

1986

Perceptual correspondence in the superior-subordinate work dyad

Lora Lee Sager
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds



Part of the [Organizational Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Sager, Lora Lee, "Perceptual correspondence in the superior-subordinate work dyad" (1986). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3700.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5584>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Lora Lee Sager for the Master of Science in Speech Communication presented July 7, 1986.

Title: Perceptual Correspondence in the Superior-Subordinate Work Dyad.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]

Theodore G. Grove, Chairman

[REDACTED]

Robert W. Vogel~~s~~ang

[REDACTED]

Larry Steward

[REDACTED]

David Cressler

The purpose of the present investigation was to provide a clearer understanding of how various levels of perceptual correspondence are associated with one another and with performance appraisal. Specifically, the present study focused on the variable of accuracy in an attempt to discover its relative importance to performance appraisal. Also of interest was the relationship between accuracy and agreement.

A review of the management literature in the area of superior-subordinate perceptual correspondence revealed a lack of consistency in the theoretical language, definitions, and measurements used by theorists. Consequently, the current study presented an integrative analysis of two theoretical models for assigning perceptual correspondence: the coorientation model (CM) and the interpersonal perception model (IPM).

Another dimension lacking in the management literature was an exploration of the interaction of levels of perceptual correspondence. Some researchers working with marital dyads have claimed that agreement within a dyad is confounded in some ways with accuracy in predicting the partner's perception. The present investigation addressed both of the aforementioned lacks by the analysis of data collected in connection with a previous study.

Based on the IPM, Crist, in a 1982 study, developed the Superior-Subordinate Interpersonal Perception Method (SSIPM) which measured the individual perceptions of superiors and subordinates with respect to 16 issues germane to the work place. Responses were compared for measures of agreement/disagreement, understanding/misunderstanding, realization/lack of realization, and feelings of being understood/misunderstood. The degree of total perceptual correspondence between the superior-subordinate dyads was compared to performance appraisal. SSIPM scores and performance appraisal scores demonstrated a significant positive relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I complete this study, there are several people to whom I feel gratitude. I would like to acknowledge all my committee members for their willingness to read and review this research. I give special thanks to each one: to Dr. Robert Vogelsang for three years of guidance, concern, and friendship; to Dr. Larry Steward for his excitement about this project; to Dr. David Cressler for stepping in on a moment's notice and managing to provide insightful comments; and especially to Dr. Theodore Grove for being my external motivation. He is the reason this thesis is finished. I could not have done it without him.

Betsy Crist wrote a thesis that allowed me to see what needed to be done next. To spark creativity in another is a truly wonderful accomplishment. I appreciate her willingness to allow me to use data and information that she spent hours collecting and entering into the computer.

My friends Gisele Tierney and Doris Werkman were my comrades in arms during this project. With all of us in the middle of our theses together, we managed to create a climate of relative sanity. Having someone to "go through it all with" made this experience exciting, fun, and much easier than it might have been.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Mel and Peggy Sager, and my sister, Beth, without whose love, encouragement, and support nothing would be possible. They are what make all my accomplishments worthwhile. I hope they never feel taken for granted. They are too special for that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND . .	1
Interpersonal Perception Method	3
Coorientation Model	5
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND PURPOSE	12
Purpose	19
III METHODS	20
Instrumentation	
Subject Selection and Test Administration	
Results	
Methods of the Present Study	
IV RESULTS	27
Reliability Study	
Relationship Between Accuracy and Performance Appraisal	
Relationship Between Accuracy and Agreement	
Relationship Between Accuracy and Performance Appraisal Corrected for Agreement	
Relationship of Item Content and Salience to Performance Appraisal	
Relationship of Item Scores to Performance Appraisal	

CHAPTER	PAGE
V DISCUSSION	40
Crist's Findings as They Relate to the Present Study	
Implications of Present Study	
Limitations	
Suggestions for Future Research	
REFERENCES	48
APPENDIX	
A Supervisory-Subordinate Interpersonal Perception Method	51
B Performance Appraisal	57

Crist received data from 14 subjects (dyad N=7) too late to include in her data analyses. The first step in the present study was to conduct a reliability and item analysis study on the increased sample size. Second, the relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal was examined without respect to agreement scores. Third, a partial correlation test for possible confounding of accuracy by agreement was run.

In the first analysis, the SSIPM produced a Cronbach Alpha of +81775 demonstrating the internal consistency of the instrument. Contrary to expectations, further analysis indicated that agreement was a more important variable in terms of performance appraisal than was accuracy and that the two perceptual levels were indeed confounded in some way.

The results obtained in this study suggest that researchers need not focus on accuracy as a predictor of performance appraisal. Future studies may wish to explore the agreement/accuracy confounding issue in more detail to provide a clearer understanding of the various levels of perceptual correspondence and their relationship to the work place.

PERCEPTUAL CORRESPONDENCE IN THE SUPERIOR-SUBORDINATE
WORK DYAD

by

LORA LEE SAGER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University


1986

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:


The members of the Committee approve the thesis of Lora Lee Sager presented July 7, 1986.




Theodore G. Grove, Chairman



Robert W. Vogelsang



Larry Steward




David Cressler

APPROVED:



Theodore G. Grove, Head, Department of Speech Communication



Bernard Ross, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Corrected Item-Total Correlations	28
II	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Relationships Between Performance Appraisal and Three Indices of Perceptual Accuracy in Superior/Subordinate Work Dyads	29
III	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Relationships Between Agreement and Three Indices of Perceptual Accuracy in Superior/ Subordinate Work Dyads	30
IV	Partial Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between Accuracy and Performance Appraisal Controlling for Agreement	31
V	Partial Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between Agreement and Performance Appraisal Controlling for the Three Indices of Accuracy	32
VI	Intercorrelations and Associated Percentages of Shared Variance for Accuracy, Agreement, and Performance Appraisal	33

TABLE

VII	Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for the Relationships of Performance Appraisal with Item Content and Issue Saliency	35
VIII	Association Between Performance Appraisal and Total Perceptual Correspondence Scores for Sixteen Items	38

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Perceptual Correspondence Constructs in the IPM and the CM: Interpersonal	9
2.	Perceptual Correspondence Constructs in the IPM and the CM: Intrapersonal	10
3.	SSIPM Issue Categories as Developed by Crist, 1982	22
4.	Percentages of Shared Variance for Accuracy, Agreement, and Performance Appraisal . . .	33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Perusal of the management literature provides even the most casual reader with evidence of extreme interest by researchers in the area of superior-subordinate communication. Of primary interest to some is the field of perceptual correspondence. This is an exploration of the relationship between the perceptions of two people. McLeod and Chaffee (1973) state:

The key assumption underlying this approach is that a person's behavior is not based simply upon his private cognitive construction of his world; it is also a function of his perception of the orientations held by others around him and of his orientation to them (p. 470).

Perceptual correspondence variables can be divided into two categories: intrapersonal and interpersonal.

The comparison of a person's own cognitions and their perception of another's cognitions is an intrapersonal variable termed "congruency" (McLeod 1971; Chaffee et al. 1969). It refers to an intrapersonal process in the case where the researcher is interested in comparing two levels of perception within one person.

When the cognitions of two or more people are compared, an interpersonal process is being explored. Such comparisons can take place at many levels. For example, we may compare

how person A views an issue or object with how person B views the issue or object. Or, we may compare how person A believes person B views an issue or object versus how person B actually views the issue or object. These distinctions will be explored in more detail later.

Investigators who have explored perceptual correspondence between superiors and subordinates have discovered vast differences in how they view themselves, each other, and various aspects of the organization (Infante and Gordon 1979; Boyd and Jensen 1972; Burke et al. 1982; Moore 1974; Mount 1983; Wexley et al. 1980).

Others have examined how these perceptual differences affect such outcome variables as job satisfaction, performance appraisal, evaluation of supervision, and career involvement (Hatfield and Huseman 1982; Eisenberg et al. 1984; Wexley et al. 1980; Smircich and Chesser 1981; Greene 1972). In most cases, small but statistically significant relationships between the degree of perceptual correspondence and outcome variables have been found. Some obstacles which may contribute to the weakness of these relationship include the lack of consistency in the theoretical language, definitions, and measurements used by theorists (McLeod 1971).

Another problem may be a lack of understanding about how various perceptual levels interact. Based on findings in their work with marital dyads, Sillars et al. (1984), claim that agreement within a dyad is confounded in some ways with accuracy in predicting the partner's perception. For

example, they maintain that, "Couples who have a high level of agreement may guess one another's response via projection or the imputation of a similar response to the partner" (Sillars et al. 1984, p. 319). Others have found such confounding of agreement and accuracy to be absent (e.g., Newmark et al. 1977).

It is the purpose of this paper to examine the relationship between various levels of perceptual correspondence within the context of the superior-subordinate work dyad. This will be accomplished by the reanalysis of data collected in connection with a previous study. The data will be examined in terms of the interaction of the various perceptual levels and their relationships to performance appraisal. For reasons which will become clear later, accuracy will be the main focus of the present study.

Before attempting this task, it is necessary to clarify terms and understand exactly what is meant by perceptual correspondence. For the most part, the thrust of research in this area has come from two theoretical models: the interpersonal perception method (Laing, Phillipson, and Lee 1966); and the coorientation model (McLeod and Chaffee 1967).

INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION METHOD

The Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM) is based on the idea that ". . . social life is not made up of a myriad

I's and me's only, but of you, he, she, we, and them" (Laing et al. 1966, p. 3). The authors contend that this experience of "others" may be more compelling and primary than the experience of "I" or "me." They summarize as follows:

. . . we have ego (self) and alter (other). We recognize that I have my own view of myself (direct perspective) in terms of which I establish my self-identity. We recognize furthermore that ego exists for the alter. This gives my being-for-the-other, or one's identity for the other. My view of the other's view of me, my perspective on the other's perspective on me, is what we are calling a metaperspective. This scheme can be extended to encompass meta-meta and meta-meta-meta perspectives (p. 5).

Specifically, a direct perspective is what one thinks about an issue or object. A metaperspective is what one thinks about how their partner evaluates an issue or object. And finally, a meta-metaperspective is how one thinks the other feels about how oneself views an issue or object.

Laing et al., label the comparison of direct perspectives, the level of agreement/disagreement. In other words, a comparison of how person A views an issue or object with how person B views an issue or object is a measure of agreement/disagreement.

The level of understanding/misunderstanding "can be defined as the conjunction between the metaperspective of one person and the direct perspective of the other" (Laing et al. 1966, p. 29). Consequently, the extent of a dyad's understanding can be measured by comparing how person A believes person B evaluates an issue or object.

The next level identified by Laing et al., is the feeling of being understood/misunderstood. This is measured by comparing a person's meta-metaperspective with his own direct perspective. Thus, how person A believes their partner thinks they view an issue or object is compared with how person A actually evaluates the issue or object. Note that this comparison differs from the others in that the two perceptual ingredients that are compared come entirely from only one of the partners; that is, feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood is an intrapersonal, as opposed to interpersonal construct.

Finally, by comparing one's meta-metaperspective with the other's metaperspective, the level of realization/failure-to-realize can be assessed. For example, what person A thinks about person B's estimate of their opinion about an issue or object is compared to person B's estimate of person A's opinion. This is a measure of person A's accurate realization or failure-to-realize of whether or not they are understood.

COORIENTATION MODEL

Chaffee et al. (1969) summarize their model as follows:

The model we have proposed assumes that a person who is cooriented with a second person has at least two distinguishable sets of cognitions: he knows what he thinks, and he has some estimation of what the other person thinks. In a two-person situation, we have, then, a minimal set of four cognitions. The basic concepts in the model consist of relations between different pairs of cognitions from this total set (p. 2).

They proceed to discuss three different kinds of relationships which can be determined from their coorientation model (CM).

The first relationship is a comparison of the first person's cognitions (what he thinks) to the second person's cognitions. McLeod and Chaffee assert that if these are similar, a certain amount of cognitive overlap has occurred, or what Laing would call "agreement."

The second relationship is congruency--the level of correspondence at which "perceived cognitive overlap" occurs. One may think one's cognitions and the other's cognitions are the same or different. It is a comparison of two levels of cognition within one person. In this one respect, congruency is similar to the IPM's feeling-of-being-understood; that is, both are the product of an intrapersonal comparison.

The third level explores the relationship between what one person believes his partner thinks compared to what the partner actually thinks. Chaffee et al. (1969), call this the level of accuracy. They claim this is the equivalent to the IPM's "understanding" construct. The present study sees the accuracy construct as equivalent to both the "understanding" and "realization" levels of perceptual correspondence. This departs from McLeod and Chaffee in that they liken both "feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood" and "realization/failure-to-realize" to congruency.

Chaffee et al., err on two counts in this latter statement of equivalency. First, as indicated in the above description of IPM concepts, the feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood is internal to each partner, whereas realization/failure-to-realize is not. The latter is a comparison of what person A believes that person B thinks about person A's opinion of an issue or object versus what person B actually thinks about A's opinion. The cognitions of two people are being compared which makes this a dyadic level or interpersonal construct.

Their second error is in their equating the CM construct of congruency with the IPM construct of feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood. While both are indeed intrapersonal or monadic constructs, they involve very different ingredients. Congruency refers to the correspondence of one's direct perception or, in IPM language, a comparison of A's direct perspective with A's metaperspective. But, feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood refers to the correspondence of A's direct perspective with A's meta-metaperspective. Thus, they refer to quite contrasting results: perceived agreement versus feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood, respectively.

In fact, Chaffee et al. (1969) say that congruency is an intrapersonal concept and therefore not a coorientational variable, and that it

. . . is not a true coorientational variable in that it is internal to one person; however, it exists only in a coorientational context, and it

is the third side of a conceptual triangle of which overlap and accuracy are the other two legs (p. 3).

The clarity of the foregoing concepts central to the IPM and CM may be enhanced by referring to Figures 1 and 2. Figure 1 depicts an interpersonal grid in which matching of row and column variables form interpersonal constructs in the several cells of the grid. Figure 2 depicts an intrapersonal grid.

OTHER

DIRECT (O-->x) META (O-->Px) META-META (O-->POx)

DIRECT (P-->x)	Agreement (IPM) Cognitive Overlap (CM)	Understanding (IPM) Accuracy (CM)	
META (P-->Ox)	Understanding (IPM) Accuracy (CM)		Realization (IPM)
META-META (P-->OPx)		Realization (IPM)	

PERSON

Figure 1. Perceptual correspondence constructs in the IPM and the CM: interpersonal.

PERSON

META
(P-->Ox)

META-META
(P-->OPx)

DIRECT
(P-->x)

Congruency (CM)
(perceived agreement)

Feelings-of-Being-
Understood (IPM)

PERSON

Figure 2. Perceptual correspondence constructs in the IPM and the CM: intrapersonal.

To simplify subsequent portions of this paper and avoid confusion, three terms will be used to refer to each of three different kinds of perceptual correspondence.

"Agreement" from the IPM will denote the outcome referred to by Laing's comparison of direct perspectives and McLeod and Chaffee's cognitive overlap.

"Accuracy" from the CM will denote McLeod and Chaffee's accuracy concept as well as Laing's understanding/misunderstanding and realization/failure-to-realize. Thus, "accuracy" will refer to both the direct/meta and the meta/meta-meta interpersonal correspondence. Finally, the term "congruency" will be used to denote two intrapersonal variables--the CM's perceived similarity and the IPM's feeling-of-being-understood/misunderstood.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND PURPOSE

In the work world, the superior-subordinate dyad is considered one of the most important interpersonal relationships in terms of the effect it has on productivity and job satisfaction. As most organizations are very interested in these two variables, it is no surprise that this dyadic relationship has proved to be a focus for many theorists.

Of particular interest to many is the field of perceptual correspondence. Many researchers have explored the level of agreement by comparing the direct perspectives of superiors and subordinates. Boyd and Jensen (1972), discovered that first level managers and their immediate supervisors differed in their perceptions of the amount of authority held by the first level manager. In fact, results were striking in terms of the amount of disagreement uncovered.

Renwick (1975) found that while superiors and subordinates seemed to agree concerning the topics and sources of conflict, there was little agreement about how the other dealt with conflict.

In a study that explored how superiors and subordinates perceived a performance appraisal system, Mount (1983) found some fundamental differences. While subordinates appear

to perceive the appraisal system in a global way, managers appear to differentiate among the various components and see them as distinct entities. Heneman (1974) and Thornton (1968) found that comparisons of self and superior evaluations of subordinate performance indicate that self ratings tend to be less lenient and more variable than superior ratings.

Burke et al.(1982), found that superiors and subordinates disagree on issues of job performance and the way that day-to-day job performance and appraisal interviews are conducted. Subordinates see their own performance differently than do their superiors. In a study which compared the perceptions of superiors, middle managers, and their subordinates, Moore (1974) found that both superior and subordinates predicted longer managerial learning times than did the middle managers.

Other studies have explored the relationships that the levels of agreement and congruency have with various outcome variables. Hatfield and Huseman (1982) examined how perceptual congruence about the communication variables of coordination, participation, and expression affected subordinate job satisfaction. Results demonstrated a small relationship with work satisfaction, supervision, and satisfaction in general.

When asked to assess self and other in terms of attitudes such as responsibility, goals, and loyalty, results indicated that the more cognizant (accurate) a manager was of the subordinate's work related attitudes, the more positively

the subordinate was evaluated by the manager. It was also discovered that the more a subordinate was aware of the manager's attitudes, the more satisfied with work she or he was (Wexley et al. 1980).

In addition to the findings reported earlier, Burke et al. (1982), also found that not only do subordinates see their own performance differently than do their superiors, but they also believe that their superiors see their performance differently than they in fact do. Greene (1972) examined the relationship between what superiors expect of subordinates versus what subordinates think their superior expects of them and how this relates to performance evaluation. When agreement and accuracy were high, superiors evaluated their subordinates higher.

In a study designed to discover whether superiors or subordinates were more accurate in predicting the others responses, it was found that subordinates appear to be slightly more accurate than superiors. But once again, ". . . the most striking result was the general degree of inaccuracy of both" (Infante and Gordon 1979, p. 221).

Eisenberg et al. (1984), looked at the levels of agreement and accuracy in relation to two communication rules: "initiation" and "termination." They then related these to satisfaction with supervision and performance evaluation. Only accuracy appeared to have an impact on these two outcome variables.

Smircich and Chesser (1981) explored the relationship between accuracy and authenticity. The authors define authentic relationships as those in which openness and empathy are high. Authenticity was measured on a twenty-item scale. They discovered that subordinates and superiors are inaccurate in their views of each other's perspectives and that authenticity appeared to have no moderating effects on this.

Many of the researchers reviewed here discovered a vast lack of agreement between superiors and subordinates on a variety of issues and theorized that this lack of agreement was a result of communication breakdown and would lead to low productivity and job satisfaction. Sussman (1975) asserts, however, that disagreement between a superior and subordinate is quite normal and that in fact, ". . . a superior-subordinate work dyad in which total agreement exists may be dysfunctional for both that dyad and the organization" (p. 192). This idea stresses the tenet that, ". . . one's role in a social system dictates his perceptions of that system" (p. 193).

Since superiors and subordinates occupy different positions within the organizational structure, Sussman argues that it is only natural that their direct perspectives disagree. He carries this one step further and states that, "Organizational roles not only structure perceptions, but that changing one's role will result in concomitant changes in his perceptions" (p. 195).

There appears to be sufficient empirical evidence to support his hypothesis. In the review presented here, it is quite obvious that superiors and subordinates do perceive almost every aspect of the organization differently. In support of the idea that organizational roles structure perception is the work of Lieberman (1956), Maier, Hoffman, and Reed (1963), Zajonc and Wolfe (1966), among others. They observed in various studies that a change in one's position within the organization did indeed affect the individual's perception of that organization. Consequently, it would seem that the level of agreement/disagreement is a relatively unimportant one for understanding superior-subordinate communication.

Coorientation theorists agree and contend that it is not disagreement which results from communication breakdown, but inaccuracy. McLeod and Chaffee (1973) state that perfect communication does not necessarily improve agreement but it should always improve accuracy, that is, an increased capacity to predict the work partner's perceptions.

They carry this argument to the level of congruency as well. McLeod (1971) stresses that, ". . . improving communication may either increase or decrease congruency depending upon its prior level and, hence, does not serve as a satisfactory criteria of communication" (p. 5). He further states that although congruency is an important variable, it appears to have the most effect early in the relationship. With the passage of time, the interpersonal variables become

more important than the intrapersonal so that according to McLeod, "The largest differences resulting from communication processes over time is seen in accuracy rather than in the other coorientation measures" (p. 12). Smircich and Chesser (1981) echo this in their discussion concluding that, "The point has been made here that research must go beyond the level of agreement in order to explore fully the perceptions resulting from interaction between superiors and subordinates" (p. 204).

Crist (1982) developed the Superior-Subordinate Interpersonal Perception Method (SSIPM), presented in Appendix A, and compared the total perceptual correspondence within 52 superior-subordinate pairs against performance appraisal scores assigned to subordinates by the superior members of each pair. In her study, Crist was responding to several deficiencies of previous research based on her review of the literature including some of those discussed above.

Previous investigations typically relied almost exclusively on monadic scores in attempting to assess perceptual correspondence--either those of the superior alone or those of the subordinate alone. Crist also found that the issues from which perceptual correspondence data were derived had not been selected with a great deal of care that would assure their importance to most superior-subordinate dyads. In addition, those studies reviewed did not report any attempt to assess the salience that partners' attributed to various issues to which they responded, nor the accuracy

with which they viewed their partner's perceptions. That is, no studies reported procedures aimed at assuring some minimal importance of test items for the respondents.

Based on several rounds of interview, survey, and item analysis data, Crist developed a sixteen-item instrument which included a salience dimension for each item and utilized a scoring program (Grove and Hays 1978) which captured dyadic level indices of perceptual correspondence between superior-subordinate pairs. Resulting correlations between dyadic correspondence scores and performance appraisal scores exhibited positive correlations at a generally low level but with some statistically significant values.

While the methodology of the Crist (1982) study represented an improvement over previous research in several important respects discussed above, all data analyses were based on total perceptual matches between partners, consisting of the composite sum of agreement and two levels of accuracy. However, as several investigators have noted, it is not agreement (or congruency) which has the greatest affect on communication effectiveness, but rather the accuracy variable (McLeod and Chaffee 1973; McLeod 1971; Smircich and Chesser 1981). Also, those few studies that do report accuracy measures (e.g., Eisenberg et al, 1984), typically provide accuracy data for only one member of the superior-subordinate pair. However, perceptual correspondence is a function of the comparison of the perspectives of

both partners rather than just one. It is for the above reasons that the present study will focus on the accuracy scores of the total dyad.

PURPOSE

Because of the observations derived from the investigations reviewed here, it is the intent of the present study to focus on the variable of accuracy. The objectives of the present study will be served by examination of available but heretofore unanalyzed portions of the Crist (1982) data. Therefore, the procedures of that study represent a major part of the methods of the present study, and a detailed review of that investigation will be provided in Chapter III.

The purpose of the present study is fourfold: (1) to perform an item reliability analysis of the SSIPM on a slightly larger data base; (2) to discover the relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal; (3) to probe the relationship between the agreement and the accuracy levels in the superior-subordinate dyad; and (4) to examine whether or not differential agreement "contaminates" accuracy and the relationship of accuracy to performance appraisal. This intensive look at the accuracy variable will hopefully further understanding of perceptual accuracy and its importance to performance appraisal, thereby effective communication, within the superior-subordinate work dyad.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The Crist (1982) investigation was conducted in three stages: development of an instrument which would reliably assess the degree of perceptual correspondence between superiors and subordinates; administration of this instrument to superior-subordinate dyads and a performance appraisal instrument to superiors; and analysis of data to determine the relationship between perceptual correspondence and the outcome of the performance appraisal.

First, the SSIPM and a standardized performance appraisal were developed, and reliability was assessed. Second, cooperating organizations contributed 52 superior-subordinate pairs (N=104) to serve as subjects, instruments were administered to subjects and an additional reliability study was performed on the SSIPM. Third, data analyses were performed to probe the relationship of performance appraisals to dyadic level accuracy scores.

Instrumentation

The SSIPM instrument was based on the IPM structure and designed to measure individual perceptions which could then be compared for measures of agreement/disagreement, understanding/misunderstanding, and realization/lack-of-

realization. In other words, correspondence scores were obtained on all variables in Figure 1, Chapter I.

Based on an extensive review of the literature, 299 issues relevant to the workplace were compiled for the SSIPM. This number was significantly reduced by the elimination of items for reasons of duplication, negatively stated issues, ambiguity, lack of relevance to the work relationship, and the possibility of variable connotation.

Eighteen personnel professionals were asked to rate the remaining issues for relevance to the superior-subordinate work dyad. After this process, forty issues remained.

These issues were then cast into the IPM format; however, two changes were made. In relation to the problems identified in the review of past research, the intrapersonal aspects of the instrument were replaced with salience questions wherein each respondent registered degree of comfort with each relational issue at the direct, understanding, and realization levels of perceptual correspondence. For example, "I feel that he is honest with himself" and "I feel that I am honest with myself" were replaced with "I feel that he highly values honesty" and "I feel that I highly value honesty" (Crist 1982, p. 36).

Consequently, all participants responded to statements at three levels: the direct (agreement); the understanding (accuracy); and the realization (accuracy). As an example, a sample question at the agreement level reads as follows:

I feel that . . .

- A. he is honest with me
- B. I am honest with him
- C. he highly values honesty
- D. I highly value honesty (Crist 1982, p. 36)

A pilot test to assess reliability of the surviving 40 items was administered to 14 superior-subordinate dyads (N=28). The test-retest reliability analysis produced a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of +.8443. A subsequent measure of internal consistency reliability was computed for all subjects (dyad N=52), producing a reliability coefficient of +.7619. Items with negative test-retest or negative or low item-total coefficients were discarded. Through these criteria, 24 items were eliminated. The 16 surviving issues of the SSIPM are presented in connection with the dimensions from which they were developed, in Figure 3.

Communication Issues: handles conflict well
is candid with me

Attitude Issues: has high personal work standards
is committed to his work
* is self-confident
is satisfied with my work
is adaptable
* likes his work

Work Behavior Issues: is qualified for his job
is capable
is competent
* uses time well
is observant
makes effective decisions
* has aptitude for his work

*In the Crist analysis, corrected item-total correlations were weak negative and low for these four items.

Figure 3. SSIPM issue categories as developed by Crist, 1982.

The performance appraisal instrument was adopted from Sims and Szilagyi (1975) and focused on six aspects of performance: quality of work; quantity of work; dependability; ability to get along with others; initiative on the job; and overall performance (see Appendix B). The superior was instructed to respond to each issue by evaluating their subordinate's performance on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

Subject Selection and Test Administration

Data were collected from 52 superior-subordinate dyads. Superiors ranged in age from 20 to over 60. The mean number of years they had worked with their test partner was 3.9. Subordinates ranged in age from 20 to 39 years. Educational levels ranged from "did not finish high school" to those holding a doctorate degree.

Subjects were volunteers from local places of employment. Organizations were contacted by phone, the study described, and appointments set up. Of the fourteen organizations approached, eleven agreed to cooperate. Eight private and three public organizations participated in the final study. These included a retail store, a data processing company, a hospital, a trucking company, and an educational institution among others.

Recruitment letters were sent to possible superior-subordinate pairs within the organizations. Test packets containing the SSIPM, performance appraisal, and letters of

instruction were delivered to cooperating organizations. These packets were then distributed to superior-subordinate pairs of willing participants. Questionnaires were distributed such that pronouns would fit the partner's gender. Using written instructions only, subjects were allowed one week to receive, respond to, and return their test packets.

All subjects responded to the SSIPM. Superiors rated subordinates using the performance appraisal instrument. With the SSIPM data, Crist combined agreement scores and both levels of accuracy scores into a single dyadic index representing overall perceptual correspondence between each superior-subordinate pair.

Results

Analysis of results did not indicate a strong relationship between perceptual correspondence and performance appraisal, but did confirm a direct and significant positive relationship between these variables. The overall correlation coefficient between the SSIPM and the performance appraisal was $+0.2779$, significant at $p = .049$. Thus perceptual correspondence and performance appraisal were associated to some extent.

These weak results may in part have been a function of sample homogeneity produced by volunteerism. They may also be related to the dysfunctional performance of a few items included in the SSIPM. On the main data (dyad $N=52$), a final reliability analysis obtained concurrently with the hypothesis

testing statistical procedures demonstrated that while twelve items achieved reasonably strong item-total correlations (.2547 to .7900), four items actually registered low negative item-total correlations. These items are identified with a "*" in Figure 3 (see page 22). More will be said about this later.

Methods of the Present Study

The Crist study did not attempt to partition accuracy from agreement in the correlational analysis of the association between perceptual correspondence as measured by the SSIPM, and performance appraisal. Pavitt (1980) and McLeod et al. (1972) indicate the need to further study the relationship between agreement/disagreement and accuracy. Also, Sillars and Scott (1983) discuss the need to assess when and where accuracy, agreement, and congruency are important to achieve communication goals.

The purpose of the Crist research was to determine if a relationship exists between overall perceptual correspondence at the dyadic level and the judgments called for in performance appraisal. The intent of the present study is to probe the relationships among agreement, accuracy, and performance appraisal in the superior-subordinate work dyad. Additionally, the purpose is to examine whether or not differential agreement "contaminates" accuracy and the relationship of accuracy to performance appraisal.

The strategy employed to achieve this will be that of examining previously collected but heretofore unanalyzed data obtained in connection with the Crist study. Crist received data from fourteen subjects representing seven dyads too late to include in her data analysis. The first step in the present study will be to conduct a new reliability and item analysis study on the increased sample size of dyad N=59. Of particular interest here will be the performance of the four dysfunctional items identified in the Crist study with respect to the sign item-total correlations. Subsequently, reanalyses of the Crist data will be conducted and will focus on two primary issues. First, the relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal will be examined without respect to agreement scores. Second, a partial correlation test for possible confounding of accuracy by agreement will be run.

All data analysis will be performed with the assistance of the "T-TEST," "ANOVA," "PEARSON CORR," and "PARTIAL CORR" sub-programs of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al. 1981) on a Honeywell 6640 computing system.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The criterion for statistical significance for all analyses was set at $\alpha = .05$. Since only positive, and not negative, associations were assumed in the several correlational analyses of this study, one-tailed tests of significance were applied throughout.

Reliability Study

Results produced a Cronbach Alpha of $+ .81775$ and a standardized item alpha of $+ .83427$, representing marked improvement on Crist's reported $N=52$ coefficients of $+ .74187$ and $+ .76189$, respectively. Average inter-item correlation was $+ .23932$. Corrected item-total correlations are reported in Table I. All items registered positive correlations with the total score. Eleven items were arrayed from the $.40$'s to the $.70$'s and the other five registered $.30$ and lower.

The addition of the seven dyads ($N=59$), an increase of $13\text{-}1/2$ percent over the original sample, greatly affected the four items which had registered negligible but negative correlations in Crist's original data analyses. Those items, marked with a "*" in Table I, now register positive correlations in the 20 's and 30 's.

TABLE I
CORRECTED ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATIONS
(Dyad N=59)

Issue	Corrected Item-Total Correlations
Is well qualified for his job	+.54208
Is capable	+.72865
Is accurate in his work	+.48104
Has high personal work standards	+.70964
Handles conflict well	+.49376
Is competent	+.30356
*Uses his time well	+.42203
Is candid with me	+.43020
*Is self confident	+.26625
Is satisfied with my work	+.48279
Is adaptable to changing situations ...	+.08707
Is observant	+.57579
Makes effective decisions	+.65661
*Has a high aptitude for his work	+.20308
*Likes his work	+.24116

The only other major change occurred for the issue of "adaptability to changing situations." In the original data analyses, this item had registered a positive correlation of +.49711. In this analyses, that coefficient has been reduced to +.08707, the lowest for all the issues. In summary, scale reliabilities in the 80's are sufficiently strong for the purposes of the present study. Discussions of the relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal, accuracy and agreement, and whether agreement is a confounding variable between accuracy and performance appraisal follow.

Relationship Between Accuracy
and Performance Appraisal

This analysis proceeded through three phases. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed for the following pairs of variables: performance appraisal with accuracy₁ (understanding/misunderstanding); performance appraisal with accuracy₂ (realization/failure-to-realize); and performance appraisal with total accuracy (a combination of both levels of accuracy). Results are reported in Table II.

Accuracy₁ appears to have the strongest relationship with performance appraisal with a coefficient of +.3473 significant at the $p = .004$ level. However, all levels demonstrated positive correlations in the 20's and 30's, significant at the $p < .05$.

TABLE II

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND
THREE INDICES OF PERCEPTUAL ACCURACY IN
SUPERIOR/SUBORDINATE WORK DYADS
(Dyad N=59)

Performance Appraisal	Accuracy ₁	Accuracy ₂	Total Accuracy
r	+.3473	+.2299	+.2945
p	.004	.040	.012

Relationship Between Accuracy
and Agreement

Similar to the above, this analysis also proceeded through three phases. Again Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed for each level of accuracy with the agreement variable. Results are reported in Table III. Agreement appears to have a very strong relationship with accuracy demonstrating positive coefficients in the 80's and 90's, significant at the $p < .001$ level. Similar to the performance appraisal results, accuracy₁ registered the strongest relationship of the three.

TABLE III

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AGREEMENT AND THREE INDICES
OF PERCEPTUAL ACCURACY IN SUPERIOR/
SUBORDINATE WORK DYADS
(Dyad N=59)

Agreement	Accuracy ₁	Accuracy ₂	Total Accuracy
r	+.9577	+.8360	+.9147
p	.001	.001	.001

Relationship Between Accuracy
and Performance Appraisal
Corrected for Agreement

Partial correlation coefficients were computed for accuracy and performance appraisal with agreement partialled out. Contrary to expectations, coefficients resulting from the correlation of performance appraisal with the three

levels of accuracy were negligible and negative, failing significance at the least rigorous (.05) alpha level. Results are reported in Table IV.

TABLE IV
PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN ACCURACY AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
CONTROLLING FOR AGREEMENT
(Dyad N=59)

Performance Appraisal	Accuracy ₁	Accuracy ₂	Total Accuracy
r	-.0917	-.1868	-.1621
p	.247	.080	.112

The expectation was that the relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal would hold up after adjusting for agreement. This was obviously not the case. However, with the above results in hand, the investigator is bound to explore the notion that the converse is true; that in fact, a moderate positive relationship persists between agreement and performance appraisal when the effects of accuracy are partialled out. Therefore, partial correlation coefficients were also computed for the relationship of agreement to performance appraisal with each level of accuracy partialled out.

Results were interesting in that each coefficient was positive and significant registering in the 20's and 30's. The relationship between agreement and performance appraisal

controlling for accuracy₁ produced the lowest positive correlation of +.2053, failing significance at the $p = .061$ level. Agreement and performance appraisal controlling for accuracy₂ produced the highest correlation of +.3666, achieving significance at the $p = .002$ level. Finally, the relationship between agreement and performance appraisal controlling for total accuracy produced a positive correlation of +.3071 achieving significance at the $p = .010$ level. Agreement would appear to have the strongest, indeed the only significant, relationship with performance appraisal.

TABLE V

PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN AGREEMENT AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
CONTROLLING FOR THE THREE INDICES
OF ACCURACY
(Dyad N=59)

Control Variable	r	p
Accuracy ₁	+.2053	.061
Accuracy ₂	+.3666	.002
Total Accuracy	+.3071	.010

Given the above outcomes, presentation of additional results is in order. Table VI provides all bivariate item correlations and percentages of shared variance for accuracy, agreement, and performance appraisal variables.

TABLE VI
 INTERCORRELATIONS AND ASSOCIATED PERCENTAGES OF
 SHARED VARIANCE FOR ACCURACY, AGREEMENT,
 AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
 (Dyad N=59)

	Performance Appraisal		Agreement	
	r	%	r	%
Agreement	+ .388	15	--	--
Accuracy	+ .295	09	+ .915	84

NOTE: The total accuracy index was used to represent accuracy in this analysis.

From these data and the partial correlation results discussed above, the picture of relationship becomes clearer. Figure 4 provides a graphic representation to help clarify those relationships.




Figure 4. Percentages of shared variance for accuracy, agreement, and performance appraisal.

Even though agreement and accuracy are related to performance appraisal at $r = +.388$ and $+.295$, respectively, the subset of concomitant variation for accuracy/performance appraisal is almost entirely subsumed by the concomitant variation for agreement/performance appraisal. However, as seen from the second partial correlational analysis reported in Table VI, the reverse is not true. That is, when variation common to accuracy is removed from the agreement/performance appraisal relationship, two of the three agreement/performance appraisal correlations retain statistically significant values.

Relationship of Item Content
and Salience to Performance
Appraisal

One of the problems with previous coorientation research mentioned by several authors cited in Chapter I was that the relative importance of the issues to which subjects responded was not addressed. Although Crist did not directly address that problem, she moved in the right direction by including companion salience items in her SSIPM, connected to the item content in each of her sixteen items. This permitted her to relate item content and item salience separately to her primary variable of interest, total perceptual conjunction. Thus, commensurate with the present study's focus on accuracy, the item content versus item salience distinction provides the ingredients for an analysis of those relationships embedded in the correlations of performance appraisal with accuracy and agreement. The results are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
 PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE RELATIONSHIPS OF
 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL WITH ITEM CONTENT AND ISSUE SALIENCE
 (Dyad N=59)

Performance Appraisal	Agreement		Accuracy ₁		Accuracy ₂		Total Accuracy	
	a*	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
r	+ .3051	+ .3797	+ .2868	+ .3175	+ .1441	+ .2356	+ .2208	+ .2805
p	.009	.002	.014	.007	.138	.036	.046	.016

*a = Item Content; b = Issue Salience

Once again, agreement in terms of item content and salience appeared to have the strongest relationship with performance appraisal with coefficients in the 30's. Another interesting pattern which emerged is that in the case of both agreement and accuracy, correspondence of item salience perceptions consistently show stronger relationships with performance appraisal than correspondence of perceptions on the item content itself. Perhaps the most interesting result from this analysis is the correlation of agreement/salience with performance appraisal at just under $+0.38$, a considerably larger "r" than the next strongest correlation (performance appraisal with agreement/content) of $+0.30$. However, the difference was not statistically significant ($t = 0.674$, $df = 56$).

Subsequently, partial correlations parallel to those previously performed on performance appraisal/agreement and performance appraisal/accuracy were run on issue content versus salience dimensions controlling for accuracy and agreement, respectively. Negative but negligible coefficients for the relationship of accuracy and performance appraisal resulted when controlling for agreement. Coefficients for the relationship between agreement and performance appraisal were $+0.3502$, significant at $p = 0.004$ and $+0.2854$, significant at $p = 0.015$ for item content and salience, respectively. These findings are consistent with the previous results discussed in this section.

Relationship of Item Scores to Performance Appraisal

Since each item conceivably contributed qualitatively different information to the total SSIPM accuracy scores in the previous analyses, and since the individual item data were in hand, it seemed reasonable to explore the relationship between accuracy at the individual item level with performance appraisal for the case of all sixteen items.

There is a problem here. Agreement, Accuracy₁, and Accuracy₂ were inextricably combined by Crist into one total perceptual matching score (total conjunctions) at the individual item level and the information required to separate them is no longer available. However, it would still be desirable to explore how each issue acts relative to performance appraisal, even when limited to such a global index as total conjunctions which admittedly masks variables of primary interest to this study. The results are reported in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
 ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND TOTAL
 PERCEPTUAL CORRESPONDENCE SCORES
 FOR SIXTEEN ITEMS

Issue	r	p
Is well qualified for his job	+.3135	.008
Is capable	+.2654	.021
Is accurate in his work	+.0786	.277
Has high personal work standards	+.1832	.082
Handles conflict well	+.1069	.210
Is competent	-.0576	.332
Is committed to his work	+.0465	.363
Uses his time well	+.1750	.092
Is candid with me	+.1452	.136
Is self confident	+.2122	.053
Is satisfied with my work	+.1763	.091
Is adaptable to changing situations	+.0313	.407
Is observant	+.2092	.056
Makes effective decisions	+.2472	.030
Has a high aptitude for his work	+.3304	.005
Likes his work	+.0455	.366

Four issues were statistically significant beyond $\alpha = .05$, two of these achieving significance at the $p < .01$ level. Two other issues just failed significance. Only one item, "is competent," registered a negative correlation with performance appraisal.

Overall results of the data analyses were interesting in that they point to agreement as the primary though modest predictor of performance appraisal. Accuracy, the variable

of interest in this study, accounted for less than 1 percent of the variance. This was quite a surprise in light of previous research and the tenets of the CM and IPM theories. A discussion of the possible explanations for the attained results as well as the limitations of the present study follow in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship of accuracy to performance appraisal and agreement. More specifically the intent was to provide a clearer understanding of how various levels of perceptual correspondence interact with one another and as correlates of performance appraisal. The expectation that accuracy would be moderately related to performance appraisal failed to materialize. In fact, contrary to expectation, agreement rather than accuracy was found to be the primary predictor of performance appraisal.

The SSIPM proved even more reliable with the addition of the seven late dyads (subjects N=14). The Cronbach Alpha of +.81775 demonstrates the internal consistency of the instrument. However, the question becomes, is anything of importance being measured? The relationship between accuracy and performance appraisal is small but statistically significant for all levels. However, as shown by further analysis, all but less than 1 percent of that relationship can be explained by agreement. Due to these findings, the major thrust of this chapter will pertain to the relationship of agreement and accuracy.

Crist's Findings as They Relate to the Present Study

Crist's results indicated that "there was a direct and significant relationship between performance appraisal and the degree of accuracy in interpersonal perceptions" (p. 67). She also suggests:

. . . that when the superior and subordinate achieve a more closely shared field of meaning, the performance appraisal of the subordinate is higher. Conversely, when perceptions do not closely correspond, superiors rate their subordinate's performance less favorably indicating that a lack of closely corresponding perceptions is dysfunctional (p. 67).

The present study attempted a partial replication of these results with the addition of the seven late dyads. A closely shared "field of meaning" was indeed indicative of a positive performance appraisal. However, when looking at the perceptual levels that comprise that field, it becomes clear that accuracy is much less important than agreement, at least in terms of performance appraisal.

Crist also found the understanding level of perceptual correspondence, (accuracy₁ in the present study) to have the strongest relationship with performance appraisal. The present study reinforces that finding. This indicates that perhaps for the superior-subordinate work dyad, understanding how another feels about an issue or object is more important than the realization of what another thinks that one feels about an issue or object. But again, once agreement is controlled for, the relationship which accuracy₁ has with performance appraisal becomes nonexistent.

When looking at individual item correlations, Crist found that the items which comprise the categories of "work behavior" issues and "communication" issues were positively and significantly related to performance appraisal, the strongest being work behavior. This suggests that these behaviors are more closely related to performance appraisal. As demonstrated in the present study's analyses of the association between performance appraisal and total perceptual correspondence scores for all sixteen items (Table VIII) that conclusion seemed to hold up with the addition of the new data.

Implications of Present Study

Regarding the four questions of the present study, the following outcomes were obtained. First, reliability on the larger sample demonstrated the internal consistency of the instrument while also representing a marked improvement on Crist's reported coefficients. Second, consistent with Crist's and other's findings, accuracy and performance appraisal were found to have a slight positive relationship. Consequently, the more accurate the partner's were, the higher were the subordinate's performance ratings. Third, again as expected, accuracy and agreement demonstrated a strong positive relationship suggesting that these variables may indeed be confounded in some way.

The fourth and final finding was the most interesting and useful. Contrary to expectations, not only was it found

that agreement was confounded with accuracy relative to performance appraisal, but that relationship was not reciprocal. the relationship of agreement and performance appraisal unearthed unique common variance as compared to the relationship of accuracy and performance appraisal which turned out to be wholly redundant. Since they are intertwined, further elaborations on the second, third, and fourth issues will be discussed together.

This study was an attempt to tie previous research into some theoretical framework, something which has been greatly lacking in the past work in the field of management research. As always, when trying to look at a whole, some important variables may go unnoticed. The CM and IPM have been developed to describe the interaction of levels of awareness. Most of the research utilizing these models thus far has focused on the marital dyad, relating perceptual correspondence to satisfaction with the relationship. Perhaps an inappropriate assumption is being made that superior-subordinate dyads are similar to other types of dyads, thus creating the unrealistic expectation of similar results in terms of the importance of the various levels of perceptual correspondence. There may be dimensions of the superior-subordinate dyad which are not being taken into account. Work relationships are not necessarily relationships of choice. The prescribed roles and behavioral norms are more rigid and externally controlled. To expect all

types of dyads to produce identical results in terms of perceptual correspondence research is unrealistic.

Another problem may be the use of the performance appraisal as the primary variable of interest. Accuracy may be the most important level of perceptual correspondence when assessing such variables as satisfaction with relationship, through which performance appraisal judgments are probably mediated. However, agreement may very well be more important when dealing with the performance appraisal situation. When a superior evaluates a subordinate, she or he will try to determine if that employee has done a "satisfactory" job. To receive a positive evaluation, the subordinate's perception of "satisfactory" must be relatively similar to that of their superior. It does not matter if a superior understands that their subordinate has a different idea of what constitutes "satisfactory," they will still expect compliance to their expectations.

A consideration not previously discussed which may confound this even further is that the superior and subordinate may agree as to what constitutes a satisfactory job, but the employee may fail to perform up to those standards. In this case, the superior and subordinate may agree and be quite accurate about the other's opinion, but the result is still a potentially negative performance appraisal.

In writing about the relationship between agreement and accuracy in marital dyads, Sillars et al. (1984) feel that accuracy may be confounded with agreement through

projection of one's own views on the other and various response sets. In the case of work dyads there is no empirical evidence about the role of projection per se, however the present study presents evidence for the first time that Sillars may be right concerning the confounding of those two variables. Further investigation is necessary to determine the effects of this relationship and the implications for future coorientation research.

Limitations

Because the present study relied on data previously collected in connection with the Crist investigation, it is only logical that some of its limitations would be inherited by this study. The first problem is that of volunteerism. It was necessary to solicit volunteers, both for participating organizations and superior-subordinate dyads within the organizations. Consequently, the sample was potentially more homogeneous than an accurate cross-section would provide. Potentially, only dyads with a "certain type" of relationship would volunteer to participate, culminating in a systematic underrepresentation of dysfunctional dyads. The resulting truncated performance appraisal score distribution would place upper limits on the potential size of correlation coefficients involving performance appraisal.

Second, there was a problem with the test method and procedures for giving instructions. Crist was concerned that the SSIPM was a cumbersome procedure as subjects were

required to respond to four statements three times, each from three different perspectives. Her suggestion to future users was to divide the test into three sections thus allowing subjects to respond to the statements from one perspective at a time.

The instructions for these tests were given by letter. Crist attributes the high number of incomplete, inaccurately completed and unreturned tests to a combination of poor instructions and unwieldy test methods. She suggests that oral instructions would have greatly reduced misunderstanding.

The third problem discussed by Crist is potentially the most serious limitation for the present study. The performance appraisal instrument was very general and vague. It would have been more useful to employ a more detailed or standardized performance appraisal instrument had one been available. The alternative would have been to draw on instruments used by the many parent companies and then compute standard scores for each. However, the latter would have resulted in including vastly different dyad specific test content under the rubric of "performance appraisal." Her solution of using the widely recognized six dimensions seemed to be a realistic compromise.

Suggestions for Future Research

It is obvious that to reach a clearer understanding of how the various levels of perceptual correspondence interact and relate to variables of importance in the workplace,

further research is required. Investigators need to explore agreement and the three levels of accuracy in conjunction with other variables of interest in the management field. Job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work relationship, and evaluation of supervision among others have proven to be important areas of study. Crist's instrument could be used for all these.

An important consideration is that research benefits no one if it is not contributing to a body of knowledge. Conducting study after study without some kind of synthesis or theoretical base is not productive. In reviewing some of the management literature, the investigator often wondered if researchers were bothering to read their colleagues' reports in the same journals. Some organizing constructs and theoretical models are necessary for coherent systematic work to proceed. The present study made an attempt in that direction.

Although some results were unexpected, they are no less important. For the first time, empirical evidence is provided that suggests researchers need not focus on accuracy as a predictor of performance appraisal. This information is extremely valuable in terms of clearing up some questions and providing useful points of departure for future research.

REFERENCES

- Boyd, B. and Jensen, M. Perceptions of the first-line supervisors authority: a study in superior-subordinate communication. Academy of Management Journal, 1972, 15, 331-342.
- Burke, R., Weitzel, W., and Deszca, G. Supervisor's and subordinates communication experience in managing job performance: two blind wisemen describing an elephant? Psychological Reports, 1982, 50, 527-534.
- Chaffee, S. and McLeod, J. "Communication as coorientation: two studies." Presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Boulder, Colorado, 1967.
- Chaffee, Steven H., McLeod, Jack M., and Guerrero, Jose L. "Origins and implications of the coorientational approach in communication research." Presented to the Communication Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, August, 1969.
- Crist, B. "Towards a measure of superior-subordinate perceptual correspondence and its relationship to the performance appraisal." Masters thesis, Portland State University, 1982.
- Eisenberg, E., Monge, P., and Farace, R. Coorientation on communication rules in managerial dyads. Human Communication Research, 1984, 11 (2), 261-271.
- Greene, C. Relationship among role accuracy, compliance, performance evaluation and satisfaction within managerial dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 1972, 15, 205-215.
- Grove, T. and Hays, J. IPALION: A Fortran IV program for comparing interpersonal perceptions in dyads. Behavior Research and Instrumentation, 1978, 10, 747-749.
- Hatfield, J. and Huseman, R. Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: moderating effects of individual characteristics. Academy of Management Journal, 1982, 25 (2), 349-358.
- Heneman, H. G. Comparison of self and superior ratings of managerial performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 638-642.

- Infante, D. A. and Gordon, W. I. Subordinate and superior perceptions of self and one another: relations, accuracy and reciprocity of liking. Western Journal of Speech, 1979, 43, 212-223.
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., and Lee, A. R. Interpersonal perception; a theory and a method of research. New York: Springer, 1966.
- Lieberman, S. The effects of changes in roles on the attitudes of role occupants. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 385-402.
- Maier, H., Hoffman, L., and Read, W. Superior-subordinate communication: the relative effectiveness of managers who held their subordinate's positions. Personnel Psychology, 1963, 16, 1-11.
- McLeod, J. M. "Issues and strategies in coorientational research." Presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.
- _____, Becker, L. B., and Elliot, W. R. "Exploration of methodological problems in coorientational research." Presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, Illinois, 1972.
- _____, and Chaffee, S. H. Interpersonal approaches to communication research. Communication Research, 1973, 16, 469-499.
- Moore, M. Superior, self and subordinate difference in perceptions of managerial learning times. Personnel Psychology, 1974, 27, 297-305.
- Mount, M. Comparisons of managerial and employee satisfaction with a performance appraisal system. Personnel Psychology, 1983, 36, 99-110.
- Newmark, Charles S., Woody, Georgye, and Ziff, David. Understanding and similarity in relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977 (33), 83-86.
- Nie, N., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, T., and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1981.
- Pavitt, C. "A test of two models of coorientation: the effect of task and disagreement level on communication and accuracy in dyadic discussions." Presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y., 1980.

- Renwick, J. Perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975 (3), 444-456.
- Sillars, A. L. and Scott, M. D. Interpersonal perception between intimates: an integrative review. Human Communication Research, 1983, 10 (1), 153-176.
- _____, Pike, G. R., Jones, T. S., and Murphy, M. A. Communication and understanding in marriage. Human Communication Research, 1984, 10 (3), 317-350.
- Sims, H. P. and Szilagyi, A. D. Leader reward behavior and subsequent satisfaction and performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975 (14), 426-438.
- Smircich, L. and Chesser, R. J. Superiors' and subordinates perceptions of performance: beyond disagreement. Academy of Management Journal, 1981, 24 (1), 198-205.
- Sussman, L. Communication in organizational hierarchies: the fallacy of perceptual congruence. Western Speech Communication, 1975, 191-199.
- Thornton, G. C. The relationship between supervisory and self-appraisal of executive performance. Personnel Psychology, 1968, 21, 41-56.
- Wexley, K. N., Alexander, R., Greenwalt, J. P., and Conch, M. A. Attitudinal congruence and similarity as related to interpersonal evaluations in manager-subordinate dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 1980, 23 (2), 320-330.
- Zajonc, R. and Wolfe, D. Cognitive consequences of a person's position in a formal organization. Human Relations, 1966, 19, 139-150.

APPENDIX A

SUPERVISOR-SUBORDINATE INTERPERSONAL
PERCEPTION METHOD

1. I feel that . . .
 - A. she is well qualified for her job
 - B. I am well qualified for my job
 - C. she highly values being well qualified for her job
 - D. I highly value being well qualified for my job

She feels that . . .

- E. she is well qualified for her job
- F. I am well qualified for my job
- G. she highly values being well qualified for her job
- H. I highly value being well qualified for my job

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is well qualified for her job
- J. I am well qualified for my job
- K. she highly values being well qualified for her job
- L. I highly value being well qualified for my job

2. I feel that . . .
 - A. she is capable
 - B. I am capable
 - C. she highly values being capable
 - D. I highly value being capable

She feels that . . .

- E. she is capable
- F. I am capable
- G. she highly values being capable
- H. I highly value being capable

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is capable
- J. I am capable
- K. she highly values being capable
- L. I highly value being capable

3. I feel that . . .
 - A. she is accurate in her work
 - B. I am accurate in my work
 - C. she highly values accuracy in work
 - D. I highly value accuracy in work

She feels that . . .

- E. she is accurate in her work
- F. I am accurate in my work
- G. she highly values accuracy in work
- H. I highly value accuracy in work

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is accurate in her work
- J. I am accurate in my work
- K. she highly values accuracy in work
- L. I highly value accuracy in work

4. I feel that . . .

- A. she has high personal work standards
- B. I have high personal work standards
- C. she highly values high personal work standards
- D. I highly value high personal work standards

She feels that . . .

- E. she has high personal work standards
- F. I have high personal work standards
- G. she highly values high personal work standards
- H. I highly value high personal work standards

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she has high personal work standards
- J. I have high personal work standards
- K. she highly values high personal work standards
- L. I highly value high personal work standards

5. I feel that . . .

- A. she handles conflict well
- B. I handle conflict well
- C. she highly values handling conflict well
- D. I highly value handling conflict well

She feels that . . .

- E. she handles conflict well
- F. I handle conflict well
- G. she highly values handling conflict well
- H. I highly value handling conflict well

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she handles conflict well
- J. I handle conflict well
- K. she highly values handling conflict well
- L. I highly value handling conflict well

6. I feel that . . .

- A. she is competent
- B. I am competent
- C. she highly values competence
- D. I highly value competence

She feels that . . .

- E. she is competent
- F. I am competent
- G. she highly values competence
- H. I highly value competence

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is competent
- J. I am competent
- K. she highly values competence
- L. I highly value competence

7. I feel that . . .

- A. she is committed to her work
- B. I am committed to my work
- C. she highly values commitment at work
- D. I highly value commitment at work

She feels that . . .

- E. she is committed to her work
- F. I am committed to my work
- G. she highly values commitment to work
- H. I highly value commitment to work

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is committed to her work
- J. I am committed to my work
- K. she highly values commitment at work
- L. I highly value commitment at work

8. I feel that . . .

- A. she uses her time well
- B. I use my time well
- C. she highly values using time well
- D. I highly value using time well

She feels that . . .

- E. she uses her time well
- F. I use my time well
- G. she highly values using her time well
- H. I highly value using my time well

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she uses her time well
- J. I use my time well
- K. she highly values using time well
- L. I highly value using time well

9. I feel that . . .

- A. she is candid with me
- B. I am candid with her
- C. she highly values being candid
- D. I highly value being candid

She feels that . . .

- E. she is candid with me
- F. I am candid with her
- G. she highly values being candid
- H. I highly value being candid

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is candid with me
- J. I am candid with her
- K. she highly values being candid
- L. I highly value being candid

10. I feel that . . .

- A. she is self confident
- B. I am self confident
- C. she highly values self confidence
- D. I highly value self confidence

She feels that . . .

- E. she is self confident
- F. I am self confident
- G. she highly values self confidence
- H. I highly value self confidence

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is self confident
- J. I am self confident
- K. she highly values self confidence
- L. I highly value self confidence

11. I feel that . . .

- A. she is satisfied with my work
- B. I am satisfied with her work
- C. she highly values my work
- D. I highly value her work

She feels that . . .

- E. she is satisfied with my work
- F. I am satisfied with her work
- G. she highly values my work
- H. I highly value her work

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is satisfied with my work
- J. I am satisfied with her work
- K. she highly values my work
- L. I highly value her work

12. I feel that . . .

- A. she is adaptable to changing situations
- B. I am adaptable to changing situations
- C. she highly values adaptability to changing situations
- D. I highly value adaptability to changing situations

She feels that . . .

- E. she is adaptable to changing situations
- F. I am adaptable to changing situations
- G. she highly values adaptability to changing situations
- H. I highly value adaptability to changing situations

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is adaptable to changing situations
- J. I am adaptable to changing situations
- K. she highly values adaptability to changing situations
- L. I highly value adaptability to changing situations

13. I feel that . . .

- A. she is observant
- B. I am observant
- C. she highly values being observant
- D. I highly value being observant

She feels that . . .

- E. she is observant
- F. I am observant
- G. she highly values being observant
- H. I highly value being observant

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she is observant
- J. I am observant
- K. she highly values being observant
- L. I highly value being observant

14. I feel that . . .

- A. she makes effective decisions
- B. I make effective decisions
- C. she highly values effective decision making
- D. I highly value effective decision making

She feels that . . .

- E. she makes effective decisions
- F. I make effective decisions
- G. she highly values effective decision making
- H. I highly value effective decision making

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she makes effective decisions
- J. I make effective decisions
- K. she highly values effective decision making
- L. I highly value effective decision making

15. I feel that . . .

- A. she has a high aptitude for her work
- B. I have a high aptitude for my work
- C. she highly values having a high aptitude for the work
- D. I highly value having a high aptitude for the work

She feels that . . .

- E. she has a high aptitude for her work
- F. I have a high aptitude for my work
- G. she highly values having a high aptitude for the work
- H. I highly value having a high aptitude for the work

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she has a high aptitude for her work
- J. I have a high aptitude for my work
- K. she highly values having a high aptitude for the work
- L. I highly value having a high aptitude for the work

16. I feel that . . .

- A. she likes her work
- B. I like my work
- C. she highly values liking her work
- D. I highly value liking my work

She feels that . . .

- E. she likes her work
- F. I like my work
- G. she highly values liking her work
- H. I highly value liking my work

She thinks that I feel that . . .

- I. she likes her work
- J. I like my work
- K. she highly values liking her work
- L. I highly value liking my work

APPENDIX B

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Code # _____

Dear Supervisor:

This portion of the study involves the rating of your subordinate test partner on his or her work performance. There will be no rating of the supervisor by the subordinate.

Based on your observation of the person you are evaluating, please rate him or her on each aspect listed by circling a single number on the five-point scale, where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent. Please complete this form prior to taking the Supervisor-Subordinate Interpersonal Perception Method. Please seal it in the envelope provided together with the computer response page, the test, the signed consent form, and the personal data inventory form.

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

	Poor				Excel- lent
Quality of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Quantity of Work	1	2	3	4	5
Dependability	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to get along with others	1	2	3	4	5
Initiative on the job	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Performance	1	2	3	4	5