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Abstract

This study explored the dimensions which account for effective communication in order to clarify the domain of interpersonal communication. Real and ideal perceptions of superiors, managers, and subordinates were compared to determine if the views of others (superiors and subordinates) differed from self (manager) perceptions of desirable interpersonal communication skills.

The Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) was used to examine sport managers' interpersonal skills. This instrument was revised by adding an ideal perceptual domain, and by changing the wording to allow for both self and others' perspectives to be investigated. The key areas reported in previous interpersonal communication research were compared to the original dimensions and five new dimensions were implemented.

Twenty-six provincial sport organizations were selected and examined. A variety of statistical procedures were used to answer the three research questions and four hypotheses (i.e., a stepwise multiple regression, three ANOVAs, two MANOVAs, and four one-tailed t-tests). Only 4.6% of the total variance within effective communication could be attributed to the dimensions used. This indicated that the dimensions which make up interpersonal communication need to be further identified. Additionally, managers were found to not be as effective in communicating as they believe. In particular, managers perceived themselves to communicate downwards better than upwards, however subordinates' perceptions indicated that managers are not as effective in downwards communication as they think.

Recommendations for future research included the need to create an introspective instrument for measuring managerial effectiveness, revising the ICI or developing a new measure of interpersonal communication, further investigation into the differences between managers' and subordinates' perceptions of the managers' communication skills, and identification of the dimensions which constitute the domain of interpersonal communication.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Communication, especially face-to-face communication, is ubiquitous. Virtually every science has explored some aspect of communication at one point in time. Communication has not only been examined by almost every science, but it has also been studied since the beginning of time. As Thayer noted, “interest in communication has existed for centuries. The [Ancient] Greeks accounted for the phenomenon in the following manner...: Their wing-footed god Mercury would pluck the appropriate idea from the speaker’s brain and plunge it on the end of his spear into the brain of the listener” (in Yeager, 1975, 261).

Despite this incessant interest in the process of communication, it is still not thoroughly understood. Even less is known about face-to-face or interpersonal communication. This ambiguity exists, not because of the lack of research carried out on communication, but because communication is a perceptual and subjective process which is difficult to analyze. However, the perceptual and pervasive nature of communication is also what makes it essential to study.

More recently, researchers such as Allen, Gotcher, and Seibert (1993), Henderson (1985), Jablin (1979), VanLear (1996), and Vezzuto (1984) have conducted interdisciplinary studies in order to combine the plethora of findings from various disciplines such as communication studies, organizational communication, managerial communication, corporate communication, and business communication. These extensive literature reviews have clarified the process of communication while delineating research areas within the management and administrative domains. However, the applicability of this research to sport managers is unclear because few studies have been conducted within the sport management field. This study attempts to bridge that gap.

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the topic of interpersonal communication and discuss the rational behind this study. The chapter begins with a brief overview of interpersonal communication and a discussion of the importance of studying interpersonal communication in the field of sport management. This is followed
by the purpose of the study, the statement of the problem, and a list of the hypotheses and research questions. The chapter ends with the assumptions, limitations, and delimitations underlying the study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this inquiry is to build upon previous interpersonal communication research to increase the understanding of which dimensions contribute to effective communication. This study also examines superiors’, managers’, and subordinates’ perceptions in order to expand current knowledge regarding the similarities and differences of these perceptions.

**Statement of the Problem**

While many researchers have examined interpersonal communication in detail, there is still little agreement about what exactly makes for effective communication. It is essential that the dimensions which lead to effective communication be identified, so that the appropriate interpersonal communication skills can be understood, practiced, and taught. Therefore, this study first explores which dimensions account for effective communication in order to clarify the domain of interpersonal communication. Then real and ideal perceptions are examined to determine if superiors, managers, and subordinates differ in what they view as desirable interpersonal communication skills. Finally, specific hypotheses about the similarities and differences in the perspectives of superiors, managers, and subordinates are investigated to extend the work of Bass and Yammarino (1991), Harris and Schaubroeck (1988), Santora (1992) and Weese (1998). A description of the operationalized terms can be found in Appendix A.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The problems investigated in this study are divided into three research questions and four hypotheses. The relationship between previous research and the following research questions and hypotheses can be found at the end of Chapter Two.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Q1. How much variance does each dimension account for in effective interpersonal communication?

Q2. Does position affect the perception of real interpersonal communication dimensions?

Q3. Does position affect the perception of ideal interpersonal communication dimensions?

HYPOTHESES

H1. $H_{01} =$ There will be no significant difference between superiors' and subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

$H_{A1} =$ Superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

H2. $H_{02} =$ There will be no significant difference between managers' and superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

$H_{A2} =$ Managers' self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

H3. $H_{03} =$ There will be no significant difference between managers' and subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

$H_{A3} =$ Managers' self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

H4. $H_{04} =$ There will be no significant difference between managers' perceptions of their upward and downward communication skills.

$H_{A4} =$ Managers' self-perceptions of their upward communication skills will be higher than their self-perceptions of their downward communication skills.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions underlying the Study:

1. Perceptions have an effect upon interpersonal communication.

2. Interpersonal communication skills contribute to managerial effectiveness.
3. The designation of superiors, managers, and subordinates by the executive directors is consistent and accurate.

Assumptions about the Instrumentation:
1. Perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills can be reliably measured using a self-reporting questionnaire.

2. Perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills can be measured with validity using a self-reporting questionnaire.

3. The instrumentation is appropriate for measuring the dimensions of interest.

4. The respondents answered in an accurate and truthful manner.

5. The surveys are clear, and respondents were not be pressured into answering incorrectly.

6. The minor word changes to the original ICI do not significantly alter the instrument.

7. The rewording of the superiors’ and the subordinates’ surveys (i.e., change “you” to “the manager”) does not significantly alter the instrument.

8. The addition of ideal perceptions to the instrument does not significantly alter the instrument.

Assumptions about the Research Questions:
1. Sports management is a separate domain, distinct from administration, business management, and organizational management.

2. However, theories and research findings from administrative, business, and organizational management areas can be transferred to the sport management field.

Assumptions about the Expert Panel:
1. The people chosen for the panel are indeed experts and therefore categorized the questions accurately and consistently.

2. Any item that has the consensus of half the panelists had some degree of content validity.
LIMITATIONS

This study has three main limitations. First, it examines Provincial Sport Organizations (PSO) which tend to be small, distinct, semi-detached, non-profit organizations. Therefore, the ability to generalize the results this study to sport managers in 'tall' or highly bureaucratic organizations such as professional sport teams or large university departments is limited. Second, a retrospective, subjective, self-reporting questionnaire is used. However, it is used by all respondents, who are therefore at an equal disadvantage with such an instrument. The third limitation is related to the use of the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) which was developed in 1969. This instrument was created almost thirty years ago, and many researchers have examined interpersonal communication since, yet the dimensions that constitute the domain of interpersonal communication have still not been clearly defined.

DELIMITATIONS

The sample is delimited to twenty-six Provincial Sport Organizations that are affiliated with the Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre. These sport organizations were selected to ensure timely, cooperative, and honest responses. Additionally, this study is delimited by the lack of prior research in the area of sport management.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the background for this study since very little research has been conducted on interpersonal communication in the sport management field. This chapter provides the reader with general overviews of communication, interpersonal communication, research areas, and research methods in order to clarify the terms and theories found in previous studies. This chapter ends with a description of the relationship between previous research and the research questions and the hypotheses.

Overview of Communication

Defining Communication

There is not a generally accepted definition for the term ‘communication.’ Part of the difficulty in defining the term communication “lies in the widespread use of the word - there are few disciplines that cannot claim the term as their own” (Barnlund in Yeager, 1975, 248). As Newman stated “communication is so diverse and discursive, that the attempt to create a generally accepted definition becomes so profoundly involved, that it hinders rather than helps further thought on the subject” (Smith in Yeager, 1975, 248). Therefore, the following does not attempt to define communication, but rather posit characteristics that must be present in order for there to be communication.

The Latin term for communication is communitas, which means to share, or commonness (Gayeski, 1993; Hawkins & Preston, 1981). In simplest terms, the goal of communication is to “develop a commonness of meaning between sender and receiver” (Hawkins & Preston, 1981, 3). This shared meaning allows two or more people to transfer information, and to define or understand respective realities, so other human activities can be achieved. (Daniels & Spiker in Gayeski, 1993; Northcraft & Neale, 1994; Rogers & Kincaid in Vezzuto, 1984).

Communication plays a crucial role in an organization, as it is the basis for all group activities and effective group functioning. “Whether communication is conceived
as the essence of organizational behaviour, or as one of the seven components...identified within the scope of the administrative process, the fact remains that no organization can exist without it” (Rubenstein & Haberstroh in Yeager, 1975, 247). A manager’s functions of planning, organizing, and controlling can only become operationalized through communicative activity (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994). However, communication is a complex and complicated process that is not fully understood and often problematic.

The Perceptual Process of Communication

One factor that makes communication so complex, and potentially problematic, is its dependence on perception. The process of communication is a dynamic sequence of events that depends on the sender and the receiver sharing the following: similar rules for understanding, similar perceptions about the rules used, similar perceptions on how to encode or decode the message, and similar perceptions on the meaning of the message (Northcraft & Neale, 1994; Steers & Black, 1994). Therefore, when studying communication, it is important to recognize how perceptions encompass each stage of the process, making it complicated and potentially problematic.

In addition to the dependence on perception, new research findings have also increased the complexity of studying the communication process. It can no longer be examined as a one-way linear transaction, as the Ancient Greeks believed. Instead, communication must be examined as an active process which is “grounded in action, not in information transmission, nor even in the transfer of knowledge” (Taylor, 1993, 112). Even though Malinowski suggested that “communication is a dimension of collective action and not separate,” it was not until two decades later that researchers in the area of communication started to recognized communication as a dynamic perceptual process rather than a closed system (in Taylor, 1993, 183).

Development of Communication Models

Although communication models have changed significantly through the course of communication research, the key elements have remained. These include the
communicator, the message, the medium, the noise, the receiver, and the feedback. These common or core elements can be simplified to refer to "the who? says what? in which way? to whom? with what effect?" (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994; Hawkins & Preston, 1981). Each of these elements are evident in the early and contemporary models.

EARLY LINEAR MODELS

The notion of communication as a system was conceptualized in the early 1950's. These early linear models "stressed the expression and encoding of messages, the transmittal of messages, and described a one-way flow of information" (Gayeski, 1993, 27). One of the first models of communication (see Figure 1) was developed by Shannon and Weaver in 1949, and includes the communicator, encoding, the message and the medium, decoding, and the receiver, with feedback and noise all along the path (Gayeski, 1993; Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly, 1994; Taylor, 1993; Yeager, 1975). This model was the cornerstone for further development in conceptualizing communication.

![Shannon and Weaver Model of linear communication. (Gayeski 1993, 26).](image)

The second major model to emerge was Berlo’s SMCR Model (Source, Message, Channel, Receiver) in 1960. This model added to Shannon and Weaver’s model by introducing the notion of environment and its effects on the sender and the receiver (see Figure 2). "The source and the receiver are personas with communication skills, attitudes, and knowledge, operating within a social system and culture. The degree to which there is commonality of these factors between the source and the receiver
determines how effective or easy the communication of a message will be” (Gayeski, 1993, 27; Yeager, 1975).

![Diagram of Berlo's SMCR Model](image)

**Figure 2.** Berlo's SMCR Model or 'ingredients' of communication. (Gayeski 1993, 27).

CRITICISM OF EARLY MODELS

Linear, interactional models provide an adequate way to describe one-way communication in which messages are alternately exchanged. Examples include announcements, memos, and email (Gayeski, 1993). However, interpersonal or face-to-face communication is not easily splintered into simple one-way messages. Interpersonal communication is a two-way interaction or “process of message exchange, rather than message transmission” (Gayeski, 1993, 28; Kincaid & Rogers in Vezzzuto, 1984).

According to Hawkins and Preston (1981), the process of communication refers to a dynamic “sequence of activities, events or ideas, that are in some way connected” (p. 4). Kincaid and Rogers stated that “the purpose of communication is defined as mutual understanding, in contrast to linear models which characterized it as persuasion” (in Vezzzuto, 1984, 3). Therefore, current research trends have moved away from one-way or linear models towards two-way or transactional models of communication where information is exchanged simultaneously.

CURRENT, CONTEMPORARY MODELS

The Schramm Model of Communication (see Figure 3) was developed in 1954, and emphasized that communication was a simultaneous, two-way process (Gayeski,
This model, and other similar models, were influenced by the human relations movement. Consequentially these researchers de-emphasized the transmission portion of communication, and emphasized the importance of feedback, receiver participation, non-verbal cues, and listening (Gayeski, 1993).

The Bateson's Relational Communication Model expands on this notion of a interactional two-way process and adds that "every exchange [has] two messages - a report message (content) and a command message (statement about the relationship)" (Gayeski, 1993, 27). This addition is significant because it highlights the importance of the relationship or the implied relationship of participants (Gayeski, 1993).

Many other models have also been developed and they all emphasized the importance of participants' relationships and environment. However the Perceptual Communication Model (see Figure 4) takes this one step further and adds the essential variable of perception. Northcraft and Neale (1994) purport that the communication elements include intended meaning, encoding, transmission, decoding, and perceived meaning. All of this occurs within the context of participants' environments and includes simultaneous noise and feedback.

Communication is essentially a perceptual process. The sender must encode intended meaning to create messages. The receiver then decodes the message to obtain perceived meaning. Effective communication depends on the sender and the receiver sharing an understanding of the rules used to encode meaning into messages (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 248).
Northcraft and Neale (1994) further itemize the importance of perception at every phase of the communication process. Before the sender can encode the message they must select what to transmit by using perceptions of "what the receiver knows, what the receiver will assume, and what else must be conveyed" (p. 248). During the transmission, the sender must select the most appropriate channel based on perceptions of the appropriateness of each medium. The success of decoding is dependent upon the compatibility of the senders and the receivers' perceptions of the meaning of the communication symbols. Even the noise and the feedback within this continuous process are dependent on the participant perceptions of what is essential to ignore, attend to, or comment on.

![Diagram of the Perceptual Communication Model](image)

Figure 4. The Perceptual Communication Model. (From Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 248).

Even though the above models have assisted in the clarifying and categorizing the process of communication, they do not yet fully explain the complexity and variance within interpersonal communications. Previous researchers have attempted to and structure and consistency to the term communication, yet it currently seems impossible to
define and explain such a dynamic, interactional process. Nothcraft and Neale (1994) recognized this when they stated:

Face-to-face interpersonal communication is a dynamic, transactional process which is more simultaneous than the above model displays…. As the sender sends a message, the receiver is already receiving and reacting - providing feedback to the sender (for instance, via facial gestures or even verbal interruptions). Thus face-to-face interpersonal communication is not about senders and receivers but about individuals who are simultaneously sending and receiving messages (p. 249).

This complexity due to perceptions is one of the main difficulty’s researchers in the area of interpersonal communication face. One unanimously accepted definition or model has not been (and may never be) developed. However, the valuable information gathered from these contemporary models are essential, and therefore this study will include a key element of the most recent models - perception.

**Introduction to Interpersonal Communication**

**Definitions of Interpersonal Communication**

Interpersonal communication is a specific area within the domain of communication that usually refers to face-to-face interactions among two or more persons (Barker & Kibler in Dahl, 1985; Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Hawkins & Preston, 1981; Ruesch in Dahl, 1985; Yeager, 1975).

Interpersonal communication deals with direct face-to-face communication “between two or more people in physical proximity in which all of the five senses can be utilized and immediate feedback is present” (Gordon in Vezzuto, 1984, 13). The presence of this concentrated, yet extremely complex process, creates an ideal condition for researchers to study perceptions, interaction, and the mechanics of the communication process.

The variance and complexity that can be found within the realm of interpersonal communication is evident after considering the endless variety of interactions humans have on a daily basis. Interpersonal communication can vary depending on its duration,
frequency, function, reciprocity, disclosure, load, duration, credibility, relational level, currencies, and reinforcement schedules (Hawkins & Preston, 1981). Within an organization, interpersonal communication is also contingent upon status, interpersonal attraction, organizational roles, and job expectations (Hawkins & Preston, 1981). This complexity, further mystified by perceptions, makes comparing one interaction with another difficult. Therefore, researchers in the field of interpersonal communication have spent considerable time studying dyads to observe mutual effects participants have on each other, and to really understand the fundamental intricacies that operate in interpersonal communication relationships (Wilmot in Dahl, 1985).

**Dyads**

A dyad includes “two people involved in a face-to-face communicative transaction” (Wilmot in Dahl, 1985, 6). In organizations, both formal and informal, superior-subordinate dyads exist and can be studied through direct or indirect observation and codification, subjective self-reporting diaries or surveys, in-depth interviews, or combinations thereof (Jablin, 1979).

Communication patterns and communication problems within an organization are usually described at a dyadic level. This is because the dyadic portion - of the organizations overall communication patterns - is the easiest (but not easy) to obtain information from when studying interpersonal communication. Therefore, the superior-subordinate dyad is commonly researched and often looked upon as the key to managerial effectiveness in all seven of the administrative functions (Allen, Gotcher, & Seibert, 1993; Case, 1975; Henderson, 1985; Lee & Jablin, 1995; Northcraft & Neale, 1994). For example Likert and Herzberg (1985) stated that “if both individuals within a [dyad] interact within an environment of mutual satisfaction, there is an increased probability that their level of productivity will be enhanced” (in McDowell, 1985, 5).

At the dyadic level, the importance of perceptions can also be examined. The effects that participants’ perceptions have on each other are important keys to further understanding the process of communication and improving managerial effectiveness, and can both be studied by examining the dyad. In a superior-subordinate dyad
"[e]ffective leadership demands awareness of perceptual differences in order to supplement the communication process and attempt to balance any existing discrepancies. The less that active discrepancies exist within a [dyad], the higher the probability that interpersonal communication will be effective, that is, less probability of miscommunication and misunderstanding" (Likert in McDowell, 1985, 27). Therefore, this study will examine the superior-manager and the manager-subordinate dyads to see if any distortion or discrepancies exist regarding the sport managers' interpersonal communication skills.

Major Influences on Interpersonal Communication

Since interpersonal communication is such a dynamic, perceptual process, many factors within an organization have a great impact upon communicative acts. Entrenched structures such as the communication patterns and channels can foster or inhibit the effectiveness of face-to-face interactions. Managerial styles and the types of interpersonal communication they choose to use can also greatly increase or decrease communication effectiveness. This section outlines these influences and denotes other barriers to effective communication that will be taken into account while analyzing how sport managers communicate.

COMMUNICATION PATTERNS

Communication follows particular patterns in an organization. Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly (1994) suggest that there are 5 directions of communication - down, up, horizontal, diagonal and the grapevine pattern. Downward communication includes policies, instructions, and official memos, whereas upward communication includes suggestion boxes, group meetings, and grievance procedures. Horizontal communication occurs across functions (peer to peer), whereas diagonal communication cuts across functions and levels. The grapevine pattern includes rumours that cut across all formal channels of communication (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994; Northcraft & Neale, 1994).
The formal communication patterns within a group or an organization are exhibited in its organizational chart (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). "Organizations, out of necessity, develop formal networks of communication. The networks represent the 'official' lines of communication. They usually follow upwards and downwards patterns, are designated on organizational charts, and are specified between line and staff, between superiors and subordinates, between departments and divisions, etc." (Case, 1975, 230).

Northcraft and Neale (1994) describe three types of formal communication patterns: the inverted Y, the wheel, and the all-channel or box. These patterns are the "constellations of communication channels through which information flows" (Nothrcraft & Neale, 1994, 253). The inverted Y occurs in a hierarchical or bureaucratic environment, whereas the wheel pattern occurs in highly centralized environments. The all-channel or box pattern is rare, but exists in "participative, egalitarian environments in which everyone is encouraged to talk to everyone else" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 255).

Along with the formal channels, organizations also develop informal communication channels. Informal communication networks may exist because formal communication channels are inadequate or do not exist where they should. "The term informal has usually been used to describe those relationships or channels diverging from the official ones and arising from human reactions spontaneously generated between and within groups" (Redding in Case, 1975, 230).

Types of informal communication patterns include horizontal, diagonal, grapevines, and 'Old Boy Networks'. Both horizontal and diagonal patterns are rarely seen on formal organizational charts, and are therefore usually elements in the informal channels. Grapevines typically make information available to anyone who will listen, whereas Old Boy Networks "collect information and share it only among themselves" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, p. 259).

In this study, only formal communication channels (upward and downward) will be examined, however the perceptions of superiors, managers, and subordinates will be affected by informal communication channels and networks. This will not be controlled for, but rather assumed to be an integral part of the perceptual nature of communication.
COMMUNICATION STYLES

The manner in which a manager communicates, or their style, also has a great impact on interpersonal communication. Managers' tendencies for communicating can be classified along two dimensions: exposure and feedback (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). Exposure refers to how openly an individual divulges feelings and information, whereas feedback refers to how well an individual elicits information or feelings from others. The Johari Window¹, developed by and named after Joseph Luft and Harry Ingrim, is a device for assessing and categorizing managers' communication styles (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Northcraft & Neale, 1994). Both of these dimensions (self-disclosure and awareness/attention) will be analyzed as they are closely related to the dimensions examined in this study.

Types of Interpersonal Communication

There are three types of communication; oral, written, and nonverbal. Since this study focuses on face-to-face or interpersonal communication, written communication will not be examined. Oral communication is the most prevalent type of communication and includes "all messages or exchanges of information that are spoken" (Steers & Black, 1994, 439). Nonverbal communication differs from culture to culture and refers to any form of interpersonal communication other than formal verbal language. It typically includes "voice inflection and content, facial cues, hand or arm gestures, and body positioning. Clothing can be used to send nonverbal signals as well - for example, when a male colleague buttons up his shirt and tightens his tie to signal that a meeting is all business" (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 249).

Nonverbal communication can be divided into two categories; body language and physical or symbolic language. Nonverbal communication - through physical or symbolic language - includes communicating status through time (chronemics), using objects or office designs to communicate status or culture (ionics), and communicating

values or expectations through clothing or other aspects of physical appearance (dress) (Northcraft & Neale, 1994; Steers & Black, 1994; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1995). Nonverbal communication through body language includes variations in voice such as loudness, pitch, rate, or hesitations (paralinguistics), the use of gestures, facial expressions, eye movements, and body positions (kinesics), and the use of touch in communication (haptics) such as a handshake, a pat on the back or an arm around the shoulder (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1995).

According to Keltner (1994), when an individual interprets a message, 7% of the comprehension comes from verbal content, 38% from vocal inflection and content, and 55% from facial content (in Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1994). Assuming this, 93% of the message is conveyed through non-verbal communication. This is because nonverbal channels are often used to highlight or reinforce parts of a verbal message (Northcraft & Neale, 1994). However, the verbal and the nonverbal portions of the message must also be consistent, or relay the same information, in order for the receiver to understand. Complete consistency is almost impossible to achieve since nonverbal communication is ambiguous in its perceived meaning and likelihood of receipt. For example, due to cultural differences “some perceivers may not attend to nonverbal communication attempts or may not completely understand them” (Northcraft & Neale, 1994, 250).

**Barriers to Effective Communication**

Due to all the complexity, diversity, and perceptual nature of interpersonal communication, “it is probably not an exaggeration to suppose a great deal of face-to-face interaction is potentially problematic” (Mortensen, 1994, 2). Considerable research has been conducted in this area and many problems within interpersonal communication have been isolated and illustrated. One problem or barrier that has been examined extensively, and will consequently be examined in this study, is proximity or proxemic behaviours.²

Proximity refers to spatial arrangements or an "individuals' use of space when interpersonally communicating with others" (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994, 592).

Other barriers to effective communication include frame of reference (past experiences shaping one's perceptions), selective listening, value judgements, source credibility (trust, confidence, and faith in the words and actions of the communicator), status differences, time pressures, semantic problems (similar words meaning entirely different things), and information overload (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994).

Additionally, barriers such as the use of filtering (manipulating information so the receiver perceives it as positive) and jargon or in-group language occur in organizations and can decrease the effectiveness of interpersonal communication. (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994). There are ways to improve communicator effectiveness3 (i.e., active listening, sender empathy, appropriate media selection) but before these can be put into action, an organization must understand how a manager communicates. Therefore, this study will account for these influences while analyzing sport managers' interpersonal communication skills.

**Relevance to Managers**

At the most elementary level, the purpose of an organization is to coordinate the efforts of people working on collective tasks that have been broken down into a set of specialized activities. The sum of these activities represents the capacity of the organization. Coordination is achieved through communication (Taylor, 1993, 32).

The importance of interpersonal communication to the management field is not a new discovery. As Henderson (1985) notes, Chester Barnard "strongly maintained that the primary task of the executive is that of communication" (p. 11). As Barnard originally stated, "in the exhaustive theory of organization, communication would occupy a central place, because the structure, extensiveness, and scope of organizations

---

are almost entirely determined by communication techniques” (in Henderson, 1985, 11). Since then, researchers have described communication as “the glue of the organization”, “the central element, the common denominator, the essential link”, and the “energizing substance that flows through the structure” (Taylor, 1993, 32; Hawkins & Preston, 1981, 1; Hagman & Schwartz in Case, 1975, 232). Katz and Kahn go further to state that “most of our actions toward others and their responses, are communicative acts whether or not they are of verbal nature” (in Case, 1975, 229).

This importance of communication can also be seen when examining the amount of time managers spend engaged in face-to-face interactions. Interpersonal communication is the main means of managerial communication, and on an typical day, a manager will spend over three fourths of his/her time involved in face-to-face interactions (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Mintzberg, 1973 and Kotter, 1982 in Henderson, 1985; Steers & Black, 1994). However, because of the pervasiveness of communication in managerial activities, its importance has often remained hidden. McCleary (1975) ironically notes that “communication is so indigenous to organized activity that its crucial importance seems to be recognized only when we suffer from its failure” (in Case, 1975, 231).

This fundamental importance of interpersonal communication to the management field has lead past researchers to closely examine the superior-subordinate dyad in the hopes of improving managerial effectiveness and eventually organizational effectiveness. However, in examining the literature, what makes communication effective has not yet been identified. Therefore, this study will not suggest how communication can improve organizational effectiveness. Instead, it will first attempt to understand what dimensions make communication effective.

**Research Areas**

The aforementioned problems, that researchers had in determining an unanimously accepted definition of communication, are also present throughout every
aspect of communication research. Because of the pervasive nature of the process of communication, there is not simply one discipline that studies the area of communication. "[Even] though practically every science concerns itself directly with communication, we do not have a much better explanation. It has been speculated that the main problem in studying communication is that everyone assumes they understand it" (Yeager, 1975, 262).

Thayer (1975) extended this idea by noting that if "someone talks about a communication pattern, we usually nod our heads. It's all too easy to assume that we know what [they] are talking about. It's even easier to assume that he/she knows what they are talking about. Scientifically, we know much less about human communication than we do about animal husbandry - this in spite of the fact that our lives are infinitely more affected by communication than the genetics of a particular breed of hogs [sic]" (in Yeager, 1975, 262).

Even if the domain of communication is partitioned to just include how managers communicate, there are still many separate disciplines that are involved (e.g. management, organizational behaviour, organizational communication, business communication, and corporate communication). Each discipline has a very different way of looking at interpersonal communication within the superior-subordinate dyad. However, there are also several commonalities between these disciplines that, when compared, increases the knowledge base of interpersonal communication.

Inspection of the literature suggests that researchers have focused the majority of their attention on studying (a) the effects of power and status on superior-subordinate communication, (b) trust as a moderator of superior-subordinate communication, and (c) semantic-information distance as a source of misunderstanding in superior-subordinated communication (Jablin, 1979, 1201).

These first two common aspects will be examined in this study. The effects of power and status on superior-subordinate communication will be analyzed when real and ideal perceptions are compared and differences or distortions are investigated. The second major area of study - trust - will be examined as one of the 11 original dimensions.
Communication Studies

Within the discipline of communication studies, there is a specific branch called organizational communication which “focuses on the context of organizations and various aspects of group and managerial communication. It is the exchange of information internally (up, down, and across organizational lines), as well as externally (to stakeholders and to the public)” (Gayeski, 1993, 25).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

Organizational communication tries to “accomplish two objectives (a) to get clear in our minds what we believe communication process to be, and (b) to decide how we are to understand the nature of organization, as a constructed reality resulting from communication process” (Taylor, 1993, x). Organizational communication “is a form of interpersonal communication and shares its dominant characteristics: namely it involves face-to-face, focused interaction, makes use of all the senses and provides immediate feedback” (Vezzuto, 1984, 11).

SUPERIOR-SUBORDINATE RELATIONS

To further divide the discipline of communication studies, superior-subordinate communication is an area within organizational communication (Jablin, 1979). This is a common relationship to investigate (Allen, Gotcher, & Seibert, 1993) but has not received sufficient review and interpretation to be considered an autonomous body of research. In 1979, Jablin undertook a comprehensive review of empirical research done in the area of superior-subordinate communication. From this review of literature ten areas of classification for study in superior-subordinate communication were proposed, namely: interaction patterns and related attitudes, openness in communication, upward distortion, upward influence, semantic-information distance, effective versus ineffective superiors, personal characteristics, feedback, conflict, and systemic variables. This study will compare perceptions within the superior-subordinate dyads to examine if they were distorted or varied.
Management and Administration

Despite the significance of communication in management and administration and the "intuitive importance attributed to this issue, the research in this area can be fairly described as fragmented, loosely defined, and underdescribed" (Henderson, 1985, 13). According to Case (1975), few articles or studies were conducted before 1940. Since then, the research in this area has expanded yet most of the studies on this issue have been done through other disciplines such as communication studies, sociology, and psychology. This fragmentation of research was beginning to stunt the growth of the body of knowledge concerning how managers communicate, so Henderson (1985) conducted an in-depth analysis of the field of managerial communication and devised a conceptual and methodological framework from which future researchers could build. Henderson (1985) noted that there are different categories of communication from which managers' communication patterns can be examined: managerial communication, corporate communication, and business communication.

MANAGERIAL COMMUNICATION

Managerial communication generally refers to the interpersonal interactions that occur between managers and others in a work environment (Klauss and Bass, 1982; Weinshaw in Henderson, 1985). Hawkins and Preston (1981) define managerial communication as the "process through which modification of interpersonal and organizational outcome occurs as a result of message exchange" (p. 27).

CORPORATE COMMUNICATION

"Corporate communication is the professional practice of developing and implementing communication rules and tools in order to enhance the dissemination, comprehension, acceptance, and application of information in ways that will help to achieve an organization's goals" (Gayesi, 1993, 2). Corporate communicators are those "individuals who are responsible for the formal communication policies and practices in
an organization (i.e., satellite teleconferencing, computer systems, training courses, email, total quality management meetings, brochures, annual sales meeting, employee attitude surveys, annual report...))" (Gayeski, 1993, 1).

BUSINESS COMMUNICATION

This area focuses on how to develop effective written and oral communication skills, and how to skillfully communicate messages to others. "Constructing these messages requires mastering skillful techniques such as negotiating, persuading, and selling" (Hollman & Campbell in Henderson, 1985). Henderson (1985) notes that Leipig and Moore observed that "researchers within business communication are unashamedly pragmatic in orientation and see limited use for theoretical approaches to the study of communication in business" (p. 54).

Sport Management

The area of interpersonal communication is not well documented in the field of sport management. Actually, in the past 20 years, no publications were found. The only studies done in the area of sport management were by Yeager (1975) who studied the interpersonal communication patterns in physical education, and Case (1975) who looked at the communication structure of a physical education unit.

Even though virtually no research has been done in the sports management domain, communication has been examined in the business or organizational management domain. This study will assume that research can be applied to sports management.

Research Methods

Just as there are many different disciplines (e.g. psychology, communication, administration, etc....) involved in interpersonal communication research, there are also many different ways of conducting this research in management settings. Some of the main methods include direct and indirect observation and codification, subjective self-reporting instruments, in-depth interviews, and combinations of the above.
Observation (direct or in-direct) and codification is a popular method of research and has been done through role playing (Kay, 1993), observational field notes in naturalistic environments (Kotter, 1982, Mintzberg, 1973, and Trujillo, 1983 in Henderson, 1985), and tape recordings of managerial activities (Frost & Morgan, 1983, and Gronn, 1983 in Henderson, 1985). Subjective self-reporting instruments such as diaries of personal conversations (Yeager, 1975) and surveys (Case, 1975; Dahl, 1985; Oliver, 1993; Pomsuwan, 1995; Samuleson, 1983) have also been used extensively to conduct research on managers' interpersonal communication skills. In-depth retrospective interviews (Anderson, 1991 in Allen, Gotcher & Seibert, 1993; and Ericsson & Simon, 1980 in Henderson, 1985), archival retrieval of electronic mail messages, performance appraisals, and management records on absenteeism, productivity and financial progress have also been used separately or in combination (Orlikowski & Yates, 1994). Finally, a few of the most comprehensive studies have used a triangulation of interviews, observations, archival documents, and surveys to examine managerial communication (Tubbs & Widgery, 1978 and Luthans, 1984 in Henderson, 1985). This study used a subjective, self-reporting survey to analyze sport managers' interpersonal skills which allowed for comparison with recent studies (Oliver, 1993; Samuelson, 1983) that also used the Interpersonal Communication Inventory.

Relevance of Previous Research

This final section of the literature review discusses the relationship between current trends in interpersonal communication research and this study. Specifically, the relationship between recent research and the three research questions and the four hypotheses is examined in order to demonstrate the relevance of this study.

Since interpersonal communication is not confined to one single discipline, a exhaustive review of interpersonal communication research topics is extremely difficult. Many disciplines including organizational communication, superior-subordinate communication, managerial communication, corporate communication and business communication must be examined. Fortunately a few researchers, namely Allen,
Gotcher, and Seibert (1993), Jablin (1979), and Jablin and Krone (1994) completed extensive literature reviews on the research that has been conducted in these disciplines.

In 1979, Jablin identified ten topics in the area of superior-subordinate communication that have been studied in great detail. These were again used in 1994 by Jablin and Krone during their updated literature review. The ten topic areas included interaction patterns and related attitudes, openness in communication, upward distortion, upward influence, semantic-information distance, effective versus ineffective superiors, personal characteristics, feedback, conflict, and semantic variables. The identification of these specific topics provided researchers with a structure to categorize interpersonal communication research.

Using these ten areas as a template for discussion, Allen, Gotcher, and Seibert (1993) performed a review of 889 organizational journals articles. They found that interpersonal communication, specifically superior-subordinate communication, was the topic most frequently researched. Within in the area of interpersonal communication they identified and prioritized the following key areas of research: effective versus ineffective supervisors (relating to supervisors' warmth, openness, friendliness, and problem-confrontation style), feedback (and its relationship with satisfaction and/or performance), interaction patterns (and non-verbal communication, vertical linkages, and satisfaction), and semantic-information (i.e., departmental size, supervisor accessibility, and technology).

DIMENSIONS OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

These research topics correspond with the eleven dimensions of interpersonal communication used by Bienvenu (1976) in the original Interpersonal Communication Inventory (self-disclosure, awareness, evaluation and acceptance of feedback, self-expression, attention, coping with feelings, clarity, avoidance, dominance, handling differences, and perceived acceptance) suggesting that this instrument measured dimensions that researchers found to be important in interpersonal communication.
Although many previous studies have utilized these eleven dimensions, the relationship between these domains and the construct of effective communication has not yet been explored. Many researchers have investigated what distinguishes an effective manager from an ineffective manager (i.e., Burke, Weitzel, & Weir, 1982; Dansereau & Markham, 1987; Jablin, 1979; Klaus & Bass, 1982; Sims & Manz, 1984) however the specific dimensions of communication that make a manager effective or ineffective have not been examined. Thus, this research examined the following question:

Q1. How much variance does each dimension account for in effective interpersonal communication?

The Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) was used in this study because the eleven original dimensions corresponded with current research trends and therefore comparisons could be made with previous studies and the results could be directly compared to Oliver (1993) and Samuelson (1983) who used the ICI to examine the relationship between communication skills and sex. Petty and Bruning (1980) found that sex did not affect subordinates perceptions of the managers effectiveness. Allen, Gotcher, and Seibert (1993) also report that many researchers (e.g. Adams, Rice, & Inston, 1984; and Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989) have also examined the relationship between age, sex and/or education with managers effectiveness in interpersonal communication. Therefore, these three demographics were examined in this study.

PERCEPTIONS OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Another area often examined, has been the notion that superiors’, managers’, and/or subordinates’ perceptions differ. This idea was examined in research question two and three, and the four hypotheses. Research questions two and three combined this notion of position with research question one to explore whether position affected the perception of the interpersonal communication dimensions, whereas the four hypotheses compared each of the positions (superior, manager, or subordinate) individually.
Burke, Weitzel, and Deszca (1982), Cahn (1986), and London and Wohlers (1991) have examined the affects of position on the perception of managers’ communication skills. Schnake, Dumler, Cochran and Barnett (1990) found that superior and subordinate perceptions were significantly different which affected subordinate participation, communication openness, and feedback. As that study suggests, inquiries need to be taken one step further, to not only explore if the perceptions of these three groups differ, but to also explore what they each perceive as desirable interpersonal communication skills for managers to possess. In light of these issues, this study explored the following questions:

Q2. Does position affect the perception of real interpersonal communication dimensions?
Q3. Does position affect the perception of ideal interpersonal communication dimensions?

SUPERIOR-MANAGER-SUBORDINATE PERCEPTIONS

Although perceptions of interpersonal communication skills have been examined, it has usually been done within the superior-subordinate dyad. Many studies have examined the superiors’ (managers’) and subordinates’ perspectives, but few have been conducted to explore the perspectives from three separate viewpoints or within the superior-manager-subordinate triad: above (superior), self (manager), and below (subordinate). Bartolome and Laurent (1988) noted, and Schnake, Dumler, Cochran, and Barnett (1990) suggested that “since most managers act both as superiors and subordinates to their own superiors, it would be interesting to investigate the perceptual congruence in both superior-subordinate dyads” (p. 46).

Even though all three perspectives are vital in order to fully understand managers’ interpersonal communication skills, rarely has the entire triad been investigated, and when all three perspectives are taken into account, superiors’ and subordinates’ scores are usually combined into an ‘others’ category so they be compared to managers’ (self) scores (Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988; Jablin, 1979). Therefore, no research has compared the extreme ends of this triad; the superior and the subordinate. It may be expected that managers would work harder at communicating with superiors than with subordinates
because superiors are in a position of power over the managers. Additionally, a manager’s upward communicative activities generally encompass questions, updates, and reports, whereas a manager’s downward communication often contains orders, criticisms, or evaluations. The extremes of the positive upward messages (upward distortion) and the critical downward messages may also influence the superior to see the manager in a positive light, and for the superior to see the manager in a negative light. These assumptions led to the following hypothesis:

H1. \( H_{A1} = \) Superiors’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.

A few studies have been conducted recently that examine the top portion of the superior-manager-subordinate triad, the manager (self) and the superior. Specifically, Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) found that “self-ratings were over a half standard deviation higher than supervisor ratings” showing that managers perceive themselves to be better communicators than superiors (p. 55). Following previous research, this study hypothesized the following:

H2. \( H_{A2} = \) Managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than superiors’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.

The bottom part of the superior-manager-subordinate triad has been thoroughly studied, as it examined the typical superior (manager) and subordinate dyad. Therefore, there has been a plethora of results regarding the differences in these two perspectives. Recently, Weese (1998) found that “the executive leaders significantly overestimated their leadership contributions in comparison to the perspective of followers” (p. 7). These findings were consistent with other researchers such as Ashford (1989), Bass and Yammarino (1991), and Harris and Schaubroeck (1988). These previous results led to the following:

H3. \( H_{A3} = \) Managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.
Unfortunately, even the research that examines communication perspectives by the superior, manager (self), and subordinate typically did not distinguish direction for the self (managers). However, the research on upward distortion and upward influence suggested that people often did a better job of reflecting upwards, than downwards (Santora, 1992). With this in mind, it was expected that managers will perceive themselves as being better communicators with superiors than with subordinates. Thus this study suggests the following:

\[ H_4: \quad \text{managers' self-perceptions of their upward communication skills will be higher than their self-perceptions of their downward communication skills.} \]

**Chapter Summary**

The primary goal of every organization is, or should be, to improve its effectiveness. One approach to improving the overall effectiveness of an organization is to increase the effectiveness of managers. Since communication - and specifically face-to-face interpersonal communication - occupies three fourths of a manager's time (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, 1994; Mintzberg, 1973 and Kotter, 1982 in Henderson, 1985; Steers & Black, 1994), and underlies each of the seven management principals. (Rubenstein & Haberstroh in Yeager, 1975; Case, 1975; Henderson. 1985; Northcraft & Neale. 1994) it has been suggested that one of the best ways to improve organizational effectiveness is to improve managers' interpersonal communication skills.

Due to the complexity of interpersonal communication relationships, Wilmot (in Dahl, 1985) suggested that dyads be used to adequately analyze the intricacies that operate during interpersonal communication. Bedar (1983) further suggested that many perceptions of the managerial dyad should be examined including superiors, subordinates, and peers. Therefore, this study initiated the exploration of managers' interpersonal communication skills within the domain of sports management by examining the superior-manager-subordinate triad. The perceptions of superiors, managers, and subordinates were examined in order to analyze managers' interpersonal communication
skills, to serve as a building block for additional interpersonal communication research in the sport management field, and to eventually suggest methods for improving managerial effectiveness.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the instrumentation, the sample, the data collection process, and the data analysis procedures related to the research questions and hypotheses. A restatement of the problem, begins the chapter, and then the instrument used in this study is discussed. The instrumentation section includes the adaptations made to the original interpersonal communication instrument so it could be applied to a management environment. A description of the sample and the selection criteria is followed by an outline of the collection procedures. The chapter ends with a discussion of study methods, and a description of the data analysis procedures.

Restatement of the Problem

Exactly what makes communication effective or ineffective is still not known. The dimensions which lead to effective communication needed to be identified, from all perspectives, so that a complete picture of interpersonal communication could be formed. Therefore, this study explored which dimensions contributed to effective communication and then examined real and ideal perceptions to discover if superiors, managers, and subordinates differed in their views of interpersonal communication skills.

Instrumentation

The dimensions in the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) were employed, as the independent measures of effective communication, in order to investigate the three research questions and four hypotheses. However, there were two versions of this instrument, the original and an adapted version. The original ICI was developed in 1969 by Millard J. Bienvenu Sr., of Northwestern State University of Louisiana (see Appendix B for the Copyright Permission Letter).

The original ICI contained forty self-reporting items which identify the patterns and characteristics of interpersonal communication. Specifically, it measured eleven interpersonal communication dimensions which were deemed critical to successful communication (see Table 1).
Table 1

Original Interpersonal Communication Inventory Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>Trust, understanding, ability to confide in people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Awareness</td>
<td>Awareness of self and how your feelings, reactions, and voice tone affect others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation and Acceptance of Feedback</td>
<td>Acceptance of criticism, dealing with disagreements understanding other views, and admitting error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-expression</td>
<td>Clarity of self expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>Ability to pay attention to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coping with Feelings</td>
<td>Truthfulness in expressing anger, self faulty, admitting error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clarity</td>
<td>Ability to determine meaning, evoke explanation, and determine feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Avoidance</td>
<td>Ways of avoiding communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dominance</td>
<td>Tendency of an aggressive and dominant speaker to monopolize conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Handling Differences</td>
<td>Awareness of feelings when differing with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived Acceptance</td>
<td>Perceived acceptance as an attitude of understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Oliver, B. (1993).
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE ORIGINAL ICI

When designing the ICI, Bienvenue performed a quartile comparison using the Chi-square test (n=316) to determine which items were distinctly different. Fifty of the original fifty-four items "were found to be significantly discriminating between the upper and the lower quartiles (p<.01)" so in 1969 the ICI was reduced from fifty-four questions to fifty (Bienvenu, 1976, 5). An additional study was conducted in 1971 (n=241) and resulted in the discard of ten more items (Bienvenu, 1976). Therefore, after two separate studies, Bienvenu retained forty items in the ICI because they were found to be significantly different from each other.

In 1974, Ott conducted a validation study of the ICI for her doctoral dissertation (in Oliver, 1993). The study consisted of 192 university students who took three tests: the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI), the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Results from this study indicated a positive correlation between the 11 ICI dimensions and the 14 of the 19 POI variables.

In 1973, Bienvenu used the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) to conduct two reliability studies of the forty-item original ICI. The results of the first study revealed a split-half reliability of r=.87 and the results of the second study (a test-retest with the same subjects within a three-week period) revealed a r=.86 (Bienvenu, 1976).

Changes to the Original ICI Factor Structure

Oliver (1993) and Samuelson (1983) used a different version of the original ICI. This altered version was the instrument used in this study to explore and describe sport managers' interpersonal communication skills. In the altered version, sixteen of the forty original questions were changed so (in order to decipher the implications of these modifications for this study) the adaptations were grouped into four categories: (1) Six questions were removed and new questions were developed, (2) three questions were exchanged from negatively-scored questions to positively-scored questions, (3) six questions contained minor changes in wording, and (4) one question was moved to
another location. A copy of the original ICI, the adapted ICI, and a detailed comparison of the two can be found in Appendices C, D, and E respectively.

For this study it was assumed that the six minor word changes had little or no affect on the scale. The one relocated question and the three reverse-scored questions could be accounted for by adjusting the marking scheme. However, six removed questions were replaced with new questions that did not correspond with their original dimensions. The fact that the six new questions no longer measured what the original items measured resulted in a number of problems; five of the eleven dimensions were affected, the original factor structure was altered, and the validity of the eleven original dimensions was compromised.

REVISED FACTOR STRUCTURE

Since these changes significantly altered the factor structure of the eleven original dimensions, a content validity analysis was utilized to assess the degree to which the items would fit into the previous identified dimensions. Following the direction of recent researchers such Allen, Gotcher, and Seibert (1993), Jablin (1979), and Jablin and Krone (1994) the key areas within interpersonal communication (openness in communication, feedback acceptance, and conflict resolutions skills) were compared with the eleven original dimensions and implemented as the five dimensions which make up the dependent variable of interpersonal communication (see Table 2).

EXPERT PANEL

Once the new dimensions were determined, a panel of experts was assembled to decide which questions corresponded with which dimension. To classify the questions into appropriate dimensions, a content analysis was chosen instead of a factor analysis because the questions were attitudinal and there were not enough respondents (n=100) to provide a stable factor structure (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Green & Lewis, 1986).
Table 2
Revised Interpersonal Communication Inventory Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Awareness of Self and Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>• Understand reveal, and discuss feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trust and confide in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Help others to understand you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-Expression and Clarity</td>
<td>• Ability to converse with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Express thoughts clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Give and request clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness of Others</td>
<td>• Awareness of others’ feelings and reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Listen with interest to others’ feelings &amp; thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider others’ points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acceptance of Feedback and Evaluation</td>
<td>• Acceptance of criticism and admission of error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Receptive, appreciative, &amp; accepting of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Listen to others before reacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coping with Feelings and Differences</td>
<td>• Truthfulness in expressing anger and hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Express feelings when they differ from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss differences or problems directly, without getting angry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expert panel consisted of fifteen professors from the Faculties of Human Kinetics (five), and Business Administration (three), and the Departments of Communication Studies (four), and Psychology (three). To assemble the panel of experts the deans or departments heads were contacted by phone and, after the study was explained, they each suggested at least five appropriate professors. The researcher then contacted the recommended professors by phone or email, described the study and their tasks, and requested their participation.
Each member of the expert panel was given an ICI categorization kit consisting of coloured cue cards, which briefly described each variable, and halved white cue cards for the forty original questions and the six altered questions. The experts were asked to match each of the forty-six questions with one of the five new dimensions or place the item in the does not fit category. Only the forty questions found in the adapted ICI were used, however, all forty-six questions were categorized by the expert panel so future duplication of this study could be conducted using either the original ICI or the adapted ICI.

Thirty-nine out of the forty questions in the adapted ICI were categorized by the expert panel. One question (number 37) was placed in the does not fit category by more than half the panel so it was omitted from the revised ICI. See Appendix F for a list of the revised dimensions. After the expert panel categorized the questions, the five new dimensions were checked for validity and reliability.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE REVISED ICI

The remaining thirty-nine questions used in the revised ICI were checked for validity by using Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR) to determine if the questions measure what they proport to measure. Lawshe (1975) quantified content validity by creating a Content Validity Ratio that measured the extent to which communality or overlap exists. Twenty-nine of the thirty-nine questions were found to be valid as more than half of the experts (at least eight out of the fifteen) agreed that the question best fit into that variable (CVR greater than .50) (Lawshe, 1975). Of the ten questions that did not meet the CVR, eight questions had a CVR greater than or equal to .40. The other two questions had a CVR equal to .33 and .27. Once the validity of the questions was determined, the dimensions were checked for reliability.

Reliability coefficients (Chronbach's Alpha) were then calculated to check the internal consistency of the five dimensions obtained through the content validity process. This analysis was performed, both with and without the valid questions. For each variable, the reliability coefficients were higher with all the questions present. Therefore, the thirty-nine categorized questions were retained and used during the data analysis.
Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1994) developed a "rule of thumb for interpreting the size of a correlation coefficient" (p. 85). They reported that if the absolute value of a correlation was from .90 to 1.00 there was a very high correlation, .70 to .90 was a high correlation, .50 to .70 was a moderate correlation, .30 to .50 was a low correlation, and .00 to .30 had little if any correlation. Therefore, using Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1994) interpretive correlation chart, one of the dimensions had a high inter-item correlation (Coping with Feeling, α=.72), two of the dimensions had a moderate inter-item correlation (Awareness of Others, α=.65; Self-Disclosure, α=.63), and two of the dimensions had a low inter-item correlation (Self Expression, α=.36; Acceptance of Feedback, α=.23). Therefore, only three dimensions could be used in the revised factor structure (Coping with Feelings, Awareness of Others, and Self-Disclosure) because the other two dimensions did not have a high enough inter-item correlation. These low levels of Chronbach's Alpha may be attributed to the fact the items were scored using a three point scale (yes, no, sometimes), and the respondents were directed to use one of these points (sometimes) as little as possible. Since the variance in responses is limited, and the correlation coefficient is mostly degree a function of variance on the items, lower correlations are to be expected. However, to be on the safe side, it was decided not to use the lower two factors in this study.

Thus, in summary, changes were made to the original factor structure to account for the adaptations made to sixteen of the forty original questions. Since these adaptations affected five of the eleven original dimensions, the original new factor structure was no longer valid. Following the direction of recent literature reviews on interpersonal communication (e.g. Allen, Gotcher, & Seibert, 1993; Jablin, 1979; and Jablin & Krone, 1994) five new dimensions were designated as the key areas which constitute interpersonal communication. These five new dimensions were presented to an expert panel, who created the scales within these dimensions. Thirty-nine out of the forty questions were categorized into the dimensions, and one question was placed in the 'does not fit' category. When these scales were checked for validity and reliability, ten did not meet the CVR criteria (Lawshe, 1975) but were retained because the reliability coefficients for all the dimensions were higher with them present. However, only three of
the five dimensions (Coping with Feelings, Awareness of Others, and Self-Disclosure) had reliability coefficients that were moderate or high according to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1994) "Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient" (p. 85). Therefore, the revised ICI contains a total of thirty-nine questions, and includes three dimensions with eight, ten, and ten items respectively.

**Changes to the Structure of the Questions**

In addition to revising the dimensions of the adapted ICI, this study also created another version of the ICI so it could be used to investigate the three research questions and the four hypotheses. The structure of the questions was modified in two ways so that the perspective of others (superiors and subordinates) could be examined instead of just the managers' (self) perspective, and so that ideal perceptions, in addition to real perceptions, could be explored. These structural changes are detailed below and were made after receiving copyright permission from the original author (see Appendix B).

First, two versions of the adapted ICI were used in this study because the respondents assessed the interpersonal communication skills of the manager from different perspectives. The superiors and subordinates evaluated the managers' interpersonal communication skills (3rd person), and the managers completed a self-assessment on their own interpersonal communication skills (1st person). The superiors' and subordinates' surveys contained changes in semantics (see Appendix G) as the original ICI was written in the first person. However, the managers' survey was twice as long since the manager performed a self-assessment on how they perceived themselves to communicate with superiors and subordinates separately (see Appendix H). This directional distinction was made to allow for investigation into whether managers perceive themselves to be better communicators with superiors or subordinates.

Second, to analyze ideal perceptions, in addition to the already existing real perceptions, three more blanks were added as an ideal column. Originally, the ICI contained one column with three blanks for the respondent to answer "yes/usually", "sometimes", or "no/seldom" regarding the managers' real interpersonal communication skills. An additional column was added for the respondent to answer "yes/usually",...
“sometimes”, or “no/seldom” regarding the managers’ ideal interpersonal communication skills.

Additionally, after completing the survey the respondent was requested to check off whether he/she perceived the manager to be (1) very ineffective, (2) ineffective, (3) neither ineffective or effective, (4) effective, or (5) very effective as a communicator. Responses to this question allowed for investigation into what dimensions account for effective communication. All of these structural changes provided a multi-perspective analysis of managers’ interpersonal communication skills, while also exploring the similarities and differences between real and ideal perceptions of interpersonal communication.

Sample Selection

The sample included eighty Provincial Sport Organizations (PSO). This constituted the vast majority of sport managers working within non-profit organizations, but only a small portion of the total population of sport managers who work in non-profit, profit, professional, and academic organizations in Ontario. Provincial Sport Organizations (PSO) fell into one of two categories; Resident Sport Organizations, and Non-Resident Sport Organizations (NRSOs). The term Resident Sport Organization referred to the sport organizations with offices at the Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre, whereas the term Non-Resident Sport Organizations referred to the sport organizations that were operated from off-site locations varying from kitchen tables to large administrative offices at sporting complexes.

Fifty-four Provincial Sport Organizations (PSO) could not be utilized because they did not meet this studies criteria regarding the size of organizations (i.e., they were either too tall or too flat). Klauss and Bass (1982) found that communication varies with the size and structure of the organization, so only PSO with at least three levels of management (i.e., superior - Executive Director, manager - Technical or Program Director, and subordinate - Secretary or Assistant) and less than twenty employees were used in this study. These criteria eliminated most of the Non-Resident Sport Organizations, because the majority of the NRSO were managed by volunteers on a part-
time basis. Almost half the Resident Sport Organizations were also eliminated because they did not have three levels of management. In total, twenty-six Provincial Sport Organizations met the criteria, twenty Resident Sport Organizations, and six Non-Resident Sport Organizations (see Appendix I).

Procedure

Before the surveys were distributed, the general manager of the Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre (OSRC) was contacted and support for this study was requested (see Appendix J). Then an introductory letter was mailed to the Executive Directors of each PSO, explaining the purpose of the study and the coding process to ensure anonymity (see Appendix K). Since interpersonal communication plays such an important role in a sport managers’ position, the anonymity of each respondent had to be ensured in order to obtain frank and honest responses. The anonymity process is outlined later in this section.

One week after the introductory letters were sent to the executive directors, the surveys were distributed, in person, to the twenty-six organizations. Whenever possible, the researcher met with the executive director to clarify the process and confirm the participants in the study. During this meeting with the executive director, the focal person would be determined depending upon the structure of each particular PSO.

These designated managers/focal person(s) were given the managers’ survey, and their supervisors and subordinates were given the appropriate surveys. To ensure subordinates and superiors knew exactly who the term the ‘manager’ referred to, there was a blank on the instruction sheet where the initials of the manager/focal person were recorded. This focal person was determined and the blank was completed during the meeting with the executive director so that superiors or subordinates could complete the surveys at a later date.

A cover letter was also enclosed with each survey (see Appendix L) outlining the purpose of the study, and the anonymity process. Respondents were given the option to complete the survey that day, retain it until the end of the week, or mail it to the coder. Since the surveys simply contained the tittle Interpersonal Communication Inventory and
did not state whether they were superiors', managers', or subordinates' surveys, they were copied onto coloured paper for easy recognition. The superiors' surveys were yellow, the managers' surveys were green, and the subordinates' surveys were blue, which aided the recording procedure during the collection process.

**COLLECTION OF THE SURVEYS**

At the end of the first week the researcher returned to the OSRC, and to the Non-Resident Sport Organizations, to collect the completed surveys. Follow up phone calls were made at the beginning of the second, third, and fifth week to encourage response. Surveys were collected in the middle and at the end of the second week, and at the beginning of the third week (see Table 3).

**Table 3**

Procedure Time Line

| Week 0 | • Letter of support by general manager  
|        | • Introductory letters to executive director |
| Week 1 | • Meeting with executive director  
|        | • Distributed surveys  
|        | • Collection 1 - 51% return |
| Week 2 | • Follow up phone calls  
|        | • Collection 2  
|        | • Collection 3 - 60% return |
| Week 3 | • Follow up phone calls  
|        | • Collection 4 - 71% return |
| Week 5 | • Follow up phone calls  
|        | • Wait for mail - 82% return |

A master recording list was created when the researcher distributed the surveys so the number of superior, manager, and subordinate surveys delivered to each PSO could
be recorded. Therefore, when the surveys were collected (in person or by mail) the colour of the survey and the name of the PSO would be recorded and the researcher would know exactly how many of each survey still remained. If surveys were mailed, there was a blank on the return envelope for the respondent to record his/her PSO. During the follow up phone calls, the researcher simply contacted the PSO and informed them that so many of each colour of survey was missing. The colours (yellow, green, and blue) were used instead of the positions because the term ‘superior’ or ‘subordinate’ might have offended some of the respondents. The titles superior, manager, and subordinate were only used during the initial meeting with the executive director and did not appear on any of the surveys.

ANONYMITY PROCESS

Anonymity of the respondents was maintained through the entire research process. First, the use of a coder ensured that the initials on the instruction sheet (the superiors’ and subordinates’ surveys had a blank for the initials of the manager/focal person), or comments on the surveys could not identify the respondent. Surveys were always received by the coder in sealed envelopes and returned to the researcher with the instruction sheets removed. If the surveys were picked up, the researcher would record the number of each type of survey received by each PSO on the master recording sheet. The coder would then open the sealed envelopes, remove the instruction pages, make note of any comments, and return them to the researcher. If the surveys were mailed, the name of the PSO was filled out by the respondent (to ensure response) but was not matched with the enclosed survey. The coder would record the number of each type of survey received by each PSO, remove the instructions, note comments, and forward the surveys to the researcher.

Second, responses were recorded using the position (colour of the survey) and the PSO instead of using specific respondents. The names of respondents were never obtained, simply the number of superiors, managers, and subordinates given surveys in each organization.
Third, responses from superiors, managers, and subordinates were grouped together, as opposed to analyzing individual managers or triads. This was done so that specific PSO or managers could not be identified and so more than one superior, manager, and/or subordinate could respond from a single Provincial Sport Organization. As a result, thirty-two superiors, fifty-one managers, and thirty-nine subordinates were sent surveys.

**Research Design**

This study utilized a self-reporting survey to explore and describe sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills as perceived by superiors, themselves, and subordinates. Besides their perceptions of the managers’ interpersonal communication skills, the respondents were also asked to report the managers age, sex, and education. Respondents were asked to check off if the manager was in his/her 20’s, 30’s, 40’s, 50’s or 60+. The respondent was also asked to note if the manager was male or female, and if the manager’s highest level of education achieved was high school, college, university, or post graduate.

The two independent variables that were varied in order to examine the three research questions, and four hypotheses were position (IV₁) and perception (IV₂). Position contained three levels (superior, manager, or subordinate) and perception contained two levels (real or ideal).

The two dependent variables that were being measured were interpersonal communication (DV₁) and effectiveness (DV₂). Respondents were asked to check off if the manager was very ineffective, ineffective, neither ineffective or effective, effective, or very effective. Interpersonal communication was measured in two ways; first as an overall measure of communication represented by the thirty-nine ICI items, and second as the three specific dimensions of interpersonal communication that were found to be reliable. The dimensions were Coping with Feelings (eight items), Awareness of Others (10 items), and Self-Disclosure (10 items).
Analysis of Data

In order to examine the research questions and hypotheses, the surveys were partitioned into three levels (superiors, managers, subordinates) and the data were analyzed using these three groups, instead of analyzing individual managers or provincial sport organizations. As mentioned in the anonymity section, grouped data were used so that individual managers or distinct triads could not be identified.

The scoring of the ICI was as follows: Positively worded correct answers (questions 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, and 40) were scored so that a ‘yes/usually’ answer received a three, a ‘sometimes’ answer received a two, and a ‘no/seldom’ answer received a zero. Negatively worded correct answers (questions 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 33, 34, and 39) were scored so that a ‘no/seldom’ answer received a three, a ‘sometimes’ answer received a one, and a ‘yes/usually’ answer received a zero. The ‘sometimes’ answer received a different weight for a positively worded answer (two) than negatively worded answer (one) in order to discriminated between these favourable and unfavourable responses. Note that question number 37 was removed because, as mentioned in the section describing the expert panel, the majority of the experts placed it in the ‘does not fit’ category.

Before the research questions were addressed, descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA’s were performed on the data to determine if age, sex, or education had an effect on sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills. Then, to answer the research questions, the analysis of data was divided into three categories; dimensions of interpersonal communication, perceptions of interpersonal communication, and superior-manager-subordinate perceptions. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS' version 7) was used to analyze the data.

DIMENSIONS OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

To explore how much variance each of the three dimensions accounted for in effective interpersonal communication skills in sport managers (research question one), a stepwise multiple regression between the managers’ effectiveness scores and the real
dimensions was used. Specifically, the relationship between the effectiveness scores (dependent variable) and each of the three dimensions (self disclosure, awareness of others, and coping with feelings) was analyzed.

PERCEPTIONS OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

To explore if there was a difference between superiors’, managers’, and subordinates’ perceptions of real and ideal interpersonal communication skills, a MANOVA with step down analysis was used. Specifically, to answer research question two, the total scores of the real dimensions (self disclosure, awareness of others, and coping with feelings) were compared with the position variable. Similarly, to answer research question three, the total scores of the ideal dimensions (self disclosure, awareness of others, and coping with feelings) were compared with the position variable.

SUPERIOR-MANAGER-SUBORDINATE PERCEPTIONS

To answer each of the research hypotheses, a one-tailed t-test was performed with the overall score as the dependent variable.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of this study and discuss the similarities and differences between these results and previous research. This chapter begins with a description of the data collected, then reports and discusses the results and implications of each research question and hypotheses separately. A summary table, listing the three research questions and four hypotheses and the corresponding results can be found at the end of this chapter.

Out of the 122 surveys distributed, 100 surveys were received (27 superiors, 46 managers, 27 subordinates). Of the 22 non-respondents, 5 were superiors, 5 were managers, and 12 were subordinates. The majority of the surveys (51%) were returned during the first week of collection when the researcher went to the twenty-six provincial sport organizations to gather them in person. After follow-up phone calls during week two, 60% of the participants had responded. In week three, a second set of follow-up phone calls and personal visits to the organizations resulted in a return rate of 71%. Final follow-up phone calls were made during the fourth and fifth week, and the most of the remaining surveys were mailed to achieve a total return rate of 82%.

Descriptive Statistics

One-way ANOVA's were performed on the data to determine if age, education, or sex had an effect on sport managers' interpersonal communication skills. Within this sample, 27.6% of the managers were in their twenties, 26.5% were in their thirties, 20.4% were in their forties, 20.4% were in their fifties, and 5.1% were sixty or older. The results from the one-way ANOVA showed no significant difference between the manager's age and their overall ICI scores ($F(44, 53) = .293, p > .05$). Respondents were also asked to report the highest degree the manager had earned. It was found that 11.5% of the respondents stated that the managers had completed their high school degree, 20.8% had completed a college program, 50% had a university degree, and 17.7% held post-graduate university degrees. The results from the one-way ANOVA reported that there was no
significant difference between the manager’s education and their overall ICI scores \( (F(44, 53) = .187, p > .05) \). These findings are consistent with previous studies conducted by Oliver (1993) and Samuelson (1983) which found there to be no significant difference between the female executives education, age, familiar responsibilities, or ethnicity and their overall ICI scores.

To determine if sex had an effect on sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills respondents were asked to report the managers sex (56.6% of the managers were males, 43.3% were females). The results from one-way ANOVA indicated no significant difference between the manager’s sex and their overall ICI scores \( (F(44, 54) = .844, p > .05) \). This finding is consistent with previous studies by Adams, Rice, and Inston (1984) and Petty and Bruning (1980) who report that sex did not affect the perceptions of managers’ communication skills.

**Research Question 1**

The first problem that this study investigates is to determine which dimensions of interpersonal communication account for effective communication.

Q1. How much variance does each dimension account for in effective interpersonal communication?

Table 4 provides a correlation matrix of the variables. Two of the independent variables Awareness of Others and Coping with Feelings were correlated with effectiveness. The step-wise multiple regression revealed that only Awareness of Others was significant \( (r = .215, p < .05) \).

Previous researchers (i.e., Dansereau & Markham, 1987; Jablin, 1979; Klauss & Bass, 1982; and Sims & Manz, 1984) have investigated what distinguishes effective managers from ineffective managers. Burke, Weitzel, and Weir (1982) found that effective managers gave recognition, discussed differences openly, and expressed their appreciation of subordinates. Therefore, it was unexpected to find that Awareness of Others only accounted for 4.6% of the total variance \( (r^2 = .046) \) and that Coping will Feelings did not add any unique variance. These results suggest that issues such as listening to others, listening for meaning or feelings, and seeing things from the other
persons' point of view are important to effective management. However, they also suggest that the dimensions which constitute the domain of interpersonal communication still need to be identified.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix of Interpersonal Communication Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Awareness of Others</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coping with Feelings</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.548*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Disclosure</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.593*</td>
<td>.539*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; N=100

A limiting factor of these results may have been a restriction of range on the effectiveness variable (SD=.89). This restriction of range becomes even more apparent after noting that the majority of the respondents only used two of the five points, stating that the manager was either effective, or very effective. The dimensions may have accounted for more of the variance if the respondents were provided with a nine point scale, instead of a five point scale. A nine point scale is recommended for future studies in order to spread out the range of the effectiveness variable.

Research Questions 2 & 3

Next, real and ideal perceptions were examined to determine if superiors, managers, and subordinates differed in what they viewed as desirable interpersonal communication skills.

Q2. Does position affect the perception of real interpersonal communication dimensions?

Q3. Does position affect the perception of ideal interpersonal communication dimensions?
A MANOVA with a step down analysis was used, with the real and ideal dimensions separately, to explore whether position affected perception of the dimensions. Table 5 shows that position did not have a significant effect on perceptions of the real dimensions (Wilks' Lambda = .967, p > .05) or the ideal dimensions (Wilks' Lambda = .954, p > .05).

### Table 5
**Multivariate Tests on Real and Ideal Perceptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position + Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position + Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* alpha = .05

These results differ from previous researchers, as Cahn (1986), London and Wohlers (1991), and Schnake, Dumler, Cochran and Barnett (1990) found that superior and subordinate perceptions were significantly different. This disagreement with past research may be due to the homogeneous nature of the sample. Within the sport management field, the distinction between supervisor, manager, and subordinate is not always clearly defined. Therefore, position may not affect perceptions in this study because the positions may not have been as distinct as in other organizations.

The next four research hypotheses further examined these perspectives by comparing specific dyads within the superior-manager-subordinate triad to determine if there were similarities or differences in their perspectives.

### Research Hypothesis 1

The extreme ends of the superior-manager-subordinate triad have not been investigated, however, it was expected that managers would work harder at communicating upwards with superiors than with downwards subordinates. Additionally,
it was expected that superiors would see managers in a more favourable light than subordinates, since superiors often hear questions, updates, and reports, and subordinates often hear orders, criticisms, or evaluations. These assumptions led to the following hypothesis:

H1. $H_{A1} = $ Superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.

Table 6 lists the means, standard deviations, and standard error for the superiors and the subordinates with the overall ICI scores as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93.37</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88.44</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one tailed t-test was performed on the overall ICI scores of superiors and subordinates, and the results reported no significant difference between superiors' and subordinates' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills ($t=1.043$, $p>.05$). Therefore, hypothesis one was not supported.

This result is counter to the hypothesis that expected superiors to see managers as being more effective communicators than subordinates. The similarities in the perceptions of others (superiors and subordinate) may suggest that the manager communicates the same upwards as downwards, and that 'others' perspectives are consistent. However, as in research questions two and three, these findings may again be due to the homogeneous nature of the provincial sport organizations and the fact that the positions (superior, manager, subordinate) may not be distinctly different. Therefore, previous research may be supported, and differences between superiors' and
subordinates' perceptions may be found in organizations with a more typical hierarchical structure.

**Research Hypothesis 2**

The second research hypothesis was based upon the work of Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) who found that "self-ratings were over a half standard deviation higher than supervisor ratings" or that managers perceived themselves to be better communicators than superiors (p. 55). The results of this previous study suggested that managers' self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills would be higher than superiors' perceptions of the managers' interpersonal communication skills.

$$H_2. \quad H_{A2} = \text{Managers' self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills.}$$

Table 7 lists the means, standard deviations, and standard error for the superiors and the managers with the overall ICI scores as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93.37</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager(Up)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>89.59</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one tailed t-test was computed on the overall ICI scores of superiors and managers, and the results indicated that there was no significant difference between managers' and superiors' perceptions of managers' interpersonal communication skills ($t=1.215$, p>0.05). Therefore, hypothesis two was not supported. These results contradict previous research by Harris and Schaubroeck (1988) and suggest that managers have an accurate perception of their communication skills with superiors. This may be due to the
fact that typically superiors evaluate the manager’s performance, so the manager may be constantly monitoring and working to improve communication with his/her superior.

**Research Hypothesis 3**

The third research hypothesis was based upon the work of Weese (1998) who found that “the executive leaders significantly overestimated their leadership contributions in comparison to the perspective of followers” (p. 7). These findings suggested that managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills would be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of the managers’ interpersonal communication skills.

\[ H_3: \quad H_{A3} = \text{Managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.} \]

Table 8 lists the means, standard deviations, and standard error for the managers and the subordinates with the overall ICI scores as the dependent variable.

**Table 8**
**Group Statistics of the Manager-Subordinate Dyad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager(Down)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88.44</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one tailed t-test revealed a significant difference between managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills (t=1.889, p<.05). Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_{A3}) was accepted. These results support previous researchers (Ashford (1989), and Bass & Yammarino (1991), Harris & Schaubroeck (1988), and Weese (1998)) and suggest that managers do not communicate downwards as well as they think they do.
These findings support the need for managers to receive feedback from subordinates on their communication skills during performance appraisals, since ¾ of a manager's duties involve communicative acts. The examination of hypothesis number two found that superiors and managers have similar views of the managers' communication behaviour, and typically it is just the superior who conducts performance appraisals. However, if a manager's job is to motivate subordinates, and the subordinates do not feel that the manager is communicating as well as he/she thinks they are, then the manager may not be as effective as the superior's performance appraisal reports him/her to be. These results suggest the need for the subordinates 'new' perspective to be incorporated into a manager's evaluation and lends support to the use of '360° feedback' performance appraisals. This type of appraisal provides information to managers on how superiors, subordinates, and peers see them on a number of dimensions. Only by understanding how others see themselves, can managers hope to identify and improve their interpersonal communication skills.

**Research Hypothesis 4**

The forth research hypothesis was based upon the work of Santora (1992) who suggested that people often do a better job of reflecting upwards, than downwards. Therefore it was expected that managers would perceive themselves as being better communicators with superiors than with subordinates.

\[ H_4. \quad H_{A4} = \text{Managers' upward ICI scores will be greater than their downward ICI scores.} \]

Table 9 lists the means, standard deviations, and standard error for the managers' upward and downward perceptions the overall ICI scores as the dependent variable. No significant difference was found in the direction of the one tailed t-test \((t=-2.799, p<.005)\). However, the negative t-score indicates that there would have been a significant result in the opposite direction if a two tailed t-test had been employed. The negative t-score suggests that the managers' downward ICI scores were greater than their upward ICI scores.
Table 9
Group Statistics of the Manager's Self-Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager (Up)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>89.59</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager(Down)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results contradict previous research by Santora (1992) and suggest that managers think they do a better job of communicating downwards than upwards. This implication is even more meaningful when combined with the results of hypothesis three which reported that managers think they communicate downwards better than they actually do. Therefore, it may be suggested that managers are fairly accurate in their upward perceptions, but totally inaccurate in their downward perceptions.

This is especially interesting since both of these groups (superiors and subordinates) perceive the managers' interpersonal communication skills to be similar. It can be speculated that in the managers' mind, communication downward is clearer because of the instructional nature of downward communication. However, these speculations were not supported by the results of hypothesis one which reported that the manager does not communicate any differently up or down. From these inferences it may be suggested that the difference is due to a perceptual distortion on the managers part. Managers may think they communicate better downwards because communicating to their subordinates is the main part of their job and what encompasses most of their time. Fox and Dinur (1988) reported that people have the tendency to project themselves in a favourable light, therefore, managers would perceive themselves as doing most of their job well (communicating with subordinates) well.

Table 10 summarizes the results revealed in this study. These findings, examined individually, provide some insight into the perceptions and dimensions of interpersonal
communication. However, when all the results are combined together they lead to some very interesting implications. In the summary section of Chapter Five these collective results will be discussed, while making recommendations for future research, and reporting the conclusions that can be drawn from this study.

**Table 10**
Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question or Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. How much variance does each dimension account for in effective interpersonal communication?</td>
<td>* Awareness of Others accounted for 4.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Does position affect the perception of real interpersonal communication dimensions?</td>
<td>* No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Does position affect the perception of ideal interpersonal communication dimensions?</td>
<td>* No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1. Superiors’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.</td>
<td>* Failed to Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than superiors’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.</td>
<td>* Failed to Reject Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Managers’ self-perceptions of their interpersonal communication skills will be higher than subordinates’ perceptions of managers’ interpersonal communication skills.</td>
<td>* Rejected Null and Accepted Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Managers’ self-perceptions of their upward communication skills will be higher than their self-perceptions of their downward communication skills.</td>
<td>* Failed to Reject Null</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of the research conducted, reports the conclusions that can be drawn from this study, and discusses the implications of the results in order to make recommendations for future research.

Summary

This study initiated the exploration of managers' interpersonal communication skills within the domain of sports management by examining the superior-manager-subordinate triad. Both real and ideal perceptions regarding managers' communication skills were examined from the perspective of others (superiors, subordinates) and self (managers). A revised edition of the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI), a self-reporting questionnaire, was used to examine sport managers' interpersonal skills as perceived by superiors, managers, and subordinates. Revisions included the addition of ideal to the existing real perceptions and changes to the wording of the survey to allow for others' perceptions to be investigated as well as self-perceptions. Also, following the direction of previous research, the key areas within interpersonal communication were compared with the original dimensions and five new dimensions were implemented.

The purpose of this study was to build upon previous interpersonal communication research in order to bridge the gap between the plethora of studies in management or administrative settings and the lack of research in sport management studies. These results were, on the most part, consistent with previous research which suggests that the two environments are similar, thereby, past findings and recommendations from the business field may be transferred and utilized in the sports management research. Results suggested that the dimensions which constitute the domain of interpersonal communication need to be identified, and that managers were not as effective in communicating as they believe. In particular, results showed that managers perceived themselves to communicate downwards better than upwards,
however subordinates perceptions indicated that managers are not as effective in downwards communication as they think.

Recommendations for future research include the identification of the dimensions which constitute the domain of interpersonal communication, the creation a new instrument to measure interpersonal communication within a management environment, and further investigation into the differences between managers’ and subordinates perceptions’ of the managers’ communication skills. These recommendations are detailed further at the end of this chapter.

Conclusions

This study was conducted to explore which dimensions account for effective communication, to examine the similarities and/or differences in superiors’, managers’, and subordinates’ perceptions of the managers’ real and ideal communication skills, and to investigate the different perspectives within the superior-manager-subordinate triad.

Although both Awareness of Others and Coping with Feelings were correlated with interpersonal communication effectiveness, only Awareness of Others accounted for variance within interpersonal communication. Even though Awareness of Others had a positive correlation, it only accounted for about 4.6% of the overall variance within effective communication. When the perceptions of superiors, managers, and subordinates were compared to the five dimensions of interpersonal communication, there was found to be no position effect. However, when these perceptions were compared (individually) with the overall ICI scores managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions were found to be significantly different. Therefore it can be concluded that the lack of knowledge regarding the dimensions that constitute the domain of interpersonal communication has hindered this study, and perhaps previous research as well.

Despite this obstacle, when overall communication scores were used, this study found that managers’ and superiors’ perceptions of the managers’ interpersonal communication skills were similar, yet the managers’ and subordinates’ perceptions were different. Further, it was reported that managers not only thought that they communicated better downwards than the subordinates reported, but the managers
actually thought that they communicated better downwards than upwards. These inaccurate self-perceptions may have been attributed to previous performance appraisals that reported the managers communication skills to be effective (which is what the superior believes), when in fact the subordinates may feel the manager needs to improve their downward communication skills. Based upon the results of this study, it can be concluded that managers do not communicate downwards as effectively as they think.

**Recommendations**

The following section outlines the implications of the results and details recommendations for future study. Recommendations include the identification of the dimensions within interpersonal communication, the modification of the ICI or the creation of a new interpersonal communication measurement tool, the investigation into other sectors of the sport management population, and the increased use of 360° performance appraisals.

1. **DIMENSIONS OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION**

   The primary problem that made sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills essential to examine, still remains the main dilemma. Prior to this study, the dimensions that constitute the domain of interpersonal communication were not clear. and the results found in this study demonstrate how important it is for them to be identified.

   Research question one attempted to tackle the uncertainty of communication by exploring how much variance each dimension accounted for in effective interpersonal communication. Two of the dimensions were found to correlated with effectiveness, but Awareness of Others was the only variable with enough unique variance, and it only accounted for 4.6% of this variance. Additionally, the investigation into research questions two and three found that position did not affect perceptions of the dimensions. This may have been due to the homogenous nature of the sample, however, positions were found to have an affect on perceptions when they were measured using the overall
ICI scores instead of just the dimensions’ scores. If the domains were more clearly defined perhaps research question two and three would have shown an effect as well.

These findings indicate that exactly what makes up interpersonal communication is still unknown, and without that knowledge communication research will continue to be fragmented and lacking. The main recommendation from this study is for the dimensions that constitute the domain of interpersonal communication to be clearly identified, defined, and used in future research. Both the practitioner and the researcher would clearly benefit from an increased understanding of the dimensions that encompass interpersonal communication. Since the majority of managers’ duties involve face-to-face interactions, a better understanding of interpersonal communication is essential to increasing managerial effectiveness.

2. INSTRUMENTATION

The Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI), as it now stands, is not effective in measuring communication effectiveness. The results from hypothesis one, which stated that the dimensions of the ICI only accounted for 4.6% of the variance, suggests that the instrument is insufficient and that research needs to be done to not only examine other dimensions but to also create a new tool with which to measure interpersonal communication.

Therefore, this study recommends that an up-to-date measurement tool for examining interpersonal communication skills is desperately needed. A survey or questionnaire that accounted for the dimensions that encompass interpersonal communication would be extremely helpful in understanding sport managers’ communication skills. This may be accomplished by combining key areas within interpersonal communication research with leadership indexes such as the LBQ (Leadership Behavior Questionnaire) or the MLQ (Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire).

Additionally, as mentioned in the introduction, the type of instrument selected and the specific instrument itself also limited this study. There are numerous methods of collecting data in the area of interpersonal communication (i.e., direct and indirect
observation and codification, subjective self-reporting instruments, and in-depth interviews). Nevertheless this study utilized a self-reporting questionnaire (ICI). It is recommended that future researchers combine the use of questionnaires with other measurements such as productivity reports, performance reviews and/or interviews in order to clearly understand the managers’ interpersonal communication skills. In addition to combining questionnaires with other measurements of communication, the restrictive range of the effectiveness variable used in this study limited the results for the second and third research question. It is recommended that for future studies a 9 point scale be utilized instead of a 5 points scale to ask respondents whether the manager was effective or ineffective.

3. SPORT MANAGEMENT POPULATION

In addition to the instrument, the other main limitation dealt with the sample selected for this study. Results from research question two and three, plus hypothesis one, suggest that the sample was extremely homogeneous in nature as the distinction between supervisor, manager, and subordinate is not always clearly defined. It is recommended that a different sample of sport managers be investigated (i.e., professional teams) so comparisons can be made to determine if these results were due to the homogeneous nature of the sample, or some other confounding variable.

4. PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF 360° PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

Individually, the four hypotheses are interesting, however when examined together they provide some interesting insight into a managers’ interpersonal communication skills. The investigation into hypothesis one found that managers essentially communication the same upwards and downwards, as perceived by superiors and subordinates. However, hypothesis two and three found that managers are able to perceive their communication skills accurately upwards, but not downwards. This may be due to the fact that typically superiors evaluate the manager’s performance, so the manager may be constantly monitoring and working to improve communication with his/her superior. This discrepancies may exist because superiors typically evaluate the
manager’s performance, and so the manager may be constantly monitoring and working to improve communication with his/her superior. The implications of these findings become even more apparent when hypothesis two is examined further.

The results of the second hypothesis suggest that managers and superiors have similar perceptions of the managers interpersonal communication skills. This may be a outcome of the manager constantly working to monitor and improve communication with her/her superior, because the superiors are typically the individuals who evaluate the manager’s performance. But according to research hypothesis three, these performance appraisals many not be as accurate as the superiors perceives, since the subordinates do not feel that the manager communication as well as his/her self-perceptions reflect.

However, according to the results of hypothesis four, not only do managers think they are better at communicating downwards than subordinates suggest, they actually perceive that they are better at communicating down than up! These results demonstrate, that when it comes to the self-perceptions of their downward communication skills, managers are completely inaccurate. This misperceptions of communication skills may have been fostered if, during the superiors’ performance appraisal, it is reported that managers have effective communication skills. This message tells managers that they do not need to improve their communication skill, when in fact they do need to improve their downward communication.

Therefore, the implications of these findings seem very apparent. Managers will not receive accurate performance appraisals unless evaluations on communication skills come from subordinates, as well as superiors. Many companies, such as Chrysler Corporation, already use reverse performance appraisals to allow subordinates to evaluate their bosses (Santora, 1992). This lends support toward the use of 360° performance appraisals which invite perceptions of superiors, peers, and subordinates. It is recommended that more organizations use this type of multi-perspective approach to evaluation.

A couple of researchers (i.e., Fox & Dinur, 1988; Thorton, 1980) have taken the ‘self’ versus ‘other’ perceptions on step further to suggest that not only are the perceptions of others important, the managers accuracy in perceiving his/her
communication skill (compared to others' ratings) may actually be a predictor of leadership abilities. Thorton (1980) suggested that the accuracy of self ratings, compared to others' ratings, might be an insight into leadership abilities because the ability of managers to be in touch with others is essential. Ironically, this ability to have insight and be in touch with others was also the dimension which accounted for the most variance in this study (Awareness of Others). This suggests that researchers may be on the right track for defining at least one important dimension of interpersonal communication, however, much still needs to be done.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Definition of Terms

**Age:** Age of the superior, the manager, and the subordinate, plus the differences or similarities in each of the respective dyads.

**Communication:** The act or action of imparting or transmitting information.

**Dyad:** Two people involved in face-to-face communication, who occupy different positions of power within the same organization.

**Education:** Education level, type of education received, and additional training received.

**Interpersonal Communication:** "The communication between a relatively small number of people which usually, but not always, occurs face-to-face, and in which at least some of the rules governing communication can be attributed to the communicators themselves" (Pomsonwan, 1995, 13).

**Manager:** The focal person for this study who reports to the Executive Director. Chosen by the researcher, and not a volunteer.

**Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre (OSRC):** A building located in Toronto, which houses most of the provincial sport organizations, and has contact with the sport organizations located outside of this building.

**Provincial Sport Organization (PSO):** A non-profit organization that administers a single amateur sport for the province.

**Resident Sport Organization:** A provincial sport organization whose main, or only, administrative location is at the Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre.

**Non-Resident Sport Organization (NRSO):** A provincial sport organization whose main administrative location is located outside the Ontario Sports and Recreation Centre.

**Perception:** An individual's distinct perspective resulting from their prior knowledge, understandings, and their current interpretations.

**Real Perception:** The current perspective of the respondent.

**Ideal Perception:** The desired perspective of the respondent.

**Sex:** One of the two divisions of humans, respectively designated male or female.
**Subordinate:** A paid individual within the organization who reports to the manager, such as an assistant or secretary. Chosen by the researcher, and not a volunteer.

**Superior:** A paid individual within the organization to whom the manager reports, such as an Executive Director. Chosen by the researcher, and not a volunteer.
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Jennifer Graham
School of Human Kinetics
c/o University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario, Canada
N9B 3P4

January 19, 1998

Dr. Millard J. Bienvenu
c/o Northwest Counseling Centre
111 East 5th Street
Natchitoches, Louisiana, USA
71457
Phone (318) 352-8345

Copyright Permission Letter

Dear Dr. Bienvenu;

As mentioned in our telephone conversation, I am a graduate student in the College of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Windsor, in Ontario, Canada. As part of my Master’s Thesis for the School of Human Kinetics I will be studying sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills.

I became interested in this topic during a MBA course on Interpersonal Dynamics, and subsequently acted as a teaching assistant for this course while working on my Master’s Thesis. Specifically, I hope to analyze sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills as perceived by superiors, themselves, and subordinates. Additionally, I wish to analyze the differences between real and ideal perceptions, of the three above groups.

I am writing to request permission to use the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) for which you hold the copyright. I would also like to request permission to make a two adaptations. First, to analyze the perspectives of superiors and subordinates, I would like to word their surveys to inquire about the manager, instead of themselves. Second, to analyze ideal perceptions, in addition to the already existing real perceptions, I would like to add three more blanks (yes, sometimes, no) in the ideal column. I have included a sample copy of the Superiors’ Survey for clarification.

...continued
Appendix C - Original ICI

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

This inventory offers an opportunity to make an objective study of the degree and patterns of communication in your interpersonal relationships.

DIRECTIONS:

1. The questions refer to persons other than your family members or relatives.

2. Please answer each question as quickly as you can according to the way you feel at the moment (not the way you usually feel or felt last week).

3. Please do not consult anyone while completing this inventory. You may discuss it with someone after you have completed it. Remember that the value of this form will be lost if you change any answer during or after this discussion.

4. Your answers are confidential and since your name is not required on this page, please be as frank as possible. Honest answers are very necessary if this form is to be of any value.

5. Start with the following examples for practice. By putting a check (✓) in one of the three blanks on the right you show how the question applies to you. Read the questions and make your marks now. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES (usually)</th>
<th>NO (seldom)</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it easy for you to express your views to others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do others listen to your point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never. The SOMETIMES column should be marked when you definitely cannot answer YES or NO, but USE THIS COLUMN AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE.

7. Read each question carefully, yet do not take too much time. If you cannot give the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can but be sure to answer each one.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

Copyright 1968 Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr. All rights reserved.
1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?  

2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask the person to explain what he means?  

3. When you are trying to explain something, do other persons have a tendency to put words in your mouth?  

4. Do you merely assume the other person knows what you are trying to say without your explaining what you really mean?  

5. When in a discussion, do you attempt to find out how you are coming across by asking for feedback?  

6. Is it difficult for you to converse with other people?  

7. Do you find it difficult to become interested in other people?  

8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from those around you?  

9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person’s shoes?  

10. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting to what he says?  

11. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others?  

12. When you are angry, do you admit it when asked by someone else?  

13. Is it very difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from others?  

14. Do you have a tendency to jump to conclusions in your interactions with others?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does it upset you a great deal when someone disagrees with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When someone has hurt your feelings, do you discuss the matter with that person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you avoid disagreeing with others because you are afraid they will get angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When a problem arises between you and another person, are you able to discuss it without losing control of your emotions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you pout and sulk for a long time when someone upsets you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. In meaningful conversation, are you aware of how you are feeling and reacting to what the other person(s) is saying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Do you have difficulty trusting other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In attempting settle a misunderstanding, do you remind yourself that the other person could be right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you help others to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is it difficult for you to confide in people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES (usually)</td>
<td>NO (seldom)</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting to what he says?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when someone is talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Do others seem to be listening when you are talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In a discussion is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not really listening?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying (his words) and what he may be feeling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. While speaking, are you aware of how others may be reacting to what you are saying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Do you feel other people wish that you were a different kind of person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Do other people fail to understand you feelings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Can you tell what kind of day another person may be having by observing them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Do you admit that you are wrong when you know that you are wrong about something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Adapted ICI

This inventory offers an opportunity to make an objective study of the degree and patterns of communication in your interpersonal relationships.

DIRECTIONS:
- The questions refer to persons other than your family members or relatives.
- Please answer each question as quickly as you can according to the way you feel at the moment (not the way you usually feel or felt last week).
- Please do not consult anyone while completing this inventory. You may discuss it with someone after you have completed it. Remember that the value of this form will be lost if you change any answer during or after this discussion.
- Honest answers are very necessary. Please be as frank as possible, since your answers are confidential.
- Use the following examples for practice. By putting a check (✓) in one of the three blanks on the right you show how the question applies to your situation.

Sample Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES (usually)</th>
<th>NO (seldom)</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. Is it easy for you to express your views to others? |              |             |           |
b. Do others listen to your point of view?       |              |             |           |

The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never.

The SOMETIMES column should be marked when you definitely cannot answer YES or NO. Use this column as little as possible.

Read each question carefully, yet do not take too much time. If you cannot give the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can but be sure to answer each one. There are no right or wrong answers. Answer according to the way you feel at the present time. Remember, do not refer to family members when answering the question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES (usually)</th>
<th>NO (seldom)</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask the person to explain what he means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When you are trying to explain something, do other persons have a tendency to put words in your mouth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you assume the other person knows what you are trying to say instead of explaining what you really meant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you ever ask the other person to tell you how they feel about the point you are trying to make?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is it difficult for you to talk with other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from those around you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person’s shoes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting to what he says?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you refrain from saying something you know will only hurt others or make matters worse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is it very difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When someone has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES (usually)</td>
<td>NO (seldom)</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does it upset you a GREAT deal when someone disagrees with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you avoid disagreeing with others because you are afraid they will get angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When a problem arises between you and another person, are you able to discuss it without getting angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle differences with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you pout and sulk for a long time when someone upsets you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you become very uneasy when someone pays you a compliment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Generally, are you able to trust other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you help others to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is it difficult for you to confide in people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting?  

30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with others?  

31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when someone is talking?  

32. Do others seem to be listening when you are talking?  

33. In a discussion, is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view?  

34. Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not?  

35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying and what he may be feeling?  

36. While speaking, are you aware of how others are reacting to what you are saying?  

37. Do you feel other people wish that you were a different kind of person?  

38. Do other people understand you feelings?  

39. Do others remark that you always seem to think you are right?  

40. Do you admit that you are wrong when you know you are wrong about something?
Appendix E

Comparison of Original and Adapted ICI

The original Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) was developed in 1969 by Millard J. Bienvenu Sr. of Northwestern State University of Louisiana. Oliver (1993) and Saumuleson (1983) used an altered version of the original ICI. In the altered version sixteen of the forty questions were changed; six questions were removed and new questions developed, three questions were exchanged from negatively-scored questions to positively-scored questions, six questions contained minor changes in wording and one question was relocated. These specific adaptations are listed below.

Specific Adaptations to the Original ICI

1. same
2. same
3. same
4. same

5. *different question (affected Dimension 7 - Clarity)*
   Original - When in a discussion, do you attempt to find out how you are coming across by asking for feedback?
   Adapted - Do you ever ask the other person to tell you how he/she feels about the point you may be trying to make?

6. *replace “converse” with “talk”*
   Original - Is it difficult for you to converse with other people?
   Adapted - Is it difficult for you to talk with other people?

7. *reworded from a negatively-scored question to a positively-scored question*
   Original - Do you find it difficult to become interested in others people?
   Adapted - In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both you and the other person?

8. same
9. same
10. same
11. same
12. different question (affected Dimension 6 - Coping with Feelings)
   Original - When you are angry, do you admit it when asked by someone else?
   Adapted - Do you refrain from saying something you know will only hurt others or make matters worse?

13. same

14. was originally question 17
   old question was not renumbered (affected Dimension 3 - Feedback)
   Original - Do you have a tendency to jump to conclusions in your interactions with others?
   Adapted - When someone has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with him/her?

15. same

16. “great” in capital letters
   Original - Does it upset you a great deal when someone disagrees with you?
   Adapted - Does it upset you a GREAT deal when someone disagrees with you?

17. original question moved to question 14; new question is different
   Original - When someone has hurt your feelings, do you discuss the matter with that person?
   Adapted - Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with someone?

18. same

19. replaced “losing control of your emotions” with “getting angry”
   Original - When a problem arises between you and another person, are you able to discuss it without losing control of your emotions?
   Adapted - When a problem arises between you and another person, can you discuss it without getting angry?

20. same

21. same

22. different question (affected Dimension 2 - Awareness)
   Original - In meaningful conversation, are you aware of how you are feeling and reacting to what the other person(s) is saying?
   Adapted - Do you become very uneasy when someone pays you a compliment?

23. reworded from a negatively-scored question to a positively-scored question
   replaced “people” with “individuals”
   Original - Do you have difficulty trusting other people?
   Adapted - Generally, are you able to trust other individuals?
24. *different question (affected Dimension 1 - Self-Disclosure)*
   Original - In attempting to settle a misunderstanding, do you remind yourself that the other person could be right?
   Adapted - Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise others?

25. same
26. same
27. same
28. same

29. *deleted “to what he says”*
   Original - In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting to what he says?
   Adapted - In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before reacting?

30. same
31. same
32. same
33. same

34. *deleted “really listening”*
   Original - Do you pretend you are listening to others when you actually you are not really listening?
   Adapted - Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not?

35. *omitted “his words”*
   Original - In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying (his words) and what he may be feeling?
   Adapted - In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying and what he may be feeling?

36. same
37. same

38. *reworded from a negatively-scored question to a positively-scored question*
   Original - Do other people fail to understand your feelings?
   Adapted - Do other people understand your feelings?

39. *different question (affected Dimension 2 - Awareness)*
   Original - Can you tell what kind of day another person may be having by observing him?
   Adapted - Do others remark that you always seem to think you are right?

40. same
Appendix F

Revised Dimensions

The following list of questions, are the items contained in each dimension. The superiors and subordinates evaluated the managers' interpersonal communication skills (3rd person) and the managers completed a self-assessment on their own interpersonal communication skills (1st person). Therefore, the items in the superiors'/subordinates' survey contained changes in semantics. The managers performed a self-assessment on how they perceived themselves to communicate with superiors and subordinates separately. Therefore, the items in the managers' surveys specify who the manager is conversing with to distinguish direction of communication. The following items can be found in the first part of the managers' survey (upward communication to superiors). Starred items (*) refer to the questions that were removed from the original ICI which were categorized by the expert panel so future duplication of this study could be conducted with either the original ICI or the adapted ICI.

Awareness of Self and Self-Disclosure
5. Do you ever ask your superior to tell you how he/she feels about the point you are trying to make?
11. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect your superior?
23. Generally, are you able to trust your superior?
25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from your superior?
26. Do you help your superior to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?
27. Is it difficult for you to confide your superior?
38. Does your superior understand your feelings?
40. Do you admit you are wrong when you know you are wrong about something?

Self-Expression and Clarity
1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?
2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask your superior to explain what he/she means?
3. When you are trying to explain something, does your superior have a tendency to put words in your mouth?
4. Do you assume your superior knows what you are trying to say, instead of explaining what you really meant?
6. Is it difficult for you to talk with your superior?
24. Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise your superior?
42. * When you are angry, do you admit it when asked by your superior?
44. * In meaningful conversation, are you aware of how you are feeling and reacting to what your superior is saying?

**Awareness of Others**
7. In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both you and your superior?
9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in your superior's shoes?
12. Do you refrain from saying something you know will only hurt others or make matters worse?
30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with your superior?
31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when your superior is talking?
32. Does your superior seem to be listening when you are talking?
33. In a discussion, is it difficult for you to see things from your superior's point of view?
34. Do you pretend you are listening to your superior when actually you are not?
35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what your superior is saying and what he/she may be feeling?

36. While speaking, are you aware of how your superior is reacting to what you are saying?
45. * In attempting to settle a misunderstanding, do you remind yourself that your superior could be right?
46. * Can you tell what kind of day your superior may be having by observing him/her?

**Acceptance of Feedback and Evaluation**
10. In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than your superior?
13. Is it difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from your superior?
22. Do you become very uneasy when your superior pays you a compliment?
29. In conversation, do you let your superior finish talking before reacting?
39. Does your superior remark that you always seem to think you are right?
41. * When in a discussion, do you attempt to find out how you are coming across by asking for feedback?
43. * Do you have a tendency to jump to conclusions in your interactions with your superior?

**Coping with Feelings and Differences**
8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from your superior's ideas?
14. When your superior has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with him/her?
15. Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?
16. Does it upset you a GREAT deal when your superior disagrees with you?
17. Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with your superior?
18. Do you avoid disagreeing with your superior because you are afraid he/she will get angry?
19. When a problem arises between you and your superior, can you discuss it without getting angry?

20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with your superior?

21. Do you pout and sulk for a long time when your superior upsets you?

28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?

Does Not Fit

37. Do you feel that your superior wishes you were a different kind of person?
INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

This survey will be used to describe and analyze sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills. All answers are completely anonymous, so please be as frank as possible. Additionally, your answers will grouped with others remarks, so your individual answers will not be identifiable.

The term manager only refers to the person which this questionnaire is focused upon. For the purpose of this study the MANAGER or the focal person is ________ (initials only). The REAL situation refers to how the manager acts at the present time. The IDEAL situation refers to how you wish the manager would act. These answers can be the same or different.

DIRECTIONS:
- There are no right or wrong answers. Answer according to how you think the manager acts.
- It is important that you answer every question.
- Answer each question as quickly as you can.
- Answer each question according to the way you feel at this moment (not the way you usually feel or felt last week).
- Do not consult anyone while completing this questionnaire.
- All answers are anonymous, so please be as frank and honest as possible.
- Use the following examples for practice. Place one check mark (✓) in the REAL column to describe your real (current) situation. Then place one check mark (✓) in the IDEAL to describe your ideal (desired) situation.

Sample Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(usually)</td>
<td>(seldom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Is it easy for the manager to express his/her views to others?

b. Do others listen to the manager’s point of view?

The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually.

The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never.

The SOMETIMES column should be used when you definitely cannot answer yes or no. Use this column as little as possible.
Begin the Questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Some-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(usually)</td>
<td>(seldom)</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>(usually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do the manager’s words come out the way he/she would like them to in conversation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>When the manager is asked a question that is not clear, does he/she ask the person to explain what they mean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>When the manager is trying to explain something, do other people have a tendency to put words in his/her mouth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does the manager assume the other person knows what he/she is trying to say instead of explaining what he/she really meant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the manager ever ask others how they feel about the point he/she is trying to make?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Is it difficult for the manager to talk with other people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In conversation, does the manager talk about things which are of interest to both people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Does the manager find it difficult to express his/her ideas when they differ from those around him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In conversation, does the manager try to put him/herself in the other person’s shoes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>In conversation, does the manager have a tendency to do more talking than the other person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Is the manager aware of how his/her tone of voice may affect others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Does the manager refrain from saying something he/she knows will only hurt others or make matters worse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Is it difficult for the manager to accept constructive criticism from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>When someone has hurt the manager’s feelings, does he/she discuss this with them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Does the manager later apologize to someone whose feelings he/she may have hurt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Does it upset the manager a GREAT deal when someone disagrees with him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Does the manager find it difficult to think clearly when he/she is angry with someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Does the manager avoid disagreeing with others because he/she is afraid they will get angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When a problem arises between the manager and another person, can he/she discuss it without getting angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Does the manager seem satisfied with the way he/she settles differences with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Does the manager pout and sulk for a long time when someone upsets him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Does the manager become very uneasy when someone pays him/her a compliment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Generally, is the manager able to trust other individuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Does the manager find it difficult to compliment and praise others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Does the manager deliberately try to conceal his/her faults from others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Does the manager help others to understand him/her by saying how he/she thinks, feels, and believes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Is it difficult for the manager to confide in people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Does the manager have a tendency to change the subject when his/her feelings enter into a discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>In conversation, does the manager let the other person finish talking before reacting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Does the manager find him/herself not paying attention while in conversation with others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Does the manager try to listen for meaning when someone is talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Do others seem to be listening when the manager is talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>In a discussion, is it difficult for the manager to see things from the other person's point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Does the manager pretend he/she is listening to others when actually he/she is not listening?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | YES  | NO  | Some-
|   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 35. In conversation, can the manager tell the difference between what a person is saying and what he/she may be feeling? |   |   |   |
| 36. While speaking, is the manager aware of how others are reacting to what he/she is saying? |   |   |   |
| 37. Do you feel that other people wish the manager was a different kind of person? |   |   |   |
| 38. Do other people understand the manager’s feelings? |   |   |   |
| 39. Do others remark that the manager always seem to think he/she is right? |   |   |   |
| 40. Does the manager admit he/she is wrong when he/she knows he/she is wrong about something? |   |   |   |

Overall, how effective a communicator is the manager? (please check one)

Very Ineffective   Ineffective   Neither Ineffective or Effective   Effective   Very Effective

Demographic Variables:

1. Sex of Manager: Male   Female

2. Age of Manager:
   If you do not know their exact age, please check one of the following:
   20’s   30’s   40’s   50’s   60’s   70+

3. Education of Manager:
   High School   College   University   Post -Graduate
   (Check One - the highest level achieved)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY!

Please tear off the cover letter, place the survey into the envelope and seal it.

If you choose to mail the survey, please write your PSO on the envelope. This will only be used to ensure response and will not be matched with the enclosed survey. All answers are completely anonymous.
INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION INVENTORY

This survey will be used to describe and analyze sport managers’ interpersonal communication skills. All answers are completely anonymous, so please be as frank as possible. Your answers will grouped with all other managers’ remarks, so your individual answers will not be identifiable.

Your survey has two parts. PART A refers to how you communicate to your superior(s). PART B refers to how you communicate with your subordinate(s). The terms superior and subordinate are only used for reference purposes and do not reflect competence or importance in your organization.

The REAL situation refers to how you act at the present time. The IDEAL situation refers to how you wish you would act. These answers can be the same or different.

DIRECTIONS:

- There are no right or wrong answers. Answer according to how you think you communicate.
- It is important that you answer every question.
- Answer each question as quickly as you can.
- Answer each question according to the way you feel at this moment (not the way you usually feel or felt last week).
- Do not consult anyone while completing this questionnaire.
- Do not consult back to Part A when completing Part B.
- All answers are anonymous, so please be as frank and honest as possible.
- Use the following examples for practice. Place one check mark (✓) in the REAL column to describe your real (current) situation. Then place one check mark (✓) in the IDEAL to describe your ideal (desired) situation.

Sample Questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Some-</td>
<td>(usually)</td>
<td>(seldom)</td>
<td>Some-</td>
<td>(usually)</td>
<td>(seldom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Is it easy for the you to express your views to others?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do others listen to the your point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening most of the time or usually.

The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as seldom or never.

The SOMETIMES column should be used when you definitely cannot answer yes or no. Use this column as little as possible.
**Begin Part A:**

When you communicate with your superior(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 2. | When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask your superior to explain what he/she means? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 3. | When you are trying to explain something, does your superior have a tendency to put words in your mouth? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 4. | Do you assume your superior knows what you are trying to say, instead of explaining what you really meant? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 5. | Do you ever ask your superior to tell you how he/she feels about the point you are trying to make? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 6. | Is it difficult for you to talk with your superior? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 7. | In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both you and your superior? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 8. | Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from your superior’s ideas? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 9. | In conversation, do you try to put yourself in your superior’s shoes? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 10. | In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than your superior? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 11. | Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect your superior? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 12. | Do you refrain from saying something you know will only hurt others or make matters worse? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 13. | Is it difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from your superior? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 14. | When your superior has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with him/her? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 15. | Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt? | YES | NO | Some-
|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |
| 16. | Does it upset you a GREAT deal when your superior disagrees with you? | YES | NO | Some-
<p>|   |   | (usually) | (seldom) | times |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REAL</th>
<th></th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you avoid disagreeing with your superior because you are afraid he/she will get angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When a problem arises between you and your superior, can you discuss it without getting angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you pout and sulk for a long time when your superior upsets you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you become very uneasy when your superior pays you a compliment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Generally, are you able to trust your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you help your superior to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is it difficult for you to confide your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In conversation, do you let your superior finish talking before reacting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with your superior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when your superior is talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Does your superior seem to be listening when you are talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In a discussion, is it difficult for you to see things from your superior’s point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Do you pretend you are listening to your superior when actually you are not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Some- (usually) (seldom) times</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>In conversation, can you tell the difference between what your superior is saying and what he/she may be feeling?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>While speaking, are you aware of how your superior is reacting to what you are saying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Do you feel that your superior wishes you were a different kind of person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Does your superior understand your feelings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Does your superior remark that you always seem to think you are right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Do you admit you are wrong when you know you are wrong about something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, when communicating with your superior(s), how effective a communicator are you? (please check one)

Very Ineffective    Ineffective    Neither Ineffective or Effective    Effective    Very Effective
**Begin Part B:**

**When you communicate with your subordinate(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REAL</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES (usually)</td>
<td>NO (seldom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask your subordinate to explain what he/she means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When you are trying to explain something, does your subordinate have a tendency to put words in your mouth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you assume your subordinate knows what you are trying to say, instead of explaining what you really meant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you ever ask your subordinate to tell you how he/she feels about the point you are trying to make?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is it difficult for you to talk with your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both you and your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from your subordinate’s ideas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in your subordinate’s shoes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you refrain from saying something you know will only hurt others or make matters worse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is it difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When your subordinate has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Does it upset you a GREAT deal when your subordinate disagrees with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do you avoid disagreeing with your subordinate because you are afraid he/she will get angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When a problem arises between you and your subordinate, can you discuss it without getting angry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you pout and sulk for a long time when your subordinate upsets you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you become very uneasy when your subordinate pays you a compliment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Generally, are you able to trust your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you help your subordinate to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is it difficult for you to confide your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In conversation, do you let your subordinate finish talking before reacting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with your subordinate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when your subordinate is talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Does your subordinate seem to be listening when you are talking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In a discussion, is it difficult for you to see things from your subordinate's point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Do you pretend you are listening to your subordinate when actually you are not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what your subordinate is saying and what he/she may be feeling? 

36. While speaking, are you aware of how your subordinate is reacting to what you are saying? 

37. Do you feel that your subordinate wishes you were a different kind of person? 

38. Does your subordinate understand your feelings? 

39. Does your subordinate remark that you always seem to think you are right? 

40. Do you admit you are wrong when you know you are wrong about something? 

Overall, when communicating with your subordinate(s), how effective a communicator are you? (please check one)

Very Ineffective   Ineffective   Neither Ineffective or Effective   Effective   Very Effective

Demographic Variables:

1. Your Sex: Male   Female

2. Your Age: 

3. Your Education:
   High School   College   University   Post -Graduate
   (Check One - the highest level achieved)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY!

Please tear off the cover letter, place the survey into the envelope and seal it.

If you choose to mail the survey, please write your PSO on the envelope. This will only be used to ensure response and will not be matched with the enclose survey. All answers are completely anonymous.
Appendix I

List of Provincial Sport Organizations

Resident Sport Organizations:
1. Canoe Ontario
2. Ontario Basketball Association
3. Ontario Bowling (5-pin) Association
4. Ontario Cycling Association
5. Ontario Equestrian Association
6. Ontario Field Hockey Association
7. Ontario Fitness Council
8. Ontario Gymnastics Federation
9. Ontario Hockey Federation
10. Ontario Lacrosse Association
11. Ontario Physical and Health Education Association
12. Ontario Ringette Association
13. Ontario Softball Association
14. Ontario Special Olympics
15. Ontario Tennis Association
16. Ontario Track and Field Association
17. Ontario Volleyball Association
18. Sport for Disabled Ontario
19. Swim Ontario
20. Synchro Ontario

Non-Resident Sport Organizations:
21. Ontario Baseball Association
22. Ontario Curling Federation
23. Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations
24. Ontario Figure Skating Association - Central Office
25. Ontario Soccer Association
26. Ontario Sportsman Association
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