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This study examined the conflict-management strategies used by younger supervisors with their older subordinates. The organizational culture variables of openness-to-change and supportiveness were also tested as mediating factors in the relationship between supervisor age and strategy selection.

Survey data was obtained by subjects (n=132) through a network sample design. The sample represented professionals from ages 18-58 years with jobs in more than twenty industries. Subjects provided information about their conflict experiences with older workers and their organizational cultures.

Results indicated that younger supervisors were more likely to use the avoiding style and less likely to use the collaborating style to manage conflict with older
subordinates. The openness-to-change culture variable had a slight impact on the age-strategy relationship, but the age factor alone was found to be the most powerful predictor of the supervisor’s selection of conflict management strategies.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Employee age has been recognized as an emerging diversity issue in both communication and organizational behavior research (Waldrum & Niemira, 1997). Past studies have examined age discrimination and the challenges facing older workers (Berry, 2005; Duncan & Loretto, 2004; McVittie, McKinlay, & Widdicombe, 2003), but until recently few had focused on the younger worker, specifically, the younger supervisor, in the workplace. In the last ten years there has been a steady rise of young professionals working in positions of authority above older workers. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, the number of professionals ages 20-34 in managerial roles has increased from 4.8 million in 1994 to 5.2 million in 2004 (Pelletier, 2005). However, reverse-age hierarchies have been largely neglected in organizational communication research.

The little information available on the reverse-age superior-subordinate dyad comes mainly out of the organizational demography literature, and most of this research is based on weak theoretical assumptions and unsubstantiated claims (Lawrence, 1997). In the majority
of studies it was assumed that age diversity had a direct impact on organizational outcomes without providing any conclusive evidence to support such assertions (Pfeffer, 1983; Vecchio, 1993). Pelled, Eisenhardt, & Xin (1999) acknowledged these flaws and argued that in order to, “capture fully the complex relationship between work group diversity and performance [outcomes], we need more sophisticated theories and empirical work incorporating intervening variables” (p. 2). Pelled’s concept of intervening processes called for the examination of additional intervening, or mediating, processes which may shape the relationship between diversity and organizational outcomes.

Pelled’s argument underscores the rationale for studying reverse-age relationships from a communication perspective. The communication exchange between these workers is certainly an inherent factor linking age differences to organizational outcomes. Thus, by gaining a clearer understanding of the communication between young supervisors and older subordinates, researchers will be able to better identify the relationship, if any, between age and outcomes.

Also, because of the numerous perceptions that reverse-age hierarchies impose negative consequences on
organizations, this study will focus on the conflict communication, particularly the conflict management strategies, used in these relationships. Some of the perceptions are that reverse-age hierarchies bring about lowered work productivity, employee job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Shore, Cleveland, & Goldberg, 2003). Also, considering that conflict is an inevitable and pervasive reality in organizational life, it certainly follows that there will be a recurrence of conflict in reverse-age relationships (Jameson, 1999). Pelled et al.'s (1999) study examined conflict as an important intervening factor, but age diversity was only referenced minimally in the investigation. It also failed to account for the impact of reverse-age relationships on the nature and intensity of the conflict experienced.

This study will move beyond previous research, defining the specific conflict management strategies used by young supervisors with their older subordinates. Until now, researchers focused primarily on determining whether age diversity is truly a driving force of organizational conflict. Several studies have confirmed, indeed, that there is a rational link between these variables. Thus, it is now essential to uncover how young managers react to and attempt to resolve such conflict when it arises.
Finally, this study will also analyze an intervening factor that may influence a supervisor’s selection of particular conflict management strategies. Organizational culture was chosen as the factor for study as it has been cited in both organizational behavior and communication research as a vital consideration in studies of employee age and diversity (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mundell, 1993; Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994; Tsui, Porter, & Egan, 2002). Further, Chatman, Polzer, Barsade, and Neale (1998) recognized organizational culture as having a substantial influence on demographic diversity and work outcomes.

Hypotheses

It has been suggested that young managers often feel uncomfortable giving direction to their older subordinates. Also it has been thought that older subordinates may be resistant to orders issued by younger supervisors, and, consequently, that these superiors may have a difficult time managing the older subordinates (Butler, 2000; Crampton & Hodge, 1996; Green, Whitten, & Medlin, 2005). Because these negative perceptions will most likely influence young supervisors’ interactions with their subordinates, it is likely that these supervisors will
abandon integrative conflict management strategies in favor of ineffective ones. Therefore:

HP1: Younger versus older supervisors will prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with their older subordinates.

HP2: Younger versus older supervisors will prefer the competing style of managing conflict with their older subordinates.

The third strategy examined in this study is the collaborating style of managing conflict. The collaborating style is a highly effective, integrative strategy for minimizing conflict in organizational settings (Conrad, 1991). Considering that reverse-age hierarchies are thought to contribute to negative organizational outcomes and effective conflict management strategies are linked with more positive work environments (Greenburg & Barling, 1996), it follows that:

HP3: Younger versus older supervisors will not prefer the collaborating style of managing conflict with their older subordinates.

An additional focus in this investigation centers on organizational culture and its potential influence on reverse-age superior subordinate interactions. When attempting to uncover meaningful differences in the ways
that younger supervisors manage conflict with older workers, the organization’s prevailing value system and norms will clearly influence these workers interactions. Past studies have indicated that organizational cultures help shape employee attitudes, the intent to remain with the organization, and overall job satisfaction (Harris & Mossholder, 1996). Thus, it is important to consider organizational culture in reverse-age relationships and how it may affect organizational outcomes. Two dimensions of organizational culture will be examined specifically in this study. First, supportiveness will be examined as having a potentially positive influence on supervisors’ selection of beneficial conflict management strategies. The literature suggested that organizations high in supportiveness foster beneficial work outcomes including greater employee commitment, member involvement, and job satisfaction (Brewer, 1993; Jehn, Chadwick, & Thatcher, 1997). Jehn et al. (1997) also suggested that organizations experience lower levels of conflict when their working environments are highly supportive. Thus, the impact of supportiveness will be:

HP4: The supportiveness dimension of organizational culture will decrease the likelihood that younger
supervisors will prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

HP5: The supportiveness dimension of organizational culture will decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors will prefer the competing style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

HP6: The supportiveness dimension of organizational culture will increase the likelihood that younger supervisors will prefer the collaborating style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

The second cultural element analyzed in this study is organizational openness-to-change. Similar to the impact of supportiveness, organizations that are highly open to change are thought to contribute to overall well-being in the workplace (Wanberg & Banas, 2000). With respect to work outcomes, organizational researchers have found that high levels of openness increase employees’ feelings of job satisfaction. Further, Miller et al.’s (1994) study addressed conflict specifically and suggested that organizations that are highly open to change fostered increased member cooperation and lowered levels of organizational conflict.
Thus, the following hypotheses result:

**HP7:** The openness-to-change dimension of organizational culture will decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors will prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

**HP8:** The openness-to-change dimension of organizational culture will decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors will prefer the competing style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

**HP9:** The openness-to-change dimension of organizational culture will increase the likelihood that younger managers will prefer the collaborating style of managing conflict with older subordinates.

*Significance of Study*

There are at least four significant contributions in the present study. First, this study will encourage investigation of reverse-age superior-subordinate dyads in the communication field. This untraditional management structure has been recognized as an emerging age-diversity issue in the workplace, and it is gaining attention from
organizational-behavior researchers, yet it has been seldom discussed in the communication literature. Considering the negative implications for organizations with reverse-age hierarchies, this age-diversity issue warrants further examination from a conflict communication perspective.

Second, this study highlights some important factors that should be considered in this area of research. The organizational demography literature suggested a causal link between reverse-age hierarchies and work outcomes, but there has been little evidence to confirm the legitimacy of this relationship. It follows that the connection may be better understood by examining the communication practices between younger supervisors and older subordinates. Studying conflict in these organizations and its effect on employee interactions is vital to understanding how age differences impact the workplace. Thus, the study of this from a communication perspective will help to resolve some of the inconsistent findings in previous research.

Third, the study of conflict-management strategies will produce a more rich understanding of how conflict between young supervisors and older subordinates affects the overall working environment. Until now, most studies aimed only at identifying whether age differences actually instigate conflict. By moving beyond merely testing for
the presence of age-driven conflict and beginning to examine the strategies used when conflict does occur will offer more practical information will be offered to organizations. Further, the specific examination of supervisors’ reactions to conflict will help researchers and practitioners identify how constructively or negatively younger managers are influencing their working environments. Considering that effective conflict management strategies are thought to foster positive working environments, it is important to investigate which strategies are used in these circumstances (Greenburg & Barling, 1996; Murphy, 1995).

Finally, this study will determine what influence, if any, organizational culture has on young supervisors’ selection of conflict management strategies with their older subordinates. In previous research it has been argued that organizational culture influences the relationship between demographic diversity and outcomes (Chatman et al., 1998). This investigation will help to determine whether organizational culture truly affects the nature of reverse-age superior-subordinate relationships. Also, this investigation will provide a more integrative study that emphasizes the consideration of multiple variables in reverse-age relationships.
Organization of Study

This thesis will consist of five chapters. Following the introductory chapter is the review of literature in chapter two that discusses the relevant findings and limitations in current research. Chapter three will explain the methodology of this study including its design, the operationalization of variables, a description of the subject, and procedures for obtaining data. Chapter four will present the statistical results of the study, and chapter five will conclude the findings of the investigation and discuss their implications. This final chapter will also provide recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The direction of this study was guided by research from both the communication and organizational demography literatures. Both disciplines offer unique insight into the emerging issue of age diversity in organizations. The organizational demography literature has been one of the few fields to address the reverse-age superior-subordinate dyad, and the communication literature offers a rich study of organizational conflict and conflict management strategies. However, both areas of research have met with some considerable limitations and weaknesses.

The available communication research has addressed member diversity and organizational conflict, but few studies focused on age specifically. The ones that did focused mainly on: (a) age discrimination in hiring practices, (b) the challenges for older workers in a technology-driven workplace, and (c) the mere presence or absence of age-driven conflict in the workplace. Conversely, the organizational demography research has given much more attention to age, even specifically addressing reverse-age superior-subordinate relationships.
(Finkelstein, Allen, & Rhoton, 2003). However, much of the literature was laden with inconsistent findings and/or based upon weak theoretical assumptions. There is at least one subject, though, that received attention in both areas of research. Organizational culture is cited in both fields of research as having a potential mediating effect on the level of conflict experienced between coworkers (Chatman et al., 1998; Miller et al., 1994).

This review of literature draws upon each area of research and highlights some opportunities to advance reverse-age studies in communication research. The following sections will discuss: (1) age diversity in organizations, (2) conflict resulting from age differences, and (3) the intervening process of organizational culture.

Age Diversity in Organizations

Until recently, employee age was studied primarily as a discrimination issue in the workplace. Past studies addressed issues such as hiring and firing on the basis of age and the challenges facing older workers in today’s fast-paced, technology driven job market (Duncan & Loretto, 2004; McVittie et al., 2003). This is evident in a recent review of age diversity literature which cited more than twenty major studies conducted within the last fifteen
years (Yeatts, Folts, & Knapp, 2000). However, though age studies have increased steadily in recent years, the majority of research has focused mainly on older workers and their experiences in organizations (Berry, 2005; Cox & Nkomo, 1992; Nichols, 2001).

The little information available on the younger worker is largely anecdotal, and much of it likened the ‘younger worker’ to Generation X and Y rather than conceptualizing the term ‘younger’ as a subjective comparison to other co-workers’ ages (Buckley, Beu, Novicevic, & Sigerstad, 2001). Oftentimes the younger worker has been characterized as radically different from the other employees in their organizations (Bunker, Kram, & Ting, 2002; McCann & Giles, 2006; O’Bannon, 2001). Some of the younger worker’s differences included a shorter attention span and a greater desire for fast-paced, exciting work environments (Buckley et al., 2001). However, a 2003 Gallup poll urged people to remain skeptical of such generalizations (Saad, 2003). Results of the poll found little evidence that younger professionals’ attitudes and loyalties in the workplace are markedly different than their older counterparts. Also, throughout the literature references to the term ‘younger worker’ were typically confined to a chronological age range, usually 18-30 years (Buckley et al., 2001). No
available studies employed the term ‘younger worker’ for supervisors who were simply younger in comparison to their co-workers.

Anecdotal literature and other publications on diversity consistently suggested that organizations with age-diverse employees were likely to foster ineffective communication between co-workers and negative organizational outcomes (Butler, 2000; Davenport, 2005; McCann & Howard, 2006). However, some of the investigations such as Thomas and Ely’s (1996) argued conversely for the important benefits that demographic diversity brings to organizations.

Theoretical Assumptions

The negative assumptions in many of these studies were founded on three theoretical perspectives: (1) the similarity-attraction paradigm, (2) social identity and self-categorization theories, and (3) age norms theory. Although these are the frameworks most consistently used in the literature, each approach has met with some criticisms and limitations.

Similarity-attraction paradigm. The similarity-attraction paradigm is grounded in the belief that people are attracted to and/or influenced by others they perceive
as similar to themselves (Byrne, 1971). Tsui, Egan and O’Reilly (1991) used this theory as the foundation for their study on employee demographics and workplace effectiveness. Tsui et al. (1991) argued that demographically similar employees share attitude and value similarities which, in turn, creates attraction and, ultimately, workplace effectiveness. George and Chattopadhyay (2002) also applied this idea to organizational demography research with the argument that employees were more likely to be influenced by workgroup members who shared similar demographic characteristics. Superior-subordinate studies from this theoretical perspective argued that employees with ages similar to their managers’ have more positive work experiences and attitudes than those who are dissimilar (Ferris, Judge, Chachere, & Liden, 1991; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Wayne & Liden, 1995).

There are also weaknesses in the similarity-attraction paradigm, though, the foremost being that many studies based on this perspective have reported no relationship between age similarity and performance outcomes. Prior to Tsui et al.’s (1991) study, Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) found no evidence linking group similarity to performance variables. Other studies also found little support for the
similarity-attraction paradigm (Perry, Kulik, & Zhou, 1999) and suggested that it is perhaps an oversimplified approach to organizational demography research (Chattopadhyay, 1999).

Social identity and self-categorization theory. Social identity is based on the idea that individuals seek positive social identities through the process of self-categorization (Turner, 1987). In this perspective, people self-categorize by forming in-groups with characteristics similar to themselves and other out-groups with characteristics different than themselves. Thus, individuals attempt to create a desired identity by emphasizing the superiority of their in-group over others’ out-groups.

This theory was employed in the organizational demography literature to argue that demographic diversity hindered attainment of desired social identities, which, in turn, caused negative organizational outcomes (Young and Buchholtz, 2002; Richard & Shelor, 2002). The self-categorization perspective was also adopted in studies to explore how demographic differences influenced members’ self-esteem, emotions, and behaviors (Finn and Chattopadhyay, 2000).
George and Chattopadhyay (2002) tested this theory in comparison to the similarity-attraction paradigm to determine whether individuals truly categorize themselves according to age and other demographic characteristics. Tsui, Egan, and O’Reilly’s (1992) study revisited their investigation from the previous year and endorsed the social identity and self-categorization theories, stating that they may better explain the relationship between demographic diversity and work attitudes/behaviors.

**Age norms.** This perspective was frequently adopted in both the communication and organizational demography literature (Lawrence, 1988). The theory of age norms is generally defined as widely shared judgments about the standard age associated with a certain role or status in a given context (Lawrence, 1996). When applied to organizational demography and communication research, it is the assumption that there are informal rules, or career timetables, which dictate the age standards for employee promotions. Employees promoted at the same rate as their peers are considered “on time,” those promoted more rapidly are considered “ahead of time,” and those promoted behind their peers are considered “behind time.” Thus, the career timetables central assumption states that employees
significantly ahead or behind the age norms for promotions are viewed more positively or negatively than those on the expected schedule (Lawrence, 1984). This assumption was evident in Tsui et al.’s (2002) study which argued demographic dissimilarities contrary to organizational age norms produced negative outcomes, while dissimilarities consistent with age norms produced positive outcomes.

The concept of status incongruence, another element of the age norms theories, was also a theme in the organizational literature. This is the assumption that organizations encounter negative work outcomes when their employees experience perceived status or role inconsistencies (Lawrence, 1988). Status congruence exists in organizations when the superiors are the oldest, most experienced, most expert members of the group (Vecchio, 1993). Thus, it is suggested that supervisors experience negative work outcomes when they fall short of this criteria. Similarly, older members of organizations who do not retain highest seniority are thought to also experience negative effects.

Several studies identified negative outcomes potentially prompted by status incongruence. In Vecchio’s (1993) study he suggested older subordinates may find it difficult to take direction from younger supervisors.
Additionally, he suggested younger supervisors may have a more difficult time managing their older subordinates. Tsui, Xin, and Egan (1995) argued older employees may be excluded from important tasks and projects and experience lowered levels of managerial support. It was also suggested that younger managers may perceive older employees as having less loyalty and willingness to contribute to their organization.

However, many studies failed to confirm hypotheses founded on this theoretical framework. Finkelstein et al.’s 2003 study on age and mentoring relationships found no evidence that older protégés “behind” the career timetable norms were neglected by their mentors. Others also acknowledged that the relationship between the two is little understood. Age norms seem to be easily observed, but many researcher have found them difficult to define and accurately measure.

Reverse-Age Relationships

Recent studies have addressed inconsistencies in age and organizational outcomes research with the argument that researchers have neglected to consider the important impact of reverse-age relationships. Tsui et al. (2002) declared that researchers “have not considered the possibility that
the effect of age difference could be contingent upon the
direction of the difference, i.e. whether the supervisor is
older or younger than the subordinate” (p. 902). This is a
timely concern considering that several business journals
and magazine publications have recently acknowledged the
rise of non-traditional power structures in America’s
workforce (Butler, 2000; Davenport, 2005). For example, an
article from the New York Times in 2000 explored the
challenging circumstances in reverse-age hierarchies,
notably the tensions caused by young managers being forced
to lay off older employees (Butler, 2000). With 400
thousand younger professionals promoted to managerial
positions in the last decade alone (Pelletier, 2005),
reverse-age hierarchies are a vital, yet largely
unexplored, subject in communication research.

The majority of available information in the
organizational literature is based on conjecture and
unconfirmed claims. Finkelstein, Higgins, and Clancy
(2000) implied that most workers typically equate age with
experience levels and ability to lead. Other studies
suggested that organizational members typically expect
supervisors to be older than their subordinates (Lawrence,
1990; Tsui et al., 1995). Also, consistent assumptions
were that young managers are often viewed by older workers
as inexperienced and incompetent (Bunker, Kram, & Ting, 2002). Tsui et al. (1995) implied younger supervisors may perceive older subordinates as lacking current knowledge pertinent to their job field. Another interesting presumption is that older workers are thought to be uncomfortable taking direction from younger managers (Crampton & Hodge, 1996; Green et al., 2005). Similarly, managers are also thought to be uncomfortable giving instruction to older subordinates. Some studies, though, found no evidence that negative organizational effects were linked to their reverse-age hierarchies (Perry et al., 1999).

**Age Differences and Conflict**

As discussed previously, the majority of organizational demography literature suggested that demographic diversity among employees heightens the potential for organizational conflict (Wong, Tjosvold, & Lee, 1992). Some researchers conducted cogent examinations into the possibility of this occurrence, but others simply advanced this claim without providing any supporting evidence (O’Bannon, 2001).

Of the studies that legitimately examined the presence or absence of diversity-conflict, many of them shared
Chatman et al.’s (1998) assumption that conflict occurs because demographically diverse employees “are likely to have fewer shared experiences, less in common, and more differences of opinion than similar employees” (p. 754). Jehn et al. (1997) also argued that the degree to which an individual differs in demographic characteristics from other group members can profoundly affect the amount of conflict experienced by the individual. Pelled et al. (1999) examined individual demographic variables, including age, and concluded that member diversity did, indeed, drive some types of conflict which, in turn, may have affected organizational outcomes. However, Pelled’s study concluded that it was age similarity rather than dissimilarity that increased emotional conflict. However, this study failed to account for reverse-age relationships, though, and their potential effect on research findings.

Of the available studies on reverse-age organizational hierarchies, very few made conflict their focus. Most of the studies only indirectly referenced the presence of conflict by acknowledging the negative perceptions younger and older employees maintain about one another (Shore et al., 2003). Other age studies, though, have noted the
importance of considering conflict in reverse-age relationships (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Smith & Nelson, 1994).

**Defining Organizational Conflict**

Organizational conflict has been labeled and categorized in numerous ways in communication research. The term organizational conflict is generally defined in the literature as the occurrence of real or perceived differences in members’ values, goals, or beliefs which influence their emotions, work environments, and/or abilities to work together (Jameson, 1999; Kolb & Putnam, 1992). From this general definition varying labels and classifications of conflict have emerged. Conflict was often distinguished according to: formality, positive or negative impact, and work-relatedness.

First, Jameson (1999) defined conflict by the formality of the conflict exchange. Formal conflicts were identified as serious policy violations which often necessitated job termination or legal counsel. Informal conflicts included disputes among coworkers and disagreements over project strategy and implementation. Because this study focuses more on the daily communication
between managers and subordinates, the informal definition was adopted.

Second, researchers have also characterized conflict as either constructive (beneficial) or destructive (harmful) (Amason & Schweiger, 1994; Wilmot & Hocker, 1993). Though studies of the constructive aspects of conflict are certainly vital, this study chose to examine conflict from a destructive angle. Destructive or dysfunctional conflict was often cited in the literature as a possible antecedent of negative organizational outcomes including: lowered employee compliance with rules and regulations, distortion of organizational goals, unprofessional behavior, and neglect of work tasks (Amason & Schweiger, 1994; Wilmot & Hocker, 1993).

Other researchers defined conflict by the extent that it centered on work or non-work issues. In this classification, work-related conflicts were designated as task or cognitive, while non-work related conflicts were labeled emotional or affective (Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1994; Pelled et al., 1999). However, in Jehn, Chadwick, and Thatcher’s (1997) study they discouraged categorizing conflict as either work or non-work related. Jehn et al. argued that emotion is an element in both work and non-work confrontations, and suggested, rather, that conflict be
conceptualized as either task or relationship-based. The former term refers to disagreements about job performance or implementation project assignments, and the latter refers to personal disagreements over non-work matters such as personality, individual values, or political and social issues.

**Limitations**

A significant weakness in the communication research is its lack of attention toward the conflict management strategies used in response to age-driven conflict. The research to date has only explored whether age differences truly provoke organizational conflict; it has failed to examine how such conflict is responded to and dealt with when it arises. Considering that many studies have already suggested the likelihood of age-driven conflict, there is now a need to aim studies toward the strategies used to manage conflict.

**Conflict Management**

Conflict management was defined by Jameson (1999) as “any action taken by a disputant or a third-party to try to manage or resolve a conflict” (p. 270). Conceptual views of conflict management include the conflict style, bargaining and negotiation, and third-party dispute
resolution approaches. Among these the conflict style approach enables researchers to examine both planned and impulsive management strategies producing both positive and negative impacts (Kolb & Putnam, 1992). Conversely, the bargaining and negotiation and third-party dispute resolution approaches focus more on the formalized organized policies and programs implemented to combat disputes. These latter approaches are better suited for studies of formal conflict rather than the informal, task conflict examined in this study.

The conflict style approach has been confirmed throughout the literature as an effective model for examining conflict between managers and subordinates (Putnam & Poole, 1987). Communication researchers have established several terms to identify elements in the conflict style approach (Putnam, 1982; Rahim, 1983; Thomas and Kilmann, 1974). These all are generally founded on two dimensions, the extent to which individuals exhibit assertive or cooperative management strategies. From this, five distinct conflict-management styles resulted: competing, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, and compromising.

The competing style is often viewed as a win/lose strategy for handling conflict wherein members use
intimidation or coercion to produce desired outcomes. Second, individuals who use the accommodating style place emphasis on maintaining harmony. Individuals using this style oftentimes yield to others’ demands in order to prevent sustained conflict. Third the avoiding conflict management style is used by individuals who attempt to resolve conflict by withdrawing from situations or tense circumstances. Fourth, individuals using the compromising style resolve conflict by reaching a midpoint in disputes and agreeing to make concessions in order to reach resolutions. Finally, of the five conflict management styles collaborating is regarded as the most effective. Individuals who prefer this style use conflict situations to create problem-solving opportunities and build stronger relationships.

**Mediating Processes: Organizational Culture**

A possible explanation for the inconsistencies in some of the organizational demography literature is due to oversimplification, or neglect, of contingent variables in the complex relationship between age diversity and organizational outcomes. Lawrence (1997) addressed this oversight as the “black box” of organizational demography research in which researchers assume the direct causality
of age differences on work outcomes without sufficient evidence to support the link. Prior to Lawrence’s seminal study, many researchers made unfounded claims that demographic diversity caused certain organizational outcomes in organizations including lowered productivity, increased turnover, and lowered employee commitment (Cleveland & Shore, 1992; Liden, Stilwell, & Ferris, 1996).

In recent years, the importance of mediating factors, or intervening processes, has been acknowledged in research. Pelled et al. (1999) recognized that in order to “capture fully the complex relationship between work group diversity and performance, we need more sophisticated theories and empirical work incorporating intervening variables” (p. 2). Pelled’s study was one of the first to adopt a communication perspective in the study of demographic diversity and work outcomes. Their investigation named conflict as a vital intervening process to consider when attempting to accurately identify the correlation between diversity and outcomes.

Perry et al. (1999) cited in the conclusion of their study the need to incorporate additional variables into their investigation. In its limitations the authors acknowledged that mediating variables such as generational work ethic and values should have been considered as
mediating processes in the variables observed. Shore, Cleveland, and Goldberg (2003) also recommended consideration of variables such as generational values and individual self-efficacy when examining work attitudes and performance. Moreover, Green et al.’s (2005) study on subordinate satisfaction and commitment levels credited its inconsistent findings to neglect of variables “that might moderate the negative impact of demographic dissimilarity in the workplace” (p. 380).

In both the communication and organizational behavior literature, organizational culture has been cited as an important consideration in research (Harris & Mossholder, 1996; Jehn, 1997; McKinnon et al., 2003; Putnam, 2005), but it has seldom been examined directly. Bacharach et al.’s (1993) study concluded that organizational value frameworks should be seriously considered in future studies. Tsui et al. (2002) also suggested organizational norms may explain some meaningful differences in the findings of studies on superior-subordinate relationships. Other researchers pointed out that organizational culture is a key influence on employee attitudes, propensity to remain with the organization, and overall job satisfaction (Harris & Mossholder, 1996). Chatman et al. (1998) also argued that
an organization’s individualistic or collectivist culture will likely affect demographic diversity and work outcomes.

Definitions of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is generally studied from two perspectives, serving as an external influence (nationality, cultural practices, etc) or an internal influence (atmosphere inside an organization) on organizational life. This study was conducted from the internal perspective; therefore, the following information addresses this perspective exclusively.

There have been numerous definitions of organizational culture in the research literature. Many researchers isolated individual elements of organizational culture while others prefer to examine culture as a singular concept. O’Reilly and Chatman (1996) defined organizational culture broadly as “a system of shared values and norms that define appropriate attitudes and behaviors for organizational members” (p. 160). Lewis (1989) conceptualized the term similarly, defining culture as the overall spirit, the perceived climate of the organization, and/or the shared ideologies or collective ways of coping with organizational experiences.
The two aspects of organization culture examined in this study are supportiveness and openness to change. Supportiveness is defined as the “degree to which individuals prefer organizations that are supportive, promote sharing information, and praise good performance” (Judge & Cable, 1997, p. 363). The literature suggested that highly supportive organizations influence a number of positive work outcomes including greater employee commitment, involvement, and satisfaction (Brewer, 1993; Jehn et al., 1997). Jehn et al. also suggested that supportive cultures foster positive work environments and help to combat destructive organizational conflict. The second element, openness-to-change, is generally conceptualized as a willingness to support change and the feeling that change will be beneficial in some way (Miller et al., 1994). Axtell, Wall, Stride, Pepper, Clegg, Gardner, and Bolden (2002), among other studies, have argued that openness to change promotes beneficial working environments.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This chapter will discuss the study’s survey-based research design and provide detailed explanations of the procedures used in this investigation. The following methodological considerations will be addressed:
(1) operationalization of variables, (2) study design, (3) description of the subjects being surveyed, (4) procedures for circulating questionnaires and collecting data, and (5) statistical tests used to analyze survey results.

Operationalization of Variables

Age

Age was operationalized by chronological year. On the final page of the questionnaire subjects were instructed to list their age as well as the age of their older subordinate. The mean and standard deviation were then calculated for both the younger superior and older subordinate. The average subject age was 32 years with a standard deviation of 10.98, and the average subordinate age was 49 years with a standard deviation of 11.56. Thus the resulting age difference in the sample was 17 years.
This number indicated the average age differential separating the “younger” supervisors from their “older” subordinates (See Appendix A).

Conflict

Conflict was operationalized using Rahim’s (1983) Organizational Conflict Instrument (ROCI-II), specifically, Form B of the measure which asks managers to assess their conflict experiences with their subordinates. Rahim’s instrument produces scores reflecting the strength of preference for five conflict management styles: collaborating (integrating), accommodating (obliging), competing (dominating), avoiding, and compromising. Perceived preference for particular conflict management styles is designated in this measure with a higher score. Form B of the ROCI-II features twenty-eight items ranked along a five-point, Likert-like scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) (Appendix B).

In past studies, the measure’s Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from .67-.86, which indicated strong internal reliability (Conrad, 1991; Gross & Guerrero, 2000; King & Miles, 1990). Rahim and Magner’s (1995) study also provided support for the convergent and discriminant validity of this measure.
This study used a principle-components factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the reliability of the measure. For an item to load onto a factor, it had to attain a primary loading of at least .50. Also, the item’s secondary loading could not be within .30 of its primary loading. In this study, four factors loaded that were constant with the ROCI-II factor solution of the measure.

The first factor, competing, accounted for 10 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: I use my influence to get my ideas accepted (.736); I use my authority to make a decision in my favor (.824); I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor (.628); I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue (.526); and I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation (.750).

The second factor, avoiding, accounted for 14 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: I attempt to avoid being ‘put on the spot’ and try to keep my conflict with my older subordinate to myself (.762); I usually avoid open discussions of my differences with my older subordinate (.652); I try to stay away from disagreement with my older subordinate (.647); I try to keep my disagreement with my older subordinate to myself to
avoid hard feelings (.793); and I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my older subordinate (.734).

The third factor, collaborating, accounted for 17 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: I try to investigate an issue with my older subordinate to find a solution acceptable to us (.733); I try to integrate my ideas with those of my older subordinate to come up with a decision jointly (.655); I try to work with my older subordinate to find solutions to problems which satisfy our expectations (.733); I exchange accurate information with my older subordinate to solve a problem together (.636); I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way (.593); I collaborate with my older subordinate to come up with decisions acceptable to us (.661); and I try to work with my older subordinate for a proper understanding of a problem (.742).

The fourth factor, accommodating, accounted for 10 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: I usually accommodate the wishes of my older subordinate (.673); I give in to the wishes of my older subordinate (.697); I often go along with the suggestions of my older subordinate (.677); and I try to satisfy the expectations of my older subordinate (.647).
The fifth factor in Rahim’s measure, *compromising*, did not emerge as a significant factor in this investigation. The internal reliabilities for the emerging four factors were: competing (.77), avoiding (.82), collaborating (.85), and accommodating (.66). Finally, each scale was weighted by its factor loadings and added together to compose the four factors.

**Organizational Culture Variables**

Two dimensions of organizational culture were tested as intervening factors in this investigation. Supportiveness and openness-to-change were measured using two instruments: an abridged version of the Organizational Culture Profile developed by O’Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) and Ogbonna and Harris’s (2000) adaptation of Deshpande, Farley, and Webster’s (1993) organizational culture measure.

*Organizational supportiveness.* The intervening process of supportiveness was operationalized using a modified version of O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) (Appendix C). The organizational literature lists the OCP as one of only a few instruments to provide evidence of its reliability and validity, and it has also been recognized for its capability to assess the
impact of organizational culture on outcomes (Ashkanasy, Broadfoot, & Falkus, 2000; McKinnon et al., 2003). Chatman’s (1991) study also reported a .73 coefficient for the OCP’s reliability.

The items tested in this study were taken from Windsor and Ashkanasy’s (1996) abridged OCP which featured 26 items from the original 54 value statements. This study also adopted Judge and Cable’s (1997) conversion of the OCP’s original Q-sort methodology to five-point, Likert-like scales which enabled subjects to submit answers by survey response. The original measure required subjects to classify the 54 items into categories and then rank the items within each category. This modified OCP has been widely used and accepted as a comparable measure to O’Reilly et al.’s original instrument (Judge & Cable, 1997).

In this study respondents were asked to evaluate the extent to which their organization was recognized for each of the value statements on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). This study used a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the reliability of the measure. For an item to load onto a factor, it had to attain a primary loading of at least .50. Also, the item’s secondary loading could not be within .30 of its
primary loading. From this, three factors loaded that were constant with the OCP factor solution of the measure.

The first factor, respect for people, accounted for 26 percent of the variance and was composed of the fairness (.866) and respect for individual (.890) scales. The second factor, team orientation, accounted for 21 percent of the variance and was composed of these scales: being people oriented (.713); being team oriented (.875); and working in collaboration (860). The third factor, stability, accounted for 21 percent of the variance and was composed of the security of employment (.919) and stability (.856) scales. The internal reliabilities for these three factors were .78 for respect for people, .77 for team orientation, and .78 for stability (Cronbach’s alpha). Finally, the scales were weighted by their factor loadings and added together to compose the three factors.

Openness-to-change. The intervening process of openness to change was operationalized using a modified version of Deshpande et al.’s (1993) organizational culture measure. The Ogbonna and Harris (2000) version used in this study alters Deshpande et al.’s original organizational culture labels from market, adhocracy, clan, and hierarchy to competitive, innovative, bureaucratic, and
community, respectively. These labels were revised to be more concordant with contemporary theory and practice. This study tested seven items from the measure using a 7-point, Likert-like scale ranging from 1 (not at all) through 7 (very great extent) (Appendix D).

A principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to determine reliability of the measure. For an item to load onto a factor, it had to attain a primary loading of at least .50. Also, the item’s secondary loading could not be within .30 of its primary loading. In this study, two factors loaded that were consistent with Ogbonna and Harris’s factor solution of the measure.

The first factor, innovativeness, accounted for 35 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: This organization emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges (.686); This organization dynamic and entrepreneurial. People are willing to take risks (.850); The glue which holds this company together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first (.821); and, In this organization the best managers are considered to be entrepreneurs, innovators, or risk-takers (.751).
The second factor, *bureaucratic culture*, accounted for 33 percent of the variance and was composed of the following scales: The glue which holds this company together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running company is important here (0.862); This organization is very formalized and structured. Established procedures generally govern what people will do (0.897); and, This organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important (0.807). The internal reliabilities of these two factors were .70 for innovativeness and .83 for bureaucratic culture (Cronbach’s alpha). Finally, the scales were weighted by their factor loadings and added together to create the two factors.

*Design*

The design of this study was an experimental survey with subject responses acquired by network sample. The four-page questionnaire was completed anonymously and required no more than ten minutes of the subject’s time. Appendix E contains a complete copy of the survey distributed with the attached instructional letter. Appendix F contains a subject informed consent form which also accompanied each survey.
Subjects

The subjects sampled in this study were employees in professional organizations who supervised one or more older subordinates. Subjects were obtained through a network sample that was administered chiefly in the Department of Communication Studies at Baylor University. A total of sixteen introductory and upper level classes participated in the study, and questionnaires were circulated to the appropriate subjects over a three-week time period. Several faculty members and professionals in the community also participated in administering questionnaires to the sample population. A total of two-hundred fifty questionnaires were distributed with 132 professionals ultimately participating in the study. This represented an overall response rate of 53 percent. Table 1 displays more detailed information about the subjects and industries represented in the sample population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Valid Response %</th>
<th>Cumulative Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Financial Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Athletics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Secondary Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support/Information Systems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Public Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Ministry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Health Services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Land Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness/Leisure Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Store Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Valid)</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cumulative</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

Subjects completed a four-page questionnaire containing the measures described previously in the chapter. Demographic information was also provided by the subject including: age, gender, tenure with the organization, length of working relationship with the subordinate, position within the organization, and industry classification (Appendix G). The cover letter and informed consent form described previously were also attached with each questionnaire. These documents informed and assured all subjects of their complete privacy rights to confidentiality and anonymity. Every questionnaire provided a self-addressed envelope for subjects to enclose their completed surveys and ensure their rights to privacy.

For the circulation of the network sample, professors in the Department of Communication at Baylor University were contacted and given information about the study and its network sample design. After obtaining consent from each participating professor, sixteen classes were visited and given information about the study over a one-week period. The principal investigator provided the following information to students, faculty members, and other remaining participants before distributing the questionnaires: (1) the purpose of the study, (2) the
rationale and function of the network samples, (3) a
description of the survey subject and qualifications for
subject participation, and (4) the procedure for returning
completed questionnaires. Three options were made
available for returning completed questionnaire packets.
Participants in the study could: (1) give sealed packets
to their professors who would forward the materials to the
principal investigator, (2) mail completed survey packets
to the address provided on the attached envelope, or (3)
deliver sealed packets to the principal investigator’s
office mailbox located in Castellaw Communications Building
on the Baylor campus.

Statistical Analysis

The primary statistical tests used in this study were
one-tailed Pearson product bivariate correlations and
partial correlations that controlled for additional
variables. The Pearson’s correlations were used to
determine the relationship between manager age and
preference for using particular conflict management styles
with older subordinates. Tests were conducted on three of
the five conflict management styles: avoiding, competing,
and collaborating. Partial correlations were used to test
the mediating effect of organizational culture on young
managers’ use of these conflict management styles. The partial correlations controlled for two organizational culture variables: three dimensions of supportiveness (team orientation, respect for individual, and stability) and two dimensions of openness to change (innovative and bureaucratic).
CHAPTER FOUR
Results

This chapter will address the outcomes of the statistical analyses described in chapter three. Results of the tests performed on supervisor age, conflict management strategies, and organizational culture will be included, and findings regarding the hypotheses will be discussed.

Conflict Management Strategies

Hypothesis One: Avoiding

The first hypothesis stated that younger versus older supervisors would prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with their older subordinates. This hypothesis was confirmed. As indicated in Table 2, the Pearson product test revealed a significant negative correlation between supervisor age and use of avoidance to manage conflict. This correlation indicates an inverse relationship between the variables whereby lower supervisor age correlates with the higher use of the avoiding style of conflict management.
Table 2
Pearson Product Correlation for Age and Avoiding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoiding</th>
<th>Supervisor Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson corr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Age</td>
<td>-.173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson corr.</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant correlation (.05 level)

Hypothesis Two: Competing

The second hypothesis stated that younger versus older supervisors would prefer the competing style of managing conflict with their older subordinates. This hypothesis was not confirmed. The Pearson product test reported no statistically significant correlation between lower supervisor age and the higher use of the competing conflict management style (Table 3).

Table 3
Pearson Product Correlation for Age and Competing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing</th>
<th>Supervisor Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson corr.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Age</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson corr.</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Three: Collaborating

The third hypothesis stated that younger versus older supervisors would not prefer the collaborating style of
managing conflict with their older subordinates. This hypothesis was confirmed, reporting the most significant correlation ($P < .005$) of the conflict management styles tested in this study. As indicated in Table 4, the Pearson product test revealed a significant positive correlation between supervisor age and use of collaboration to manage conflict. The positive correlation suggests that older supervisor age corresponds with the higher use of the collaborating style, while younger supervisor age corresponds with the lower use of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Supervisor Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson corr.</strong></td>
<td>.226**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant correlation (.01 level)

Organizational Culture

Once bivariate correlation tests were conducted on supervisor age and conflict management styles, partial correlation tests were conducted to determine how organizational culture variables influenced the age and strategy selection relationship. Each of the original correlations was tested separately, controlling for three
supportiveness factors and two openness-to-change factors. As discussed below, the results indicated, overall, that the age-strategy correlation relationship functioned independently of the two organizational culture variables.

**Hypothesis Four: Supportiveness-Avoiding**

The fourth hypothesis stated that organizational supportiveness would decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors would prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This hypothesis was not confirmed. While there were statistically significant correlations reported in the partial correlation tests, the changes from the original bivariate correlations were minimal (Table 5). This test indicated that the intervening variable of supportiveness had little impact on the strength of the age-avoiding negative correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportiveness Dimension</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Individual</td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant correlation (.05 level)
**Hypothesis Five: Supportiveness-Competing**

The fifth hypothesis stated that organizational supportiveness would decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors would prefer the competing style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This hypothesis was not confirmed. There were no statistically significant correlations reported between lower supervisor age and the higher use of the competing style when controlling for organizational supportiveness (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportiveness Dimension</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Competing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Orientation</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>.0253</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Competing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0347</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect for Individual</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Competing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Individual</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0222</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Six: Supportiveness-Collaborating**

The sixth hypothesis stated that organizational supportiveness would increase the likelihood that younger supervisors prefer the collaborating style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This hypothesis was
moderately confirmed. The partial correlation tests controlling for supportiveness produced statistically significant correlations, but the changes in correlation strength from the original age-collaborating correlation were slight (Table 7). This test indicates that the intervening variable of supportiveness faintly decreased the strength of the age-collaborating positive correlation. The correlation suggests that organizational supportiveness somewhat increases the likelihood that younger supervisors will use collaboration to manage conflict with older subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportiveness Dimension</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age Collaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>1.0000 0.2438**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>0.2438** 1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>1.0000 0.2273**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2273** 1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Individual</td>
<td>1.0000 0.2153**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2153** 1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant correlation (.01 level)
Hypothesis Seven: Openness-Avoiding

The seventh hypothesis stated that organizational openness-to-change would decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors would prefer the avoiding style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This hypothesis was not confirmed. While there were statistically significant correlations reported in the partial correlation tests, the changes from the original bivariate correlations were inconsequential (Table 8). This test indicates that the openness to change variable had minimal impact on the strength of the age-avoiding negative correlation.

Table 8
Partial Correlations for Openness to Change and Age-Avoiding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness to Chg.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.1642*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>-.1642*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.1605*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>-.1605*</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant correlation (.05 level)

Hypothesis Eight: Openness-Competing

The eighth hypothesis stated that organizational openness would decrease the likelihood that younger supervisors would prefer the competing style of managing
conflict with older subordinates. As with the other hypotheses that tested for use of the competing conflict management style, this hypothesis was not confirmed. There were no statistically significant correlations reported between lower supervisor age and the higher use of the competing style when controlling for organizational openness-to-change (Table 9).

Table 9
Partial Correlations for Openness to Change and Age-Competing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness to Chg.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Competing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>.0166</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>.0307</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Nine: Openness-Collaborating

The ninth, and final, hypothesis stated that organizational openness would increase the likelihood that younger supervisors would prefer the collaborating style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This hypothesis was moderately confirmed. The partial correlation tests indicate that the openness-to-change variable slightly decreases the strength of the positive correlation between supervisor age and use of collaboration (Table 10). This
correlation suggests that organizational openness-to-change somewhat increases the likelihood that younger supervisors will select the collaborating style to manage conflict with older subordinates.

Table 10
Partial Correlations for Openness to Change and Age-Collaborating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness to Chg.</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sup. Age</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2158**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2158**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2137**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2137**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant correlation (.01 level)
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the conflict management strategies used by young managers with their older subordinates. Previous organizational demography research examined the trend of reverse-age hierarchies in organizations, but there was little attention toward this relationship in communication research. With anecdotal literature pointing consistently to the negative effects of reverse-age hierarchies, the opportunity existed to examine this relationship from a conflict communication perspective.

Much of the reverse-age superior-subordinate research also called for consideration of intervening processes which may affect the work outcomes linked with reverse-age relationships. Hence, hypotheses were formed to assess young superiors' strategies for managing conflict and the impact of organizational culture on strategy selection. This chapter will discuss results of this study including implications of the findings, limitations and weaknesses in the study, and opportunities for future research.
Employee Age

With the majority of literature centering on the older worker, this study conducted from the younger subordinate’s perspective provides unique data that is different from previous age-based conflict research. Among the interesting discoveries in this study was how easily subjects were obtained who fit the young manager profile. This suggests that reverse-age superior-subordinate relationships are certainly becoming more prevalent in the workforce. Another surprising finding was the average age gap of 17 years between young supervisors and their subordinates, a difference that was much higher than initially expected.

The ineffective conflict management strategies often used by subjects with their older subordinates suggests that younger managers may not feel completely confident or comfortable exercising authority over their older employees. This idea aligns with several previous studies (Crampton & Hodge, 1996; Green et al., 2005) which suggested that younger managers were reluctant to give instruction to older subordinates and that these subordinates were as equally reluctant accept it.
Conflict Management Strategies

The study provided significant evidence that younger managers tend to select certain conflict management strategies more readily with older subordinates. Statistically significant evidence emerged for the avoiding and collaborating strategies, but there was no data to support young managers’ use of competing with older subordinates. The ROCI-II instrument upheld its reliability in the study and proved effective overall at measuring subjects’ preference for particular conflict management styles. The reliability tests for the avoiding, collaborating, and competing styles were soundly confirmed.

The test of the first hypothesis confirmed that young managers have a tendency to use avoiding when attempting to handle conflict with older subordinates. These results lend some logical force to the assumption that young professionals may be reluctant to confront and give direction to older employees (Crampton & Hodge, 1996). This finding resonates with aspects of the age norms theories, particularly the concepts of career timetables and status incongruence (Lawrence, 1984; 1988). A possible reason why other studies (Finkelstein et al., 2003; Vecchio, 1993) found no support for these theories is due to methodological flaws in their investigations. Many of
them tried to link work outcomes, such as productivity and organizational commitment, to age diversity first without considering contingent variables. This study took a more integrative approach, examining communication as it is linked to age diversity before attempting to establish overarching connections to work outcomes.

Support was also found for the third hypothesis that stated younger supervisors would not typically use collaborating to manage conflict with older employees. This test yielded the strongest relationship among the conflict styles analyzed in the study. A negative correlation resulted which confirmed that this strategy is often neglected by younger superiors. The collaborating style is thought to be the most integrative and beneficial strategy for dealing with conflict. The absence of this strategy in reverse-age superior-subordinate conflicts implies that young professionals are not successfully communicating with their older employees. Similarly, the use of avoiding to manage conflict indicates that many younger managers may prefer to ignore and escape from conflict rather than attempting to resolve it. The implications of the collaboration and avoidance findings indicate a harmful impact on organizational productivity and harmony. Thus, there is evidence that organizations
with reverse-age hierarchies truly face some unique challenges in the pursuit to establish effective communication and productive interactions.

The only hypothesis not supported among the first three was the second, which suggested young managers’ proclivity toward using the competing style of managing conflict with older subordinates. This study yielded no statistically significant relationships between subject age and the competing conflict management style. There are several potential explanations as to why competing did not emerge as a significant conflict management strategy in this study. One factor to take into consideration is the composition of the subject sample. The majority of subjects were obtained locally through students at Baylor University. Several of the respondents worked in the university and, arguably, many others had significant ties to the school. Perhaps this predominantly friend, family, and spiritually oriented environment produced an uncharacteristic sample of professionals who were less likely to use competitive communication strategies. Some self-reporting bias could have existed wherein subjects were reluctant to acknowledge their competitive actions. Albeit, these findings may simply suggest that younger managers prefer to not be confrontational with their older
employees. This is a logical assumption considering this study’s findings on the avoiding and compromising styles.

Organizational Culture

The second aim in this study was to determine what impact, if any, organizational culture had on young supervisors’ selection of conflict management strategies with their older subordinates. Overall, it was concluded that the culture variables of supportiveness and openness-to-change had little mediating effect on which conflict management strategies were employed.

Supportiveness

Interestingly, the supportiveness dimension of organizational culture proved to be an insignificant variable in the relationship between manager age and strategy selection. This further indicates how powerful the age component is in reverse-age relationships. In this study, the age of the supervisor was certainly a predictive factor in which conflict management strategies were selected with employees.

Openness to Change

Tests of the openness-to-change dimension, however, indicated the variable had some influence on the
relationship between supervisor age and conflict management strategy selection. Methodologically, the measure proved to be highly effective. Ogbonna and Harris’s (2000) instrument reported the highest reliability of any measure used in this study. Because the competing style did not emerge as a significant factor in the initial phases of the study, tests on this variable produced no valuable information.

However, small but definite significant correlations emerged in the avoiding and collaborating tests. Though the change was only slight, organizational openness-to-change clearly weakened the negative correlation between supervisor age and the use of avoidance. Similarly, the openness variable also decreased the positive correlation between supervisor age and the use of collaboration to manage conflict. Thus, two encouraging findings were produced. The first indicates that organizations highly open to change may potentially reduce young supervisors’ likelihood of using avoiding with their older subordinates. Second, there is the indication that organizations which are highly open to change also may potentially increase the likelihood that younger supervisors will use the collaborating style to manage conflict with older subordinates. Hence, this also provides some support of
Pelled et al.’s (1999) intervening process theory and confirms the importance of culture variables in organizational communication research.

**Weaknesses and Limitations**

The greatest limitation in this study is its need for more longitudinal research data. Due to time constraints, subjects were surveyed only once with no opportunity to monitor responses over an extended period time. An extended longitudinal research design would enable the researcher to determine whether strategy selection was consistent or changing over time.

Second, this study would have benefited from including some additional items in the questionnaire, particularly open response items that gave subjects the opportunity to elaborate on their organizational experiences. In order to encourage survey response, this questionnaire was limited to four pages and featured only closed response items. Opportunities for open response would have produced some richer data as to the frequency and nature of subjects’ conflict experiences.

Also, the study may have produced some different findings by testing the hypotheses separately by different age groups. Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 58 years,
and there is the possibility that generational experiences factored into subject response. For example, the questionnaire responses submitted by subjects ranging 18 to 29 years may have differed greatly from the responses of the 39 to 58 year-old portion of the subject sample.

One possible weakness in this study is its methodological design, notably the conflict style approach. This approach has met with two major criticisms. First, the model has been criticized for reducing conflict to a static event rather than a normative process that evolves and changes over time (Morrill and Thomas, 1992). Critics of this method point out that individuals' initial and follow up strategies may differ greatly. Second, there is criticism that the conflict style approach determines general communicative dispositions but is not predictive of strategies used in dynamic organizational settings and specific conflict experiences (Conrad, 1991).

Also, the Organizational Culture Profile may be an effective instrument for measuring overall culture, but it did not prove to be an effective measure in this study for isolating and analyzing individual elements of organizational culture. Follow up investigation of this instrument revealed that there is very little consistency in its design throughout literature. Most studies have
altered the measure in some way, either by shortening its length or attributing different items to the various cultural dimensions. This study may have benefited from using a different instrument and approach to assess organizational culture.

**Future Research**

This study encourages further investigation into the reverse-age superior-subordinate relationship and its impact on organizational communication. In the future it is necessary to study additional factors, other than organizational culture, that may influence the communication exchanges between younger supervisors and older subordinates. One factor for consideration is how sex may affect this relationship. In this study, male-to-male relationships comprised 34 percent and female-to-female relationships made up 27 percent of the sample. Interestingly, mixed sex relationships accounted for approximately 34 percent of the sample. Twenty percent of the relationships were male supervisors with female subordinates, and 14 percent were female supervisors with male subordinates (five percent of subjects supervised several older employees, both male and female). This factor could profoundly affect which conflict management
strategies are employed. Supervisors may manage conflict with employees of the opposite sex differently than they do with employees of their own sex. Considering that gender and sex have been widely recognized as an important diversity issue in organizations, sex could logically be an important factor in this relationship.

Another factor that may influence communication in reverse-age hierarchies is the type of industry that the professionals are employed in. A separate consideration from organizational culture, this study would actually investigate reverse-age organizations by industry to explore any trends in communication that may exist. For example, workers in innovative work environments such as advertising, fashion, and telecommunications may communicate with and view younger managers differently than those in large corporations with more formalized, traditional management structures.

**Summary**

Overall, the age factor arose as the greatest determinant of which conflict management styles were chosen. Supplemental tests on the hypotheses which replaced supervisor age for the subordinate’s age and the supervisor-subordinate age gap produced no significant
correlations. Additionally, the inconsequential results of
the organizational culture variables further emphasize the
dominant force of the age factor.

The reverse-age organizational structure is projected
to increase in the future, making it a timely focus for
organizational research (Tsui et al., 2002). With
information from business publications, trade magazines,
and other anecdotal research all indicating the negative
effects spurred by young manager and older employee
interactions, it is vital to determine the implications of
this hierarchy and the strategies necessary to adjust to
this relationship. Thus, it is important to conduct
research focusing on the communication within this reverse-
age superior-subordinate dyad. Organizational demography
research has attempted to uncover the impact of this
relationship on various work outcomes such as job
satisfaction, commitment, and productivity, but it has been
limited by theoretical and methodological flaws. The
relationship between age diversity and work outcomes is
extremely complex, and studying this relationship from a
communication perspective may help to produce meaningful
findings and information to enhance our understanding of
this issue.
This study sought to identify the strategies used by younger superiors experiencing tension and conflict with their older subordinates. Results indicated that the avoiding style was commonly employed by young managers while the collaborating and integrative communication styles were not used to address conflict. These findings provide some support for the claim that the reverse-age hierarchy has met with resistance by many employees in the workplace. This study also attempted to uncover an important variable, organizational culture, that influences the positive or negative nature of communication between supervisors and subordinates. However, there was only little evidence to support these hypotheses indicating that, overall, age appeared to have the greatest impact on of which conflict management styles were employed.

Thus, this study succeeded in calling attention toward reverse-age hierarchies and their importance in organizational communication research. This study also recognized the need to conduct research from the younger worker’s perspective rather than focusing only on the older worker’s experience. Future studies are necessary to grasp a truer, more integrative understanding of how young supervisors and older employees interact in the workplace.
APPENDIX A

Age Measure

1. What is your age, in years? _______

2. What is your subordinate’s age, in years?* _______

* estimations are acceptable in answering these questions
APPENDIX B

Conflict Measure

You may have incompatibilities, disagreements, or differences (i.e. conflict) with your subordinates. Rank each of the following statements from SA (strongly agree) to SD (strongly disagree) to indicate how you handle conflict with your subordinates.

SA  A  U  D  SD  1. I try to investigate an issue with my subordinates to find a solution acceptable to us.

SA  A  U  D  SD  2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of my subordinates.

SA  A  U  D  SD  3. I attempt to avoid being “put on the spot” & try to keep my conflict with my subordinates to myself.

SA  A  U  D  SD  4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of my subordinates to come up with a decision jointly.

SA  A  U  D  SD  5. I try to work with my subordinates to find solutions to problems which satisfy our expectations.
6. I usually avoid open discussions of my differences with my subordinates.

7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.

8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.

9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.

10. I usually accommodate the wishes of my subordinates.

11. I give in to the wishes of my subordinates.

12. I exchange accurate information with my older subordinate to solve a problem together.

13. I usually allow concessions to my subordinates.

14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.

15. I negotiate with my subordinates so that a compromise can be reached.

16. I try to stay away from disagreement with my subordinates.
17. I avoid an encounter with my subordinates.
18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.
19. I often go along with the suggestions of my subordinates.
20. I use “give & take” so a compromise can be made.
21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.
22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.
23. I collaborate with my subordinates to reach decisions acceptable to us.
24. I try to satisfy the expectations of my subordinates.
25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.
26. I try to keep my disagreement with my subordinates to myself to avoid hard feelings.
27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my subordinates.
I try to work with my subordinates for a proper understanding of a problem.
APPENDIX C
Supportiveness Measure

To what extent is your organization recognized for the following statements? Rank each of the following items from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much) to indicate the nature of your organization’s culture.

1 2 3 4 5 Fairness
1 2 3 4 5 Respect for individual
1 2 3 4 5 Tolerance
1 2 3 4 5 Being socially responsible
1 2 3 4 5 Being competitive
1 2 3 4 5 Being achievement oriented
1 2 3 4 5 Having high expectations for performance
1 2 3 4 5 Being results oriented
1 2 3 4 5 Being analytical
1 2 3 4 5 Being people oriented
1 2 3 4 5 Being team oriented
1 2 3 4 5 Working in collaboration
1 2 3 4 5 Being action oriented
1 2 3 4 5 Willingness to experiment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Being not constrained by many rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Taking advantage of opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being precise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being rule oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Security of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Predictability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Openness to Change Measure

1. This organization emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at all     very great extent

2. This organization is dynamic and entrepreneurial. People are willing to take risks.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at all     very great extent

3. The glue which holds this company together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at all     very great extent

4. In this organization the best managers are considered to be entrepreneurs, innovators, or risk takers.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

   not at all     very great extent
5. The glue which holds this company together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running company is important here.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very great extent

6. This organization is very formalized and structured. Established procedures generally govern what people will do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very great extent

7. This organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all very great extent
APPENDIX E

Informational Letter Attached to Questionnaire

February 1, 2006

Dear Working Professional,

The attached questionnaire is part of a study which examines how younger supervisors in organizations manage conflict with their older subordinates. I would greatly appreciate if you will take a few minutes to complete this questionnaire.

You will be asked to complete this questionnaire from your perspective as a supervisor, recalling the conflict experiences you have encountered with older subordinates. There will also be some questions asking you to assess your organization’s unique culture, or the norms and values of your workplace. The information you provide will help researchers to better understand the communication relationships between young supervisors and older subordinates in the workplace.

As you complete the questionnaire, please remember to do the following: (1) Read the instructions for each section carefully; (2) Answer all questions in the entire survey, and; (3) Do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Once you have completed your questionnaire, please seal it in the provided envelope and either return it to your initial contact person, or mail it back to me at the address below.

Your individual identity and responses will be assured complete anonymity. If you have any questions about the survey, feel free to call me at (254) 710-1621 or email me at Lacy_Urbantke@baylor.edu. Your participation and prompt reply is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lacy G. Urbantke
Department of Communication Studies
Baylor University
Box 97368
Waco, TX 76798
Phone: (254) 710-1621
Email: Lacy_Urbantke@baylor.edu
APPENDIX F

Informed Consent Form for Subjects

Baylor University
Certification of Informed Consent
Principal Investigator: Lacy G. Urbantke, Department of Communication Studies

This form asks you for your consent to participate in communication research. For this research you will be asked to respond to a questionnaire pertaining to your conflict experiences with older subordinates. The entire questionnaire is seven pages in length and should require no more than thirty minutes of your time.

There will be no physical risks to you at any time. You may elect, either now or at any time while completing the questionnaire, to withdraw your participation without penalty. Your compliance in this study is completely voluntary.

This study meets the American Psychological Association’s standards for “Minimal Risk” and poses no major risks or dangers for you as a participant.

We have no interest in knowing how a specific individual responds to the questionnaire. There will be no identifying codes used, so you are guaranteed of complete anonymity.

The results will be tabulated in the coming months, and will be available for you to review, should you wish to see the outcome. However, since no identifying information will be documented, we have no way to inform you of how your individual responses compare with the overall study results. The data will allow us to better understand the unique relationship between younger supervisors and older subordinates in the workplace. Additionally, this data will allow a more complete understanding of how the rising number of young professionals in organizations influences workplace communications and relationships.

By signing this form and participating in this study, you are acknowledging that you are at least 18 years of age and able to participate in this study as an adult.

Please direct all inquiries to Lacy Urbantke, a Master’s candidate, through Dr. David Schlueter, Department of Communication Studies, Baylor University, P.O. Box 97368, Waco, TX, 76798-7368. Ms. Urbantke can also be reached at (254) 710-4468. Dr. Schlueter may be reached at (254) 710-1621.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant, or have other questions regarding this research as it relates to you as a participant, please contact the Baylor University Committee for Protection of Human Subjects in Research, Dr. Matthew S. Stanford, Chair, Baylor University, P. O. Box 97334, Waco, TX, 76798-7334. Dr. Stanford may also be reached at (254) 710-2236.

I have read and understood this form, am aware of my rights as a participant, and have agreed to participate in this research.

________________________________________________________________________
NAME (Signature)      DATE
APPENDIX G

Sample Questionnaire

Conflict with Older Subordinates

Try to recall as many organizational experiences as possible when ranking these statements. There are no right or wrong answers. The response which is most characteristic of your organizational life is the best answer.

Conflict Situations

You may have incompatibilities, disagreements, or differences (i.e. conflict) with one of your older subordinates. Please rank each of the following statements to indicate how you handle conflict with this subordinate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I try to investigate an issue with my older subordinate to find a solution acceptable to us.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I attempt to avoid being “put on the spot” &amp; try to keep my conflict with older subordinate to myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of my older subordinate to come up with a decision jointly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I try to work with my older subordinate to find solutions to problems which satisfy our expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I usually avoid open discussions of my differences with my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I usually accommodate the wishes of my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I give in to the wishes of my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I exchange accurate information with my older subordinate to solve a problem together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I usually allow concessions to my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I negotiate with my older subordinate so that a compromise can be reached.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I try to stay away from disagreement with my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I avoid an encounter with my older subordinate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. I often go along with the suggestions of my older subordinate.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

20. I use “give & take” so a compromise can be made.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

23. I collaborate with my older subordinate to come up with decisions acceptable to us.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

24. I try to satisfy the expectations of my older subordinate.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

26. I try to keep my disagreement with my older subordinate to myself to avoid hard feelings.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my older subordinate.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

28. I try to work with my older subordinate for a proper understanding of a problem.  
   **Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
   1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Organizational Supportiveness**

Think about the level of support in your working environment. To what extent is your organization recognized for the following statements? Please indicate your response by writing the appropriate number on the line next to each item, according to the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not at All</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minimally</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moderately</strong></td>
<td><strong>Considerably</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very Much</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fairness____
- Respect for individual____
- Tolerance____
- Being socially responsible____
- Being competitive____
- Being achievement oriented____
- Having high expectations for performance____
- Being results oriented____
- Being analytical____
- Being people oriented____
- Being team oriented____
- Working in collaboration____
- Being action oriented____

- Willingness to experiment____
- Being not constrained by many rules____
- Taking advantage of opportunities____
- Being innovative____
- Risk taking____
- Being careful____
- Attention to detail____
- Being precise____
- Being rule oriented____
- Security of employment____
- Stability____
- Being aggressive____
- Predictability____
### Organizational Openness to Change

Every organization responds to change differently. Please rank the following statements from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very great extent) to indicate how your organization deals with change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Very Great Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This organization emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This organization is dynamic and entrepreneurial. People are willing to take risks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The glue which holds this company together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In this organization the best managers are considered to be entrepreneurs, innovators, or risk takers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The glue which holds this company together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running company is important here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This organization is very formalized and structured. Established procedures generally govern what people will do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This organization emphasizes permanence and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitude Toward the Organization

Here are some statements about you and your job. How much do you agree or disagree with each? Rank each statement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I really care about the fate of this organization.  
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

8. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.  
   | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

9. In general, I don’t like my job.  
   | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

10. In general, I like working here.  
    | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11. I often think about quitting.  
    | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12. I will probably look for a new job in the next year.  
    | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Please answer the following question: (1=not likely at all, 7=extremely likely)

1. How likely is it that you will actively look for a new job in the next year?  
   | Not Likely At All | Extremely Likely |
   | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

---

**About Yourself**

Finally, please answer the following questions about yourself and one of your older subordinates. Again, your individual answers will not be identified in any way. This simply provides overall information about the survey sample.

What is your age, in years? _______  
What is your sex: ____ male ____ female  
What is your subordinate’s age, *in years? _______  
What is your subordinate’s sex: ____ male ____ female  
What is your tenure (length of employment) in your current organization (in years)? _______  
What is your subordinate’s tenure (length of employment) in your current organization *(in years)? _______  
How long have you been working with this subordinate *(in months or years)? _______  
(* estimations are acceptable in answering these questions)

What best describes your title within your organizational? (check one)  
   ____ top (president, vice-president)  
   ____ middle (department manager, director)  
   ____ lower (level supervisor, manager)  

What best describes your organization’s industry? (check one)  
   ____ consulting  
   ____ retail  
   ____ banking  
   ____ accounting  
   ____ childcare  
   ____ primary/secondary education  
   ____ IT support/information systems  
   ____ manufacturing  
   ____ legal services  
   ____ food services  
   ____ marketing/public relations  
   ____ federal/state services  
   ____ telecommunications/media  
   ____ medical/health services  
   ____ insurance  
   ____ Other (please specify): ________________________

Name of person who gave you this questionnaire: ____________________________________
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