

Organizational Orientations

Theory and Measurement:

Development of Measures

and Preliminary Investigations

James C. McCroskey, Virginia P. Richmond, Aaron D. Johnson
and Heather T. Smith

Four studies are reported which focus on organizational orientations theory and relevant measuring instruments. An initial study designed to develop measures of the three components believed to constitute organizational orientation (upward mobile, indifferent, and ambivalent) is reported. Since it was believed that valid measures of organizational orientations should be associated with the way workers communicate, a second study designed to determine the association of organizational orientations with communication apprehension, immediacy, assertiveness, responsiveness, and job satisfaction was conducted as a preliminary validity test. Results of the first two studies pointed to both the reliability and the validity of the new measures. A third study was conducted which included new items designed to increase the reliability of the scales. The results generated revised measures with higher reliability. The fourth study was designed to expand the validation of the instruments by testing their associations with temperament, job satisfaction, and subordinates' perceptions of the credibility of their supervisors. Results suggest that the organizational orientations are associated with the "BIG THREE" temperament variables (extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism) and are predictive of both job satisfaction and perceptions of supervisor credibility. Suggestions for future research and the limitations of the research program at this point are discussed.

KEY CONCEPTS organizational orientations, organizational communication, temperament, source credibility, communication apprehension, job satisfaction, immediacy, assertiveness, responsiveness

James C. McCroskey (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) and Virginia P. Richmond (Ph.D., University of Nebraska, 1977) are Professors in the Department of Communication Studies at West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506-6293. Aaron D. Johnson (M.A., West Virginia University, 2001) is a doctoral student at the same institution. Heather T. Smith (M.A., West Virginia University, 2000) was a graduate student at the same institution when this research program was begun. Study 2 in this report was based on data collected for her M.A. thesis which was directed by the first author.

Since the seminal work of Hovland and his colleagues at Yale during the post World War II era (Hovland & Janis, 1959; Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953), which many credit as being the first significant research program in human communication, personality and other trait orientations have been seen as strongly linked to human communication behavior. While most of the work relating to trait orientations and communication have centered on persuasion and/or interpersonal communication (McCroskey & Daly, 1987; McCroskey, Daly, Martin, & Beatty, 1998), some have focused on organizational communication (e.g. Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977; Richmond & McCroskey, 1979). Most of this work has dealt with communication-related traits such as communication apprehension, tolerance for disagreement, or communication style.

General traits, such as Machiavellianism, authoritarianism, dogmatism, and innovativeness, which may relate to communication and leadership behavior in organizations as well as other contexts, have been studied by scholars in communication, management, psychology, and other fields. Relatively few traits that are organization specific, however, have been addressed. As might be expected, scholars in management have taken the lead in theorizing about trait orientations related to organizations.

One theoretical approach which has been demonstrated to have empirical support and has drawn attention in the management community as well as from writers concerned with organizational communication (Koehler, Anatol, & Applbaum, 1981; Richmond & McCroskey, 2001) is that advanced by Presthus (1958). Presthus's theory centers on a typology of three trait orientations toward organizations. He suggests that these three are the "upward mobile," the "indifferent," and the "ambivalent."

Presthus sees the person with a highly upwardly mobile orientation to be rule- and procedure-oriented and have a strong affinity for organizations. They are thought to have goals of advancement in the organization and to be willing to work strategically to achieve those goals. These individuals are also believed to identify with the organization and be willing to defend it against others who would choose to attack it. If something goes wrong, this individual feels personally to blame, rather than blaming the organization. These individuals are believed to have strong decision-making skills and are willing to take risks. They are also believed to be more concerned about their own success than how they are seen by their peers. People at the low end of the upward mobile scale, of course, are seen to have orientations which are the opposite of those at the high end.

Presthus suggests that individuals who are high on the "indifferent" orientation are people who don't care much about organizations, one way or the other. He believes that most wage and salaried employees in most organizations are high indifferents. He describes these people as individuals who work to live (not live to work), and see work as a necessary evil. They do not expect much from the organization, except a paycheck. High indifferents are believed to socialize with their peers at work, and are concerned about acceptance in the work group. However, they see their life as existing separate from work, and begins when work ends. Those people who are low on the indifferent scale are believed to generally have orientations that are opposite to the high indifferents. However, upward mobility and indifference are not seen as opposites of one another. While they may be negatively related, they are seen as distinctly different orientations.

The third orientation type, those who are ambivalent, do not adapt to the

organization well. While they may be creative, they also likely are anxious. They tend to be introverts who do not like rules or authority (low on authoritarianism). Ambivalent individuals often are frustrated on the job. Their expectations about the organization tend to be unreasonable and unattainable. They do not fit into normal organizational roles and express their differences with the organization and its leadership. These individuals do not see themselves as a part of the organization. Again, people at the low end of the ambivalent scale are seen as the opposite of those on the high end. While scores on any measure of ambivalence might correlate either positively or negatively with scores on the other two orientations, ambivalence is seen to be a distinct orientation.

Pruden (1978) conducted a study of 150 U.S. businessmen designed to validate expected outcomes based on Presthus's theoretical typology. He confirmed hypothesized expectations for variations on the three orientations with regard to five outcome variables: job satisfaction, career mobility, alienation/attachment with work, cosmopolitanism, and organizational rank. His results confirmed the fact that the three orientations were distinct from one another and that the organizationally related expected outcomes could be confirmed.

Even though Pruden's research clearly validated the "organizational orientation theory" advanced by Presthus, subsequent research employing the theory has been scant. An examination of the characteristics of the three orientation types suggest numerous hypotheses related to organizational communication. These three types are very different, and the organizational outcomes for people high or low on each of them are substantial. An obvious potential link between these organizational orientations and the observed organizational outcomes is organizational communication. However, there has been no communication research reported that has investigated this linkage.

Pruden's research was primarily qualitative in nature. He measured the three orientations through observation of the individuals and the outcomes rather than by use of scales designed to measure the orientations directly. This may explain why there has been little follow-up research based on Pruden's work. Up until this point, there have been neither self-report nor other-report scales available to identify where people fall on the continua delineated by the theoretical orientations. The primary purpose of the current research, therefore, was to develop scales which could be used for the purpose of advancing research efforts to explore the impact of trait orientations towards organizations on organizational communication and/or the subsequent outcomes of that communication.

Given the previous research noted above, we posed three general hypotheses which guide this research program:

- H1 Reliable and valid self-report measures which represent the three organizational orientations can be developed.
- H2 Scores on organizational orientation measures are significantly associated with orientations toward organizational communication.
- H3 Scores on organizational orientation measures are significantly associated with organizational outcomes.

The current report presents the results of four studies. The first study centered on the initial development of scales to measure organizational orientations (H1). The second study centered on the initial validation of those scales (H1) and determining

associations between organizational orientations and organizational communication traits (H2) and organizational outcomes (H3). The third study centered in improving the reliability of the organizational orientation measures (H1). The final study directed primary attention to validation of the measures (H1) and determining the associations between those measures and broader trait influences on organizational communication (H2) and organizational outcomes (H3).

STUDY 1—MEASUREMENT DEVELOPMENT

Study 1 was designed to develop initial measures of the upward mobility organizational orientation, the indifferent organizational orientation, and the ambivalent organizational orientation. A total of 60 Likert-type items were written which were believed to be associated with the three organizational orientations. These were formatted randomly in a questionnaire with a five-point response option (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Disagree). Since we desired to develop scales that measure general orientations rather than an orientation toward a particular organization, the items were written in terms of general orientations, not referencing any given organization.

A convenience sample of undergraduate students participated in this study. The volunteers were enrolled in non-required service classes in communication studies at a large, Mid-Atlantic university. A total of 309 students participated in the study (53% female, 46% male, 1% not reported). Participants received points for attendance for assisting in the project. All participants indicated they were either currently employed or had been within the previous six months. Responses of potential participants who indicated they had not been so-employed were not included in the data analyses.

The initial analysis of the data was an exploratory factor analysis, the procedure recommended for early stages of measurement development (Hatcher, 1994). Kiaser's MSA for this data set was .89, which indicates a satisfactory sample. An eigenvalue of 2.0 was set as the minimum criterion for identifying a factor (an eigenvalue of 2.0 equals the variance theoretically accounted for by two items). The results of the analysis indicated the presence of only the expected three factors (a scree test confirmed this number of factors). Consequently, a principal components analysis was computed and the three factors were rotated employing the Promax procedure, a procedure which allows correlated factors. This type of rotation was selected because the theory upon which this research was based accepts that fact that the three dimensions may well be correlated. The Promax procedure allows factors to be correlated or uncorrelated, hence truly uncorrelated factors can still be identified from this analysis.

An examination of the factor structures indicated one factor which was labeled the "ambivalent factor." There were 22 items which had their primary loadings of this factor. The alpha reliability estimate for these items functioning as a measure was .91. A second factor, which included 10 items, was labeled the "indifferent" factor. The alpha reliability estimate for these items functioning as a measure was .79. The final factor, which included 9 items, was labeled the "upward mobile" factor. The alpha reliability estimate for these items functioning as a measure was .66. These three factors were found to be intercorrelated. The obtained correlations were: ambivalent/indifferent = .49; ambivalent/ upward mobile = -.21; and indifferent/upward mobile = -.07.

Descriptive statistics for the three measures were computed and are reported in Table 1. Comparing the hypothetical means with the obtained means indicated that average scores for the ambivalent measure were somewhat lower than would be

expected if the scores were evenly distributed around the neutral point on the scale. Also, the range, 24-95, compared to the possible range, 22-110, indicates few respondents were reporting an extremely high level of ambivalence. This may suggest somewhat of a social undesirability associated with that construct. In contrast, the obtained mean on the upward mobile measure was somewhat higher than would be expected, and the range did not approach the lowest possible score, hence suggesting a social desirability associated with that construct. The mean and range for the indifferent scores were very close to the theoretical mean and possible range, which suggests the absence of any social desirability concerns.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics for Study 1

Orientation	Hypothetical Mean*	Obtained Mean	S.D.	Range
Ambivalent	66	50.1	11.7	24-95
Indifferent	30	29.3	6.2	11-50
Upward Mobile	27	34.3	4.1	22-45

* Assumes scoring at the mid-point on every item.

The results of this investigation were generally encouraging. The existence of the three dimensions of organizational orientations was confirmed. An acceptable measure for at least one of the three dimensions was developed. The measure developed for the ambivalent orientation was excellent, 22 items with high reliability. The measure developed for the indifferent orientation was acceptable, 10 items with moderate reliability. However, the measure developed for the upward mobile orientation was not acceptable, 9 items with unsatisfactory reliability.

STUDY 2—INITIAL VALIDATION

Prior to additional efforts to improve the instruments, Smith (2000) investigated the assumption that organizational orientations would be associated with organizational communication variables. This study employed the measures developed in Study 1. In addition, measures of job satisfaction and four communication traits which have been found to be important in previous research in the organizational context were administered. The communication traits selected from previous research efforts were communication apprehension (Falcione, McCroskey, & Daly, 1977), immediacy (Richmond & McCroskey, 2000), and the assertiveness and responsiveness dimensions of socio-communicative orientation and style (McCroskey & Richmond, 2000). These communication trait measures were selected specifically because they had been found to be highly reliable and were previously validated to have important ramifications in the organizational context.

A sample of students from the same population drawn upon in Study 1 were the participants in the study. The sex of the participants was not collected in this data set, but was approximately equal in proportion. A total of 301 individuals participated in the study. In addition to completing the instruments developed in Study 1, the participants completed the following instruments:

1. A five-item job satisfaction scale (Richmond & McCroskey, 2000). The alpha reliability estimate for the scale in this study was .97.
2. The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 (McCroskey,

- 1982). The alpha reliability estimate for the PRCA-24 in this study was .95.
3. The 15-item Self-Report of Immediacy Behavior measure (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995). The alpha reliability estimate for the SRIB in this study was .84.
 4. The Assertiveness-Responsiveness Measure (Richmond & McCroskey, 1990). The alpha reliability estimates for assertiveness and responsiveness in this study were .86 and .88, respectively. Descriptive statistics for job satisfaction and all of the communication measures employed in this study are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics for Study 2

Measure	Mean	S.D.	Range	Potential Range
Job Satisfaction	24.1	7.9	5-35	5-35
PRCA	64.3	16.7	24-112	24-120
SRIB	56.2	7.1	35-75	15-75
Assertiveness	36.4	6.4	20-50	10-50
Responsiveness	40.2	5.1	24-50	10-50

The associations of the organizational orientations with job satisfaction and communication traits were examined in two ways. The first analysis examined the simple Pearson correlations between organizational orientations and each of the criterion variables. These results are reported in Table 3. The second analysis examined these same associations via analysis of variance. The participants were classified into three groups for each of the organizational orientations. Those scoring at least one standard deviation above the sample mean were classified as "high" on each of the measures. Those scoring at least one standard deviation below the sample mean were classified as "low" on each of the measures. The remaining participants were classified as "moderate." The results of these analyses are reported in Table 4.

TABLE 3
Correlations Between Organizational Orientations and Criterion Variables

Criterion Variables	Organizational Orientations		
	Ambivalent	Indifferent	Upward Mobile
Job Satisfaction	-.50	-.30	.15
PRCA	.14	.11*	-.27
SRIB	-.32	-.09*	.25
Assertiveness	-.02*	-.14	.30
Responsiveness	-.23	-.01*	.33

* Not statistically significant, $p > .05$. All other correlations are statistically significant.

Job Satisfaction

Examination of Tables 3 and 4 indicates some clear findings. With regard to job satisfaction, ambivalent and indifferent orientations are significantly negatively associated. The pattern of means suggests both have a negative linear association. While there is a statistically significant, but very small, positive correlation between higher upward mobility orientation and job satisfaction, the differences between the means of the levels of upward mobility are not significant. By breaking the participants into three

TABLE 4
Results of Analyses of Variance for Study 2

Dependent Variable\ Independent Variable	Orientation Level			F-ratio	p <	Omega Square
	Low	Moderate	High			
Job Satisfaction						
Ambivalent	28.3a	24.7a	18.0a	25.21	.0001	.14
Indifferent	28.0a	24.2a	19.0a	19.66	.01	.12
Upward Mobile	22.7a	24.1	26.3a	2.10	NSD	---
PRCA						
Ambivalent	56.7ab	65.3a	66.5b	5.52	.01	.03
Indifferent	58.2ab	65.6a	66.2b	5.06	.01	.03
Upward Mobile	70.0a	64.1a	57.0a	6.72	.001	.04
Immediacy						
Ambivalent	59.2a	56.2a	53.0a	10.25	.0001	.06
Indifferent	58.3ab	55.8a	55.0b	3.71	.05	.02
Upward Mobile	53.1a	56.1a	60.7a	12.64	.0001	.08
Assertiveness						
Ambivalent	38.1	36.1	36.2	1.72	NSD	---
Indifferent	36.8	36.2	37.0	.34	NSD	---
Upward Mobile	34.5a	36.1b	41.6ab	14.92	.0001	.08
Responsiveness						
Ambivalent	42.7ab	40.0a	39.1b	6.61	.001	.04
Indifferent	41.1	40.0	40.0	1.42	NSD	---
Upward Mobile	37.8ab	41.0a	42.0b	8.54	.001	.05

ab Means with same alphabet letter in same analysis are significantly different, $p < .05$.

categories, substantial power is lost. Hence, there appears to be a very small, but linear (given the observed means) relationship. However, the size of the relationship is so small as to suggest that it probably is not meaningful. Given the data available in this investigation, it appears appropriate to conclude that having higher ambivalent or indifferent orientations is meaningfully associated with reduced job satisfaction.

Communication Apprehension

The results with regard to communication apprehension are pointed to by both the correlational and analysis of variance findings. Higher ambivalent and higher indifferent orientations are both associated with higher communication apprehension. However, higher upward mobile orientations are associated with lower communication apprehension. The relationship of CA with upward mobility is substantially stronger than the other relationships. Examination of the means of the three levels of upward mobility suggests that this is a linear relationship. However, a similar examination of the ambivalent and indifferent mean results suggests that neither of these relationships are linear. Moderate and high levels are not significantly different for either orientation, but lower orientations on both are associated with substantially lower communication apprehension.

Immediacy

The results with regard to immediacy which are reported in Tables 3 and 4 point to linear relationships of immediacy with both ambivalent and upward mobile

orientations, but in opposite directions. Higher ambivalent scores are associated with less immediacy, while higher upward mobile scores are associated with more immediacy. However, the non-significant correlation between indifferent scores and immediacy is explained by the clear non-linear pattern of the means reported in Table 4. People in the low indifferent category are more immediate than people in either the moderate or high indifferent categories, the latter categories' means do not differ.

Assertiveness

Both data analyses indicated no relationship exists between ambivalent scores and assertiveness. The results for the indifferent scores were similar, no relationship in the analysis of variance and a trivial, but statistically significant negative relationship between indifferent and assertiveness scores. In contrast, both analyses point to a positive and linear relationship between upward mobile scores and assertiveness.

Responsiveness

The pattern of results relating to responsiveness suggests the absence of any relationship between responsiveness and indifferent scores. A modest negative correlation between responsiveness and ambivalent scores is countered by a negative correlation between responsiveness and upward mobile scores. An examination of the correlations indicate they both are non-linear. People classified low ambivalents report being more responsive than moderate or high ambivalents while people classified as low upward mobiles report being less responsive. Moderate and highs on both orientations do not differ from each other, but both differ significantly from lows.

On balance, the results of Study 2 provide validation for the belief that organizational orientations are associated with at least some types of organizational communication behaviors, behaviors which have been found to be meaningful in previous research in organizations. The fact that our initial measures of organizational orientations were able to measure these associations points to the validity of the measures.

STUDY 3—MEASUREMENT IMPROVEMENT

As noted above, our initial efforts to generate an acceptable measure of the upward mobile orientation produced only nine items with a reliability below .70. Similarly, the measure of the indifferent orientation only included ten items. Study 3 was designed to improve the measurement of the upward mobile and indifferent orientations. Fifteen new items were generated which were believed to be associated with upward mobile orientations. Ten new items for the indifferent orientation were generated.

Participants in Study 3 were 265 students drawn from the same population as the previous studies. The items from the previously developed ambivalent and indifferent scales were included in a questionnaire along with the nine items from the upward mobile scale and the new items generated for upward mobile and indifferent scales. Items from all three scales were randomized for presentation to the participants. The same five-step response options employed in the previous studies was used in this study.

Exploratory factor analysis (employing the same criteria as in Study 1) indicated the existence of the three factors representing the three organizational orientations. All of the new items designed to measure the upward mobile orientation loaded on the appropriate factor. The nine items with the highest item-total correlations were added

to the upward mobile orientation scale. Only two items generated for the indifferent measure factored with the correct factor. These items were added to the indifferent scale. Item-total correlations on the ambivalent orientation scale were examined, and the twenty items with the highest item-total correlations were retained on that scale. The obtained alpha reliability estimates for the upward mobile, ambivalent, and indifferent scales, respectively, were .84, .89, and .79. The items for each scale are noted in Figures 1-3.

FIGURE 1
Upward Mobile Orientation Measure

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by recording your response in the space before each item. Use the following response options: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree.

- _____ 1. I generally try my best to do what an organization I work for wants me to do.
- _____ 2. If I had the choice, I would take a promotion over the acceptance of my peers any time.
- _____ 3. One of my goals is to get a good job and excel at it.
- _____ 4. Eventually, I would like to be the "big boss" in an organization.
- _____ 5. I firmly believe that if I work hard enough, one day I will be right up at the top.
- _____ 6. I am good at my job and I love it.
- _____ 7. Most of all, I really want to be recognized for the excellent work I do.
- _____ 8. *I think moving up in an organization is not worth all the work you have to do.
- _____ 9. Sometimes I think I am a "workaholic."
- _____ 10. I want a job where what I do really counts for something.
- _____ 11. Everyone tells me I am a really good worker.
- _____ 12. I want work which has a lot of intangible rewards.
- _____ 13. Ordinarily, I feel good about what I have accomplished when I am done with my day's work.
- _____ 14. I would be willing to work hard to be the top person in an organization.
- _____ 15. Since I am really good at what I do, I will move up in the organization.
- _____ 16. What I want most in a job is the possibility of really doing something important.
- _____ 17. Any job worth doing is worth doing as well as I can.
- _____ 18. I am a very creative worker.

* Reverse scoring.

FIGURE 2
Ambivalent Orientation Measure

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by recording your response in the space before each item. Use the following response options: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree.

- _____ 1. Other than a paycheck, the organizations I have worked for have had little to offer me.
- _____ 2. The product/service produced by organizations where I have worked are of very low quality.
- _____ 3. *I have generally been quite satisfied with jobs I have had.
- _____ 4. The organizations I have worked for couldn't care less whether I live or die--and I feel the same way about them.
- _____ 5. I really dislike the rules and regulations I am forced to live with in organizations.
- _____ 6. I am usually unhappy wherever I work.
- _____ 7. Everywhere I have worked, I have had an incompetent supervisor.
- _____ 8. Wherever I work, I wish I were working somewhere, almost anywhere, else than where I am.
- _____ 9. *The procedures and regulations of organizations I have worked for have generally been quite reasonable.
- _____ 10. I find it difficult to adapt to the demands of most organizations.
- _____ 11. Generally, I don't like the rules that organizations make me follow.
- _____ 12. I don't really like most of the people I have worked with.
- _____ 13. *I have worked for really good organizations.
- _____ 14. Most organizations have unreasonable expectations for workers like me.
- _____ 15. Most of the time, a halfhearted effort is all I feel I need to give in a job.
- _____ 16. I really hate most organizations I have worked for.

FIGURE 2 (cont.)
Ambivalent Orientation Measure

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by recording your response in the space before each item. Use the following response options: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree.

- _____ 17. One supervisor is about like any other, a pain in the backside.
- _____ 18. What I want most in a job is to be left alone.
- _____ 19. Frankly, I am smarter than most of the people I have worked for.
- _____ 20. I have been unhappy just about everywhere I have worked.

* Reverse scoring.

FIGURE 3
Indifferent Orientation Measure

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below by recording your response in the space before each item. Use the following response options: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree.

- _____ 1. My life begins when I get off work.
- _____ 2. If I were offered a job that paid better, I would take it in a "New York Minute."
- _____ 3. A job is a job--everyone has to work somewhere.
- _____ 4. I am generally indifferent to where I work. One job is about the same as another.
- _____ 5. Generally, I just do as much as is required by my job.
- _____ 6. Since I am entitled to them, I take all of my sick days whether I am sick or not.
- _____ 7. I don't much care where I work, so long as the pay is good.
- _____ 8. When work is over, life begins.
- _____ 9. One job is pretty much like any other job.
- _____ 10. If I found out the organization I worked for was in trouble, I would quickly look for a job in another organization.
- _____ 11. Work is something I have to do, not something I want to do.
- _____ 12. When it comes to choosing a job, "show me the money!"

STUDY 4—ETIOLOGY AND OUTCOMES

The fourth study was designed to explore the possibility that organizational orientations have genetic bases and to investigate relationships of organizational orientations with job satisfaction (to replicate Study 2) and another outcome which has been found to be associated with supervisor/subordinate communication--subordinate perceptions of supervisor source credibility (Richmond & McCroskey, 2000).

A sample of students from the same population drawn upon in the previous studies were the participants in the study. A total of 354 individuals participated in the study. Data on biological sex was not collected. However, the enrollment in the classes in which the data were collected was approximately equally distributed by sex.

The participants completed the following instruments:

- 1. The organizational orientation measures reported in Figures 1-3. The alpha reliability estimates for the upward mobile, ambivalent, and indifferent scales were .85, .88, and .80, respectively.
- 2. The five-item job satisfaction scale employed in Study 2 (Richmond & McCroskey, 2000). The alpha reliability estimate for the scale in this study was .96.
- 3. The 18-item source credibility measure developed by McCroskey & Teven (1999). The alpha reliability estimates for the competence, caring/goodwill, and

trustworthiness dimension scores on this instrument were .89, .94, and .93 respectively.

4. Measures of the "BIG THREE" temperament variables. The 10-item measures of extraversion and neuroticism developed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) produced alpha reliability estimates of .78 and .82 respectively. The 12-item measure of psychoticism developed by Eysenck, Eysenck, and Barrett (1985) produced an alpha reliability estimate of .65. Descriptive statistics for all of the measures employed in this study are reported in Table 5.

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics for Study 4

Measure	Mean	S.D.	Range	Potential Range
Upward Mobile	68.56	8.75	36-88	18-90
Ambivalent	48.29	11.59	20-78	20-100
Indifferent	34.57	6.55	18-53	12-60
Job Satisfaction	24.98	7.80	5-35	5-35
Competence	31.92	7.58	6-42	6-42
Caring/Goodwill	30.25	9.40	6-42	6-42
Trustworthiness	32.89	8.51	6-42	6-42
Extroversion	25.80	3.67	10-28	10-30
Neuroticism	18.02	5.18	12-30	10-30
Psychoticism	27.54	3.68	17-33	12-36

The associations among the organizational orientations, the outcome variables, and the temperament variables were examined by computing simple correlations, multiple correlations, and canonical correlations. Table 6 reports the simple and multiple correlations of the organizational orientations with the outcome variables. Table 7 reports the simple and multiple correlations of the temperament variables with the organizational orientations. Table 8 reports the simple and multiple correlations of the temperament variables with the outcome variables.

TABLE 6
Simple and Multiple Correlations between Organizational Orientations and Outcomes*

Outcome Variables	Organizational Orientations			Multiple Correlations
	Ambivalent	Indifferent	Upward Mobiles	
Job Satisfaction	-.49	-.22	.24	.49
Competence	-.44	-.20	.23	.45
Caring\Goodwill	-.50	-.23	.26	.51
Trustworthiness	-.43	-.14	.23	.45

* All correlations are statistically significant, $p < .01$.

TABLE 7
Simple and Multiple Correlations between Organizational Orientations and Temperament

Org. Orientations	Temperaments			Multiple Correlations
	Extroversion	Neuroticism	Psychoticism	
Ambivalent	-.14	.21	.42	.43
Indifferent	-.03*	.19	.32	.40
Upward Mobile	.16	-.16	-.37	.33

* NSD, $p > .05$. All other correlations are statistically significant, $p < .01$

TABLE 8
Simple and Multiple Correlations between Temperament and Outcome Variables

Outcome Variables	Extroversion	Temperament Neuroticism	Psychoticism	Multiple Correlations
Job Satisfaction	.16	-.14	-.09*	.19
Competence	.06*	-.04*	-.14	.14*
Caring/Goodwill	.03*	-.02*	-.18	.18
Trustworthiness	.07*	-.04*	-.14	.16

* Not statistically significant, $p > .05$. All other correlations statistically significant, $p < .01$.

Three canonical analyses were also computed. The first analysis involved the three temperament measures and the three credibility measures. The first analysis yielded no significant canonical correlations [$F(9, 842) = 1.57, p > .12$].

The second canonical analysis involved the three temperament measures and the three organizational orientations. This analysis yielded one significant canonical correlation [$F(9, 837) = 12.53, p < .0001, R_c = .49$]. The correlations between the temperament variables and the canonical variable were extroversion, .31; neuroticism, -.46; and psychoticism -.95. The correlations between the organizational orientations were ambivalence, -.86, upward mobile, .78; and indifference, -.64.

The third canonical analysis involved the three organizational orientations and the credibility measures. This analysis yielded one significant canonical correlation [$F(9, 847) = 14.26, p < .0001, R_c = .52$]. The correlations between the organizational orientations and the canonical variate were ambivalence, -.98, upward mobile, .51, and indifferent, -.44. The correlations between the credibility variables and the canonical variate were competence, .85; caring/goodwill, .96; and trustworthiness, .85.

Examination of these results indicate there were substantial associations between the organizational orientations and the outcome variables of job satisfaction and source credibility. They also indicate that the temperament variables are meaningfully associated with the organizational associations. However, the associations of the temperament variables with the outcome variables were modest, at best, and of little theoretical interest.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the four studies reported here are encouraging. All three of our general hypotheses were supported. Measures of the three organizational orientations advanced theoretically have been developed. While additional refinement would likely be useful, the ability of these measures to predict organizational communication orientations and outcomes point to the validity of both the theory and the measures.

Study 2 indicated that the organizational orientations are associated with at least some communication orientations. Extension of this research to determine whether other organizational communication orientations are associated with these organizational orientations would be useful as well.

The results of Study 2 and 4 indicate that the organizational orientations are meaningful predictors of at least some organizational outcomes. Research which examines other potential organizational outcomes of these organizational orientations would also be useful. It may well be, for example, that these orientations impact the way subordinates react to supervisors and vice versa. The potential impact may be reflected

in such things as tolerance for disagreement and conflict style. Other outcomes, such as retention and advancement, also deserve attention in future research.

A major concern addressed in the current research was a potential causal factor related to these trait orientations. The early theoretical work (Presthus, 1958) drew on the traditional learning models to suggest that these orientations may be learned. While this view should not be discounted, the fact that our data were drawn completely from typical undergraduate college students, and the results so clearly fit the original theory, we must question when and how we should expect this learning process to occur. Most of these students have had comparatively little previous experience with organizations. Hence, if they have learned their orientations, it is not likely that this learning has come from actual organizational experience, but may come from vicarious experiences obtained as a function of communication with family and other interpersonal contact as well as media influence.

However, the traditional learning model also has come under severe attack from scholars advancing the communibiological paradigm (Beatty & McCroskey, 2001; Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998; McCroskey, Heisel, & Richmond, 2001). The possibility of these organizational orientations having a genetic basis was examined in Study 4. Since the organizational orientations which were found in Study 2 to be meaningfully related to certain communication traits which have been found to have genetic foundations, the possibility that both of these sets of traits may stem, at least in part, from the same genetic foundations needed to be examined. The results of Study 4 indicate that temperament (as represented by Eysenck's BIG THREE) is substantially associated with the organizational orientations. Since these genetically related temperament variables have been found as useful markers for other genetically based orientations, the substantial relationships observed in Study 4 are highly suggestive that organizational orientations, at least in part, have genetic roots. While determining the exact path of causation was not a focus in this study, the correlations observed are consistent with a theory that genetically based brain structures may influence organizational orientations which, in turn, impact organizational communication behaviors, which influence organizational communication outcomes. Future research is needed which explores this plausible theoretical position.

Finally, it needs to be noted that this research program currently suffers from one significant limitation. That is, all research participants have been college students. Future research needs to expand the participant base to include people with extended experience in a variety of organizations. While preliminary measurement development typically relies on student data, if we are to generalize to workers in ongoing organizations, it is necessary to demonstrate that such generalization is justified. Replication of Studies 2 & 4, with extension to other communication orientations/behaviors, with participants from ongoing organizations would be particularly useful.

REFERENCES

- Beatty, M. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). *The biology of communication: A communibiological perspective*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs*, 64, 197-219.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*. New York: Plenum.

- Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 21-29.
- Falcione, R. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1977). Job satisfaction as a function of employee's communication apprehension, self-esteem, and perceptions of their immediate supervisors. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 1* (pp. 363-375). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Hatcher, L. (1994). *A step-by-step approach to using the SAS system for factor analysis and structural equation modeling*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Hovland, C. I., & Janis, I. L. (1959). *Personality and persuasibility*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Koehler, J. W., Anatol, K. W. E., & Applbaum, R. L. (1981). *Organizational communication: Behavioral perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Daly, J. A. (1987). *Personality and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. A., Martin, M. M., & Beatty, M. J. (1998). *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- McCroskey, J. C., Heisel, A. D., & Richmond, V. P. (2001). Eysenck's BIG THREE and communication traits: Three correlational studies. *Communication Monographs*, 68, 360-366.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2000). Applying reciprocity and accommodation theories to supervisor/subordinate communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 28, 278-289.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 90-103.
- Presthus, R. V. (1958). Toward a theory of organizational behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 3, 48-72.
- Pruden, H. O. (1973). The upward mobile, indifferent, and ambivalent typology of managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 16 (3), 455-464.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1979). Management communication style, tolerance for disagreement, and innovativeness as predictors of employee satisfaction: A comparison of single-factor, two-factor, and multiple-factor approaches. In D. Nimmo (Ed.) *Communication Yearbook 3* (pp.359-373). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports*, 67, 449-450.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- 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. (2001). *Organizational communication for survival: Making Work, Work*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, H. T. (2000). *The relationships of organizational personality variables with worker socio-communicative orientation, communication apprehension, immediacy, and job satisfaction*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, West Virginia University.

Copyright of Communication Quarterly is the property of the Eastern Communication Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. This article has been reproduced with permission of the Eastern Communication Association for the development of Applied Communication Research Methods textbook under development by Jason S. Wrench, Virginia P. Richmond, Candice Thomas-Maddox, and James C. McCroskey. Users may print articles for individual use only.