

COMMUNICATION STYLES AMONG ORGANIZATIONAL PEERS

Faisal Ibrahim and Dr. Narimah Ismail
Communication Department, Universiti Putra Malaysia

Introduction

Communication styles are representative of the individuals and identifying the communication styles of an individual allows the understanding of individual background, the way of thinking and perception of social reality. In the organizational context, studying the communicator styles of a group of organizational employees can be equated with learning the organizational culture. The purposes of this study are to determine the predominant communication styles among organizational employees and to examine if an individual's communication styles in an organization differ according to demographic variables. An exploratory study involving 48 employees of a local Research & Development organization was conducted in which self-administered questionnaires were used. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way ANOVA and Pearson Correlation. The findings of this study showed that communication styles differ significantly according to gender, age, years of working, educational background, positions held and departments represented. Attentive, relaxed, and friendly styles are found to be the top three predominant styles among organizational employees.

Communication styles, which refer to the styles applied by a communicator while interacting, are representative of the individuals. Identifying the communication styles of an individual allows us to understand individuals in terms of their background, the way of thinking and perception of the social reality. When the focal point of a study is aimed at indulging an individual, the study is heading to a depiction of a specific culture within which the individual lives and ascribes to the values and norms. According to Gudykunst et al. (1997), everyone possesses a mode or style of communicating and each style is based on norms, rules, and values of the culture.

Organizational peers are individuals working together in an organization. In an organizational framework, studying the communication styles of a group of organizational peers can be equated with learning the culture of this particular group. It can be viewed as a process of comprehending the set of attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviors of each organizational peer and, at the same time, shared by everyone in the organization. Since communication is inseparable from any organizational culture, understanding the aspects of communication

existing within an organization leads to a larger view of that organization as a whole.

Based on the above, it is conclusive that communication is a learned behavior which is governed by shared values and norms among different individuals. Everyone has his or her way of communicating since communication style is the way one opts to communicate while giving form to literal meaning and to be understood. According to Littlejohn (2002), communication styles are not utterly individuals. This is because in reality culture affects the way people conduct themselves, perceive and observe others and view social reality. As such, cultural values and social interaction play a significant role, both direct and indirect, in determining different communication patterns.

Communication styles are not a '*black box*' phenomenon and thus can be experiential. There are various styles of communication used by individuals to correspond differently with each other in different settings, purposes and groups (Norton, 1983). A study by Miller (1978) established that white Americans tend to be more dominant while black Americans are more dramatic. Ishii et al. (1981) found that the Japanese perceived themselves as being more open than the Filipinos. Malaysians, on the other hand, are known to be friendly and polite (Asma Abdullah, 1996). In addition to that, a study by Bodary and Miller (2000) found that gender has a significant influence on communication styles. Despite having several communication styles, individuals are generally recognized for the style which is consistently prevailing and dominant.

From an individual communication style perspective we may conclude that the styles are natural or culturally nurtured. This may be evident in an interpersonal context, for example when one person interacts with others in various settings. However, will the style be maintained in an organization where many people are involved in shared daily tasks or organizational routines? In the organizational context, people are actively communicating among themselves and this scenario offers an avenue for the study of differing communication styles. In light of the different cultural and organizational values, each of them may have their own preferred style of communication.

Communication Styles

Communication styles are defined as "*a cognitive process which accumulates 'micro behavior' form-giving of literal content, and adds up to 'macro judgment'. When a person communicates, it is considered an attempt of getting literal meanings across* (Norton, 1983; Kirtley & Weaver, 1999)". Each style thus reflects how an individual perceives him/herself interact with others. Communication styles can also be viewed as a meta-message which contextualizes how verbal messages should be acknowledged and interpreted (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988). This explains why the way a person

communicates is reflective of the self-identity and affects others' perceptions of the individual.

Communication styles comprise of fundamentals which institute dissimilar forms of language patterns and are also viewed as a blend of spoken and illustrative elements of communication. The verbal messages an individual uses to communicate are the languages or definite words which characterize the communication styles. This includes tone, volume, and speech rate accompanying those messages (Raynes, 2001).

Scholars have come up with various clusters, types or categorizations of communication styles. Norton (1983) classifies communication styles into ten different types. They are: (i) dominant style where *an individual takes control of social situations*, (ii) dramatic style in which *a person is verbally alive with picturesque speech*, (iii) contentious style where a person is *argumentative or quick to challenge others*, (iv) animated style where *an individual is nonverbally active*, (v) impression-leaving style where someone *displays communication stimuli that are easily remembered*, (vi) relaxed style in which *a person is at ease and not conscious of any nervous mannerism*, (vii) attentive style through which *an individual is empathetic and listens carefully*, (viii) open style where *someone is unreserved, somewhat frank and possibly outspoken*, (ix) friendly style where *a person confirms, strokes and positively recognizes others*, and (x) precise style in which *a communicator asks for precise and accurate content of communication and conversations*.

Another cluster of communication style involves three major styles that are categorized as *noble style* which is conceptualized as directive and straightforward, *reflective style* which is *conceived as non-directive*, and *socratic style* in which *analysis of details and debate are emphasized* (McCallister, 1992). Along with these, there are other groups of styles which combine the three major styles. They are *candidate style*, *magistrate style*, and *senator style*. The characteristics assigned to each of these styles indicate that they are actually combinations of the ten styles categorized by Norton (1983).

Comstock and Higgins (1997), on the other hand, merge Norton's classification of styles to structure four clusters of communication styles. These clusters include *cooperative style* which *blends social and task orientation*, *apprehensive style* which *is relatively friendly but anxious and submissive*, *social style* that *is expressive, dominant, and dramatic but not argumentative or precise*, and *competitive style* which is *precise, expressive, not open about personal issues, and likely to be argumentative and dominant*.

Heffner (1997), in his analogous classification of communication styles to the work of McCallister (1992), groups the styles into three. These three styles are categorized as *passive style* in which *a person tends to value rights of others as more important than one's own*, *assertive style* where *one favors to stand up for*

one's own right while maintaining respects for others, and aggressive style during which an individual would stand up for his/her own right, feel superior, violate the rights of others, and ignore their feelings.

Due to individual preferences, views, perceptions and constructions of social reality it is perceptible the styles of every individual may vary. Employing a predominant style to communicate seems to be at one's own choice (McCallister, 1992).

Interpersonal Communication in Organizations

As Redding (2006) puts it, "internal communication can be subdivided into two areas which are *organizational* and *interpersonal*". In studying communication from both organizational and interpersonal perspectives, the heart of an organizational communication system is the close and personal relations between supervisor and worker or among employees themselves. *Researches in organizational communication range from studies of information flow, and superior-subordinate communication to recent work on perceived environmental uncertainty, information acquisition and decision making* (Putnam et al., 2006; Eisenberg, 2006). *Focuses on how employees suppress unpleasant messages, distort and withhold information, sharpen and assimilate message, and concentrate primarily on what senders believe that receivers want to hear* have been established in early studies. (Putnam et al., 1996)

According to Eisenberg (2006), *people in organizations confront multiple situational requirements which require them to develop multiple and often conflicting goals, and respond with communicative strategies.* As Farace et al. (1977) put it *in the multiple-goal approach communication is instrumental in building and maintaining self-image, in facilitating interpersonal relationships, and in advancing innovation, as well as in aiding production. The typical problem faced by organizational member is in creating a balance between being understood, not offending others, and maintaining self-image. Many different strategies are used to handle conflicting interactional goals such as avoiding interaction altogether, remaining silent, or changing the topic.*

Based on the above, it is thus probable to witness a phenomenon of different communication styles being applied by organizational peers. Such differences are likely since each organizational peer looks for precision and clarity in his/her communication with others. The establishment of clarity, according to Eisenberg (2006), is when the following conditions are met: (1) *an individual has an idea*; (2) *he or she encodes the idea into language*; and (3) *the receiver understands the message as it was intended by the source.* Eisenberg further states that, *while trying to be clear with other, individuals take into account the possible interpretive contexts in messages by the receiver, and attempt to narrow the possible interpretations. This is because clarity is a continuum which reflects the degree to which a source has narrowed the possible interpretations of a message and*

succeeded in achieving a correspondence between his or her intentions and the interpretations of the receiver. These attempts will thus lead to different employment of communicator styles among the organizational peers.

Meanwhile, it may be evident that organizational peers do not all the time endeavor to produce the connection between goals and understandings. Eisenberg (2006) asserts this by stating that, "It is often preferable to omit purposefully contextual cues and to allow for multiple interpretations on the part of receivers. When communicating with close friends, incomplete phrases and vague references may engender high degrees of clarity, through the use of a restricted code; the same message strategies applied in less close relationships may lead to confusion and ambiguity."

The direction of organizational communication studies have lingered around the issues and interests of how organizational peers or members, at different levels, interrelate, network and interact with each other. Even so, not much is discussed on the different individual styles of communication among the organizational peers. In spite of various studies pursued on the different communication styles, there is a lack of information on what actually influences communication styles when someone is communicating in an organization with the organizational peers. Will the styles be different in an organizational context? If yes, are the styles different according to the different demographic variables? Based on these, it is practical to question if; (a) there are any differences in the way organizational peers communicate with each other according to demographic variables, and (b) what communication styles mostly employed by organizational peers are. Thus, the aim of this study is; (I) to find out if there are any differences in communication styles among organizational peers according to demographic variables, and (II) to identify what the predominant communication styles among organizational peers are.

Significance of Study

The use of the Communicator Style Measurement by Norton (1983) in this study reaffirms the measurement items for each communicator style construct. This will thus strengthen the measurement and how it can be generalized in various settings and within the local context.

In addition, the findings of this study contribute to the literature by providing information on communication styles by organizational peers within an organization. Practitioners could benefit from this study since it provides an understanding of the different individuals' communication styles within a workplace setting.

Limitation of Study

The limitation of this study is in its sample and location of study. This number of respondents for this study is limited and they are confined to only one organization. For the purpose of this study and due to the constraints which were identified before the study was conducted, the findings of this study can thus be generalized to the organization where the study was conducted. However, for any organizations that have similar characteristics with the organization involved in this study, the findings may be used as a term of reference.

This study is also limited in the sense that it does not examine in details each communication style as categorized by Norton (1983). This study is interested in knowing which styles are mostly used instead of why they are used. Thus, on communication styles, this study deals with only the 'which' questions but not the 'why' issues.

Further to the above, the limitation of this study also lies in the use of communication styles as categorized by Norton (1983). Despite several less detailed categories of communication styles (McCallister, 1992; Comstock & Higgins, 1997; Heffner, 1997), this study chooses only to study the communication styles from the categorization made by Norton (1983).

Method

Participants

The population of this study consists of 120 employees of seven departments in an R&D organization in Kuala Lumpur. These employees represent the various levels of position held in respective Units. 18(37.5%) of the respondents are aged between 30-34 years old. 11(22.9%) aged between 35-39 years old, seven (14.6%) each for the 25-29 and 40-46 age groups and the remaining five (10.4%) are aged between 24-29 years old. 13 non-executives (27.1%) and 13 executives (27.1%) responded to the survey. This was followed by 12 Senior Executives (25.0%), six Senior Managers (12.5%) and four Managers (8.4%). Finally, in terms of education level, 27 respondents (56.3%) hold degrees, 10 (20.8%) have Diplomas, six (12.5%) are master degree holders and five (10.4%) hold Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM). Twelve (25%) respondents represent the Marketing Department followed by nine (18.8%) from Commercialization Department, eight (16.7%) from Research Department, seven (14.6%) from IT Department, five (10.4%) each from both Legal and HR Departments and only two (4.2%) representing the PR Department.

Measurements

A two-section Likert-Scale survey instrument was used in this study (Part 1 - Demographic Information, Part II - Norton's (1983) Communicator Styles Measurement (CSM). The CSM consists of 40 items. Each of the 10 styles is

measured using four items at a Likert scale (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Agree, 4-Strongly Agree).

Data Collection and Analysis

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed among the 70 employees of the seven departments. 48 questionnaires were returned. Based on the actual data, the reliability test had resulted in reliability coefficient being 0.897 for communication styles. According to Norton (1983), the measurement of communication styles (CSM) has construct and content validity. The CSM was well constructed and there is no need for factor analysis unless a compelling rationale can be provided. Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to describe the characteristics of the respondents. Mean scores were used to determine the mostly used communication styles. T-Test and One-Way ANOVA were used to compare means differences of communication style variables across gender, age, education levels, positions, years of working and departments.

Results & Discussion

Difference in Communication Styles

The first objective of this study is to find out if there are any differences in communication styles among organizational peers according to demographic variables.

Gender

In finding the difference in communication styles according to gender t-test was used. There is a significant difference in the friendly style between males and females at the 0.05 significance level. ($t=1.758$, $p=0.040$). Male organizational peers are found to be friendlier with a higher mean score of 2.989 as compared to female peers (2.850). The significant difference is most probably due to the fact that the studied organization consists of a Malay majority and Malay females are known for holding on strongly to the local norm and values in which women are expected to be more reserved in any social encounters (Asma Abdullah, 1996). Based on the norm and values men are expected to start conversations more than the women but this does not indicate that women are not friendly. There is no significant difference in other communication styles.

Age Groups

To find out if there is any significant difference in communication styles among the age groups, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was used. Among age groups, there are significant differences in friendly ($F=2.960$, $p=0.030$), impression leaving ($F=12.622$, $p=0.000$), relaxed ($F=8.067$, $p=0.000$), contentious ($F=3.582$, $p=0.013$), attentive ($F=11.138$, $p=0.000$), precise ($F=8.998$, $p=0.000$), animated ($F=5.986$, $p=0.001$), open ($F=4.468$, $p=0.004$), and dominant ($F=9.363$, $p=0.000$) styles at the 0.05 significance level. There is no significant difference in dramatic style.

Subsequently, a Tukey HSD post hoc test was conducted to find out which age groups differ significantly. It was found that organizational peers aged between 20-24 years old differ significantly from those who are aged between 40-46 years old in friendly style (I-J= -1.97143, p=0.021). Based on the means, those aged between 40-46 years old (mean=3.143) use more of the friendly style as compared to the 20-24 age group (mean=2.650). For the impression leaving style, organizational peers from the 40-46 age group differ from all other groups; 20-24 age group (I-J= -3.97143, p=0.000), 25-29 age group (I-J= -3.00000, p=0.000), 30-34 age group (I-J= -3.29365, p=0.000), and 35-39 age group (I-J= -2.84416, p=0.000). These groups, however, do not differ from each other. The 40-46 age group also differs from all other groups in relaxed style; 20-24 age group (I-J= -2.25714, p=0.003), 25-29 age group (I-J= -1.57143, p=0.039), 30-34 age group (I-J= -2.41270, p=0.000), and 35-39 age group (I-J= -1.40260, p=0.043). There is no significant difference among the other groups. For contentious style, the difference is found between the 40-46 age group and the 30-34 age group (I-J= -2.01587, p=0.010). Meanwhile, for open style the 40-46 age group differs from two groups which are the 25-29 (I-J= -2.42857, p=0.022) and the 30-34 age group (I-J= -2.61905, p=0.002). In the attentive, precise, animated, and dominant styles, which differ significantly at the 0.05 significance level, the 40-46 age group differs significantly from all other groups.

Organizational peers who are aged between 40 to 46 years old seemed to differ significantly from all other age groups in all communicator styles, except for dramatic style. The age factor perhaps, in this case, indicates maturity in the way they communicate within an organizational setting. However, surprisingly this group also differs significantly with other groups in the contentious style. Generally, being more matured as compared to the others, this group should not be contentious or argumentative in the way they communicate with other staff.

Years of Working

Using ANOVA, the differences in communication styles among different groups based on the years of working are found in all styles except for friendly style (F=2.328, p=0.088). The styles in which there are significant differences are impression leaving (F=11.381, p=0.000), relaxed (F=7.888, p=0.000), contentious (F=3.614, p=0.020), attentive (F=13.379, p=0.000), precise (F=7.766, p=0.000), animated (F=6.446, p=0.001), dramatic (F=3.534, p=0.022), open (F=8.539, p=0.000) and dominant (F=13.355, p=0.000).

It was also found that the organizational peers who have worked for 16-20 years differ significantly with all other groups in impression leaving (1-5 years: I-J= -3.11905, p=0.000; 6-10 years: I-J= -3.12281, p=0.000; 11-15 years: I-J= -1.88889, p=0.032) attentive (1-5 years: I-J= -2.71429, p=0.000; 6-10 years: I-J= -2.68421, p=0.000; 11-15 years: I-J= -2.22222, p=0.000) and precise styles (1-5 years: I-J= -2.71429, p=0.001; 6-10 years: I-J= -2.86842, p=0.000; 11-15 years: I-J= -2.16667, p=0.016). In these three styles, the other groups do not differ from

each other. In relaxed style the differences are between the 1-5 years and 16-20 years groups (I-J= -1.59524, p=0.017), and also between the 6-10 years group with two other groups which are the 11-15 years (I-J= -1.30409, p=0.019) and 16-20 years (I-J= -2.19298, p=0.000) groups. The 16-20 years group also differs from; the 6-10 years group in both contentious style (I-J= -1.81579, p=0.028) and animated style (I-J= -2.53509, p=0.001), and the 1-5 years in dramatic style (I-J= -2.09524, p=0.016) and animated style (I-J= -2.30952, p=0.004). Other groups do not differ from each other in the contentious, animated and dramatic styles.

In open style the 1-5 years group differs from the 16-20 years group (I-J= -2.19048, p=0.008) while the 6-10 years group differs from the 11-15 years (I-J=-1.69006, p=0.016) and 16-20 years (I-J= -2.91228, p=0.000) groups. Meanwhile, the 1-5 years and 6-10 years groups differ from both 11-15 years and 16-20 years groups in dominant style.

Education Level

In terms of education, ANOVA was also used to find if there is any significant difference among the four groups which are SPM, diploma, degree and master. It was found that the differences are only significant in two styles which are impression leaving (F=2.767, p=0.050) and dominant (F=2.874, p=0.047). The post hoc test result indicates that for impression leaving style, organizational peers who hold SPM differ significantly from Bachelor degree (I-J= -2.03704, p=0.043). Meanwhile, for dominant style the significant difference is between SPM and Master holder (I-J= -3.50000, p=0.050). There is no significant difference among other groups.

Positions

The ANOVA test result shows that there are significant differences in communication styles among organizational peers of different positions. The differences are in impression leaving style (F=9.896, p=0.000), relaxed style (F=6.802, p=0.000), attentive style (F=13.706, p=0.000), precise style (F=10.512, p=0.000), animated style (F=11.075, p=0.000), open style (F=12.530, p=0.000), and dominant style (F=18.145, p=0.000).

Based on the post hoc test, Senior Managers differ significantly from all other groups in impression leaving and attentive styles. In impression leaving style they differ from non-Executive (I-J= -3.43590, p=0.000), Executive (I-J= -3.12821, p=0.000), Senior Executive (I-J= -3.41667, p=0.000), and Manager (I-J= -2.41667, p=0.029). Similarly, in attentive style, Senior Managers differ significantly from non-Executive (I-J= -2.78205, p=0.000), Executive (I-J= -2.70513, p=0.000), Senior Executive (I-J= -3.08333, p=0.000), and Manager (I-J= -2.16667, p=0.004).

In all other styles (relaxed, precise, animated, open and dominant) Senior Managers differ significantly from non-Executives, Executives, and Senior Executives but not the Managers. The Managers, however, differ significantly

from non-Executives, Executives, and Senior Executives in relaxed, animated, open, and dominant styles.

The fact that Senior Managers and Managers differ from other groups is most probably due to the experiences which they are exposed to in their positions as compared to what the lower positions have to offer. Being at the upper levels in the organization, it is important that the Senior Managers and Managers exhibit more matured ways of communicating which will create more credibility among the other staff.

Department

The final demographic variable which is tested in this study is the departments represented by the organizational peers. The significant difference is only found in the impression leaving style ($F=4.225$, $p=0.002$) and all other styles do not differ significantly. A post hoc test was run to determine which departments differ significantly in impression leaving style and the result shows that the Marketing Department differs from IT Department ($I-J= -2.16667$, $p=0.027$) and Commercialization Department ($I-J= -2.38889$, $p=0.005$). At the same time, the Commercialization Department also differs significantly from the Research Department ($I-J=2.09722$, $p=0.042$).

A comparison of means shows that Commercialization staff apply more impression leaving style (mean=3.056) than Marketing staff (mean=2.458) and Research staff (mean=2.531). The IT Department also scores a higher mean (3.000) than the Marketing Department.

Predominant Communicator Styles

For the second objective of this study which is to find out which communication style is predominant among the organizational peers, mean scores were used to compare the tendency towards each of the communication style variable. As shown in Table 13 the attentive style (mean=3.182) is the mostly used style and this is followed by relaxed style (mean=3.042). Surprisingly, despite Malaysians (or Malays in particular) being known for their friendly trait (Asma Abdullah, 1996) friendly style is ranked third with a mean of 2.917. This is most probably due to the fact that in any organizations, organizational peers regard themselves as readily close to each other and it is thus more important to pay attention to what the other peers have to say with regard to organizational matters. This explains why the attentive style gets the highest score.

As expected, the least used styles are contentious (mean=1.818) and dramatic (mean=1.828) considering the ethnic background of the respondents who are majority Malay and thus being argumentative or dramatic does not reflect the Malays in general (Asma Abdullah, 1996).

Conclusion

Different individuals communicate with different communication styles. Categorizing communication styles have been done differently by several scholars. Some scholars categorized the styles into three categories and some grouped them into four. These categories are based on the ten styles constructed by Norton (1983) which are *dominant style*, *dramatic style*, *contentious style*, *animated style*, *impression-leaving style*, *relaxed style*, *attentive style*, *open style*, *friendly style*, and *precise style*.

Although an individual may have several communication styles, there is only one communication style that is predominant. For example, a person may have the dominant style, open style, and dramatic style, the dominant style may become his/her major style that is predominant and best represents the personality.

The communication styles of individuals are applied or used in most interpersonal communication process. However, in the organizational context, these styles tend to differ according to demographic variables and several other factors concerning organizational matters or interests. The pattern of communication styles in an organization apparently is an interesting area to examine through which we are able to see which styles are predominant amongst the organizational peers.

In an organization, the senior or elderly staff tends to communicate differently from junior staff due to their lengthy experiences. Demographic variables such as gender, age, education, years of working, positions and departments the staff is working with may create significant differences in the various communication styles. Males tend to communicate differently compared to females in all communication styles but with no significant difference except for the friendly style in which the males tend to be friendlier. Organizational peers, who are aged between 40-46 years old, worked between 16-20 years, hold Master degree, and assume higher positions show greater tendency to each of the communication style variable compared to the others. This is most probably due to their longer experience and understanding of the organizational matters.

The attentive and relaxed styles turn out to be predominant among organizational peers compared to the other communication styles. Being attentive is important as an organizational peer needs to attend to each organizational matter prudently as it may affect the organizational as a whole. The pressure or stress which may be faced by organizational peers requires them to be more relaxed as organizational problems or stresses are on-goings and have to be handled well.

Practical Implication and Recommendation for Future Study

The implication of this study is seen in its contribution to the understanding of communication styles which tend to differ in organizational settings as compared

to general social settings. Managers, for example, can understand why the staff communicates in certain ways compared to another setting.

Since organizational peers who are more experienced indicate greater tendency towards each of the communication styles variable, it is thus highly suggested that they should provide and conduct trainings on effective communication skills leveraging on their vast experiences. Sharing of their experiences could widen the perspectives of the younger and junior organizational peers on more effective communication skills which will benefit the individuals, the departments they represent, and the organization as a whole.

For future study, it is recommended that the research questions in this study are answered with a longitudinal observation and focus groups to understand the underlying perceptions of individuals when they are communicating with each other in the organizational context.

REFERENCES

- Asma Abdullah (1996). *Going glocal – cultural dimensions in Malaysian management*. pp 129-132. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bodary, D.L. & Miller, L.D. (2000). Neurobiological substrates of communicator style. *Communication Education* 49(1), 82-99.
- Comstock, J. and Higgins, G. (1997). Appropriate relational messages in direct selling interaction: Should salespeople adapt to buyers' communicator style. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34 (4) p.401
- Eisenberg, E.M. (2006). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. In *Organizational Communication (Edited by Putnam, L.L. & Krone, K.J.) Vol.5, 219-236*. London: Sage Publications.
- Farace, R.V., Monge, P.R., & Russell, H. (1977). *Communicating and organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gudykunst, W.B. and Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newsbury Park, CA: Sage
- Gudykunst, W.B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K.S., & Heyman, S. (1997). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construal, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 22(4): 510-543.
- Heffner, C.L. (1997). *Communication styles*. Retrieved October 8, 2006 from Southern Illinois University Carbondale Mental Health Web: <http://www.siu.edu/offices/counsel/talk.htm#chart>.
- Ishii, S et. al., (1981). *Communication styles among college students in Japan and the Philippines*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Communication Association of the Pacific Conference, Nagasaki, Japan.
- Kirtley, M.D. and Weaver, J.B. III. (1999). Exploring the impact of gender role self-perception on communication style. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 22(2), 190. Retrieved March 31, 2005 from <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001854051>.
- Krejcie, R.V., and Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Education and psychological measurement*, 30: 607-610.

- Littlejohn, S.W. (2002). *Theories of Human Communication*. (7th Ed.) Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- McCallister, L. (1992). *I wish I'd said that: How to talk your way out of trouble and into success*. NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Miller, L.D. (1978). *Attraction and communicator style: Perceptual differences between friends and enemies as a function of sex and race*. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago.
- Norton, R.W. (1983). *Communicator style: theory, applications and measures*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- Putnam, L.L., Phillips, N., and Chapman, P. (2006). Metaphors of communication and organization. In *Organizational Communication (Edited by Putnam, L.L. & Krone, K.J.) Vol. 1, 84-133*. London: Sage Publications.
- Raynes, B.L. (2001). Predicting difficult employees: The relationship between vocational interests, self-esteem, and problem communication styles. *Applied Human Resource Management Research*. 6(1), 33-66. Retrieved July 18, 2005 from http://www.radford.edu/~applyhrm/2001/MS%206_1_%20Raynes.pdf.
- Redding, W.C. (2006). Stumbling toward identity: The emergence of organizational communication as a field of study. In *Organizational Communication (Edited by Putnam, L.L. & Krone, K.J.) Vol 1, 3-48*. London: Sage Publications.