ 35. is sensitive to my needs of the moment.
_____ 36. typically gets right to the point.
_____ 37. pays attention to what I say to him or her.
_____ 38. deals with me effectively.
_____ 39. is a good listener.
_____ 40. is difficult to understand when communicating in written form.
_____ 41. expresses his or her ideas clearly.
_____ 42. is difficult to understand when he or she speaks to me.
_____ 43. generally says the right thing at the right time.
_____ 44. is easy to talk to.
_____ 45. usually responds to messages (memos, phone calls, reports, etc.) quickly.

E. Leadership Style Scale

Directions: Think about how often your immediate supervisor engages in the described behavior. For each item, select the number that best represents the behavior that your immediate supervisor is most likely to exhibit.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5	4	3	2	1

My immediate supervisor . . .
_____ 46. tells group members what they are supposed to do.
_____ 47. acts friendly with members of the group.
_____ 48. sets standards of performance for group members.
_____ 49. helps others feel comfortable in the group.
_____ 50. makes suggestions on how to solve problems.
_____ 51. responds favorably to suggestions made by others.
_____ 52. makes his or her perspective clear to others.
_____ 53. treats others fairly.
_____ 54. develops a plan of action for the group.
_____ 55. behaves in a predictable manner toward group members.
_____ 56. defines role responsibilities for each group member.
_____ 57. communicates actively with group members.
_____ 58. clarifies his or her own role within the group.
_____ 59. shows concern for the personal well-being of others.
_____ 60. provides a plan for how the work is to be done.
_____ 61. shows flexibility in making decisions.
_____ 62. provides criteria for what is expected of the group.

_____ 63. discloses thoughts and feelings to group members.
_____ 64. encourages group members to do quality work.
_____ 65. helps group members get along.

REFERENCES

Alder, S., & Golan, J. (1981). Lateness as a withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *66*, 544-545.

Anderson, C. M., Madlock, P. E., & Hoffman, P. (2006, April). *Leadership, commitment, and attitudes as predictors of satisfaction in small task groups*. Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association Convention, Indianapolis, IN.

Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995). The effects of communication motives, interaction involvement, and loneliness on satisfaction: A model of small groups. *Small Group Research*, *26*, 118-137.

Avtgis, T. A., & Taber, K. R. (2006). "I laughed so hard my side hurts, or is that an ulcer?" The influence of work humor on job stress, job satisfaction, and burnout among print media employees. *Communication Research Reports*, *23*, 13-18.

Barnett, R., & Brennan, R. (1997). Change in job conditions, change in psychological distress, and gender: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*, 253-274.

Berman, S. J., & Hellweg, S. A. (1989). Perceived supervisor communication competence and supervisor satisfaction as a function of quality circle participation. *Journal of Business Communication*, *26*, 103-122.

Blau, G. (1985). Relationship of extrinsic, intrinsic, and demographic predictors to various types of withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *70*, 442-450.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.

Campbell, K. S., White, C. D., & Johnson, D. E. (2003). Leader-member relations as a function of rapport management. *Journal of Business Communication*, *40*, 170-194.

Cartwrite, D., & Zander, A. (1960). *Group dynamics—research and theory*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.

Castaneda, M., & Nahavandi, A. (1991). Link of manager behavior to supervisor performance rating and subordinate satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management*, *16*, 357-366.

Crino, M. E., & White, M. C. (1981). Satisfaction in communication: An examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. *Psychological Reports*, *49*, 831-838.

Cushman, D. P., & Craig, R. T. (1976). Communication systems: Interpersonal implications. In G. R. Miller (Ed.), *Exploration in interpersonal communication* (pp. 37-58). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fairhurst, G. T. (1993). The leader-member exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. *Communication Monographs*, *60*, 321-351.

Fleishman, E. A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E. A. Fleishman & J. G. Hunt (Eds.), *Current developments in the study of leadership* (pp. 1-37). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: John Wiley.

Hall, R. J., & Lord, R. G. (1995). Multi-level information-processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 265-281.

Harris, L., & Cronen, V. E. (1979). A rules-based model for the analysis and evaluation of organizational communication. *Communication Quarterly*, *27*, 12-28.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, *4*, 253-264.

Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 6-38). Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Hersey, P. (1984). *The situational leader*. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.

Hilgerman, R. (1998). Communication satisfaction, goal setting, job satisfaction, concertive control, and effectiveness in self-managed teams. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *59*, 1661.

Holladay, S. J., & Coombs, W. T. (1993). Communication visions: An exploration of the role of delivery in the creation of leader charisma. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *6*, 405-427.

Iverson, R. D., & Deery, S. J. (2001). Understanding the "personological" basis of employee withdrawal: The influence of affect disposition on employee tardiness, early departure, and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 856-866.

Korte, W. B., & Wynne, R. (1996). *Telework: Penetration, potential and practice in Europe*. Amsterdam: Ohmsha Press.

Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Madlock, P. E. (2006a). Do differences in displays of nonverbal immediacy and communicator competence between male and female supervisors affect subordinates, job satisfaction. *Ohio Communication Journal*, *44*, 61-78.

Madlock, P. E. (2006b, November). *Supervisors' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and their relationship to subordinates' communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and willingness to collaborate*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, San Antonio, TX.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). Rounding out the manager's job. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *36*, 11-25.

Monge, P. R., Backman, S. G., Dillard, J. P., & Eisenburg, E. M. (1982). Communicator competence in the workplace: Model testing and scale development. *Communication Yearbook*, *5*, 505-528.

Myers, S. A., & Kassing, J. W. (1998). The relationship between perceived supervisory communication behaviors and subordinate organizational identification. *Communication Research Reports*, *15*, 71-81.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pavitt, C. (1999). Theorizing about the group communication-leadership relationship: Input-process-output and functional models. In L. R. Frey, D. S. Gouran, & M. S. Poole (Eds.), *The handbook of group communication theory and research* (pp. 313–334). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1975). Determinants of supervisory behavior: A role set analysis. *Human Relations*, *38*, 138-153.

Pincus, J. D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction and job performance. *Human Communication Research*, *12*, 395-419.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, *80*, 151-176.

Postmes, T., Tanis, M., & de Wit, B. (2001). Communication and commitment in organizations: A social identity approach. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *4*, 227-246.

Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Phua, J. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Studies*, *15*, 44-52.

Quick, J. C., & Macik-Frey, M. (2004). Behind the mask: Coaching through deep interpersonal communication. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *56*, 67-74.

Ray, E. B., & Miller, K. I. (1994). Social support: Home/work stress and burnout: Who can help? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *30*, 357-373.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2000). The impact of supervisor and subordinate immediacy on relational and organizational outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, *67*, 85-95.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Davis, L. M., & Koontz, K. A. (1980). Perceived power as a mediator of management style and employee satisfaction: A preliminary investigation. *Communication Quarterly*, *28*, 37-46.

Rodwell, J., Kienzle, R., & Shadur, M. (1998). The relationships among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee perceptions and employee performance: The integral role of communication. *Human Resource Management*, *37*, 277-293.

Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication research measures: A sourcebook*. New York: Guilford.

Russell, S. S., Spitzmüller, C., Lin, L. F., Stanton, J. M., Smith, P. C., & Ironson, G. H. (2004). Shorter can also be better: The Abridged Job In General scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *64*, 878-893.

Salacuse, J. W. (2007). Real leaders negotiate. *University Business*, *10*, 2-3.

Sharbrough, W. C., Simmons, S. A., & Cantrill, D. A. (2006). Motivating language in industry: Its impact on job satisfaction and perceived supervisor effectiveness. *Journal of Business Communication*, *43*, 322-343.

Shaw, K. (2005). Getting leaders involved in communication strategy: Breaking down the barriers to effective leadership communication. *Strategic Communication Management*, *9*, 14-17.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. *Communication Education*, *32*, 323-329.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1981, November). *Self-monitoring and relational competence*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Anaheim, CA.

Stohl, C. (1984, May). *Quality circles and the quality of communication*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Taylor, F. W. (1970). What is scientific management? In H. F. Merrill (Ed.), *Classics in management* (pp. 67-71). New York: American Management Association.