

Giovanna Kirinić

The Correlations among the Dimensions of Teachers' Communication Styles and Communication Etiquette

Abstract: Understanding upbringing practices and respecting the need for two-way communication and reciprocal relationships among children, adults and the learning environment require a constant exploration of the common life elements and learning of all education participants. The dimensions of teachers' communication styles allow a thorough analysis of the student–teacher relationship and an understanding of a particular communication style resulting from a teacher's behaviour. Therefore, the aim of the research was to examine the communication skills and communication etiquette of teachers and their self-assessment of their application of different communication styles in their educational work, using a sample of 257 primary school teachers. Two instruments were used in the research: a six-dimensional Communication Styles Inventory (CSI) questionnaire (De Vries 2013) and a communication etiquette questionnaire, which, according to Watzlavick's laws, was edited by Walroose (1974). The data obtained from the questionnaires revealed that teachers prefer a *compliant, passive* communication style, meaning they prefer the dimensions of *preciseness* and *emotionality*. The study results also show that teachers have some knowledge of good communication but do not fully apply it.

Keywords: implicit pedagogy, communication competency, quality communication, teacher competencies

UDC: 37.015.3

Scientific article

Introduction

Communication is the basis of human interactions, and quality interpersonal communication is a prerequisite for developing a sense of well-being. It takes place in different contexts and is crucial for personal development, upbringing, self-affirmation and self-understanding. Communication is a learned behaviour governed by shared values and norms among individuals, and is developed as a cyclical upward spiral of growth that »leads to higher forms of responsible independence and effective interdependence« (Covey 1995, p. 89). It refers to any kind of human networking that establishes contacts (families, groups of people, organizations), including that which takes places in schools or in the educational process. In fact, it can be said that the teaching process is a communication process (Peko et al. 2014). Through the teaching–learning process, the purpose, materials, forms, methods and tools of education are manifested as a communication activity that presupposes the communication competencies of its participants. In school, children acquire skills, abilities and knowledge in different fields and develop and shape their personality through the activity of learning. The impact of a teacher’s actions is realised through symmetrical communication between the actors (the teachers and students) and through social interactions between them and their mutual interpretations of such interactions. Throughout this process, the teacher’s communicative work must simultaneously link two different discourses: theoretical (scientific) and practical (classroom-related). Theoretical and scientific knowledge are translated into practical discourse through the shaping and development of the teacher’s personal educational philosophies (Mušanović 2001). Such implicit teacher pedagogies influence the communicative interaction between students and teachers in the teaching–learning process because they convey emotions, desires, states, lessons learned, cultural contents, beliefs, values, norms and mindsets as personal experiences. Due to the multiple and complex teacher roles in the art of education, »of which knowledge is only one segment« (Bratanić 2000, p. 7), the teacher’s expertise, observed in the context of a communicative relationship, implies his/her pedagogical, psychological and communicative competence (Bratanić 1993). The importance of teachers’ communicative competence in the teaching process

(communication process) pertains not only to the content but also to the relational aspect of communication, even to becoming aware of and knowing one's own emotions, attitudes and values. These include more advanced skills of presenting and explaining one's opinions and dialoguing, and readiness to communicate (Dubovicki 2019; Zrilić 2010) and should ultimately result in positive student outcomes in the area of communication.

Communicative competence has been emphasized in previous studies that focused on teacher competences as assessed by students and teachers (e.g. Brajša 1993; Bratanić 1993; De Vries et al. 2013; Jurčić 2012; Jurić 2005; Schulz Von Thun 2005; Tot 2010). Such studies emphasized the importance of communicative competence due to the reciprocal and interdependent nature of human interaction and the ability of communicative competence to be observed only in the context of relationships. Thus, some studies that focused on the key factors contributing to or complicating cultural relations within a school (e.g. Kozmus and Kirinić 2010) have shown that the interpersonal relationships and communication among all the participants are the key factors in achieving quality communication.

Communication style is defined as a mode of communication, and teachers' congruent¹ or authentic communication is considered a key tool for their communication with their students (Ginott 1972). The frequently cited definition of *communication style* is that of Norton (1983): a type of personal verbal, non-verbal and paraverbal interaction in relation to signs/symbols and their literal interpretations and to ways of filtering and understanding them. De Vries et al. also pointed out that people often tend to communicate more than just through signals, emphasizing that communication styles are the ways people send verbal, paraverbal and non-verbal signals in social interactions that signify who they are or whom they want to represent, how they relate to the people they are interacting with and how their messages should be interpreted (De Vries et al. 2009, p. 179). This definition focuses explicitly on interpersonal communication behaviour using a lexical approach (i.e. the dimensional structure of the words people use to describe people's communication styles). The principle behind a lexical study of communication styles is in line with a similar research conducted on personality and applied in the construction of De Vries' Communication Styles Inventory (CSI), the communication style questionnaire that was used in this research.

Considering the foregoing, this study focused on exploring the dimensions of teachers' communication styles, which present a more sophisticated way of analysing such communication styles. The *dimensions* of a teacher's communication style enable a more thorough analysis of the student–teacher relationship and a better understanding of a particular communication style as a reflection the teacher's behaviour. While it seems, however, that although the assertive communication style is more widely accepted today it is more natural to apply different communication styles in different situations, the results of the research conducted by Myers et al. (2007) showed that teachers who are perceived by their students as verbally

¹ Congruent communication refers to the correspondence of what is said with what can be seen through non-verbal behaviour (Watzlawick 1967).

aggressive tend to discourage their students from communicating in class and from participating in the planned student activities.

The communication style also implies a particular cultural context or *communication etiquette*. The research by Gudykunst (2001) showed that there are differences in communication style preferences by cultural characteristics. According to this research, Asian Americans use a more indirect communication style, which emphasizes interpersonal harmony, while European Americans use a more direct communication style characterized by tendencies to be dramatic, open and precise. The communication etiquette is often focused on providing recommendations for quality communication (e.g. Wahlroos 1974).

To facilitate the monitoring of student–teacher relationships and their causes and to obtain a more thorough understanding of these and link them to a communication style as a reflection of the teacher’s behaviour, this paper compares the common and generally accepted three-part classification of communication styles and the communication style dimensions (Table 1). We identified the dimensions and characteristics whose meanings have been coded in a standardized way so we could use different names for communication styles that are more understandable and reflexive. Thus, we correlated De Vries’ (2013) communication style dimensions with Ury’s (1994) and Satir’s (1972) classifications of communication styles, as shown in Table 2.

Source author and year of publication	Communication styles	Descriptions of communication styles
Satir 1972		We care only about ourselves.
	Blame	We care only about others.
	Placate	We care only about messages.
	Super-reasonable	We do not care about anyone; we distract ourselves from a situation by turning to something else or to something unimportant.
	Irrelevant	We care about real communication situations, ourselves, the interlocutor and the message, and try to keep all of these together and connected with each other.
Ury 1994	Congruent	
	Passive/compliant	Allowing concessions and negotiations
	Rigid/aggressive	The interlocutors are opponents and rivals, fighting to win.
De Vries 2013	Assertive	Separation of problems from people; solving problems to mutual satisfaction
	Expressiveness	Talkativeness, conversational dominance, humour, informality
	Preciseness	Structuredness, thoughtfulness, substantiveness, conciseness
	Emotionality	Sentimentality, worrisomeness, tension, defensiveness;
	Questioningness	Unconventionality, philosophicalness, inquisitiveness, argumentativeness
	Verbal aggressiveness	
De Vries 2013	Impression	Angriness, authoritarianism, derogatoriness, non-supportiveness
	manipulativeness	Ingratiation, charm, inscrutableness, concealingness

Table 1: Communication styles and their descriptions by Satir (1972); Ury (1994); De Vries (2013)

The following are brief descriptions of the dimensions of De Vries' communication styles, on which part of this research was based. Each of the six dimensions has a four-aspect scale, as shown below.

The *expressiveness* dimension includes the following: *talkativeness* (tending to talk a lot), *conversational dominance* (tending to lead the way in conversation and choice of topics), *humour* (joking or making others laugh often) and *informality* (approaching people, tending to be relaxed/not stiff).

The *questioningness* dimension includes the following: *unconventionality* (tending to bring up bizarre ideas, say unexpected things or inject unusual inputs into the discussion), *philosophicalness* (showing a liking for discussing the meaning of life), *inquisitiveness* (tending to try to find out about the background of somebody's opinion or to uncover someone's motives) and *argumentativeness* (showing a liking for finding out people's opinions by debating with them).

The *verbal aggressiveness* dimension includes the following: *angriness* (showing dissatisfaction or reacting somewhat irritably to people), *authoritarianism* (insisting that others do or obey what one tells them to do), *derogatoriness* (making fun of or humiliating someone in front of a crowd), *non-supportiveness* (not understanding other people's problems).

The *impression manipulativeness* dimension includes the following: *ingratiation* (using flattery to get someone in a favourable mood), *charm* (using one's own charm or appearance to get something done), *inscrutableness* (hiding one's negative feelings about other people), *concealingness* (concealing information for one's personal interests).

The *emotionality* dimension includes the following: *sentimentality* (tending to get emotional when one talks about one's memories, tending to cry when other people start crying), *worrisomeness* (tending to be visibly worried or anxious), *tension* (tending to be tense during a conversation or when addressing a large group of people), *defensiveness* (tending to take critical remarks from other people personally).

The *preciseness* dimension includes the following: *structuredness* (having a clear chain of thoughts when arguing), *thoughtfulness* (tending to choose one's words with care), *substantiveness* (tending to talk about important rather than trivial topics), *conciseness* (tending to express oneself using only a few words).

As can be seen in Table 2, De Vries' *expressiveness* and *questioningness* communication style dimensions can both be interpreted as Ury's *assertive* communication–leadership style or Satir's *congruent* form of communication. De Vries' *verbal aggressiveness* and *impression manipulativeness* communication style dimensions both correspond to Ury's *aggressive* or *rigid* communication–leadership style and to Satir's *blame* and *placate* forms of communication, respectively. Finally, De Vries' *emotionality* and *preciseness* communication style dimensions can both be linked to Ury's *passive* or *compliant* communication–leadership style and to Satir's *irrelevant* and *super-reasonable* forms of communication, respectively.

Communication style dimensions (De Vries 2013)	Aspects of communication style dimensions (De Vries 2013)	Communication-leadership style (Ury 1994)	Forms of communication (Satir 1972)
Expressiveness	Talkativeness, conversational dominance, humour, informality	Assertive	Congruent
Questioningness	Unconventionality, philosophicalness, inquisitiveness, argumentativeness	Assertive	Congruent
Verbal aggressiveness	Angriness, authoritarianism, derogatoriness, non-supportiveness	Aggressive, rigid style	Blame
Impression manipulativeness	Ingratiation, charm, inscrutableness, concealingness	Aggressive, rigid style	Placate
Emotionality	Sentimentality, worrisomeness, tension, defensiveness	Passive, compliant style	Irrelevant
Preciseness	Structuredness, thoughtfulness, substantiveness, conciseness	Passive, compliant style	Super-reasonable

Table 2: Communication style dimensions and their four-aspect scales (adapted to De Vries 2013) compared to the communication management styles of Ury (1994); Satir (1972)

Again, it is important to examine the communication etiquette that complements a communication style. It includes a combination of communication knowledge and skills that have been adopted and are being applied in everyday formal and informal relationships. The key to good communication is constant adaptation to the situations prevailing in the environment, which requires the development of more skills and constantly learning to act/communicate appropriately in given situations. There are certain beliefs, however, that can drive teachers to have less interest in correcting their communication flaws and further improving their communication skills. For example, in the study of communication culture by Bakić-Tomić (2003), 60% of the respondents indicated that they believed that communication skills are innate and cannot be learned or developed. Generally, few studies are focused on exploring teachers' communication styles, through which students receive information from their teachers. This research thus aimed to fill such research gap by examining teachers' communication skills (i.e. teachers' communication etiquette) and their self-assessment of their application of different communication styles in their educational work.

Research Methodology

Research sample

A questionnaire survey (Kirinić 2019) was conducted on a sample of 257 teachers in the elementary schools of the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County. The sample consisted of teachers from different academic fields (sociolinguistics, science and pedagogy) according to the Croatian national curriculum (Nacionalni okvirni kurikulum 2011).

Table 3 presents the research sample by gender and according to the academic field the teachers belonged to. An overwhelming majority (80.20%) of the teachers were women, and according to the academic field they belonged to, most belonged to the sociolinguistics field (42.00%), followed by science (34.20%), with the least number belonging to the pedagogy field (23.70%). These data correspond to the real representation of academic fields in the Croatian schools with regard to the norms of individual subjects according to the current curricula. Thus, the research sample was representative of the investigated population.

Variable	Group	N	%
Gender	M	51	19.8%
	F	206	80.2%
	Total	257	100.0%
Academic field	Sociolinguistics	108	42.0%
	Science	88	34.2%
	Pedagogy	61	23.7%
	Total	257	100.0%

Table 3: Structure of the teacher sample by gender and academic field

Research methods and instruments

Two instruments were used in the study. The dominant communication style of the teacher (i.e. the dominant dimension) was investigated using a six-dimensional model of CSI (De Vries 2013). The questionnaire was created in response to one of the main problems in the previous investigations of interpersonal communication: the absence of a wider framework in which different communication styles could be recorded. This questionnaire distinguishes among six dimensions of communication behaviour: *expressiveness*, *precision*, *verbal aggressiveness*, *questioningness*, *emotionality* and *impression manipulateness*, each with a four-aspect scale (see Table 2) consisting of four claims. The entire questionnaire consists of a total of 96 claims measured by the scale of responses in which 1 = I fully disagree and 5 = I fully agree. The six aforementioned communication style dimensions serve as a framework for determining the respondent's dominant communication style dimension.

The second instrument that was used in this study was a communication etiquette questionnaire, which was edited by Walroose (1974) according to Watzlavick's laws and adapted to the Croatian language and culture by Bakić-Tomić (2003). This questionnaire measures the respondent's adoption of quality communication and contains 30 claims, 13 of which are correct and 17 incorrect. To still consider a certain skill a developed skill, the lowest permissible value is 80% of the adopted communication skills according to the questionnaire. The questionnaire examines

the knowledge and application of quality communication, with the incorrect answers showing a certain percentage of declarative knowledge and the undeveloped communication skills needed for successful communication.

To process the results, descriptive, univariate statistical, bivariate and multivariate statistical analyses were used. To test the significance of the differences between the arithmetic means from the multiple samples, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for the independent and dependent samples, and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for examining the influence and interaction of the multiple independent variables on a number of dependent variables.

Objective and research problems

The aim of this research was to determine the teachers' self-estimated communication style dimensions and degree of adoption of communication etiquette, and their connection to each other.

Problems and hypotheses

1. What is the dominant communication style of teachers?
H1: Teachers prefer an assertive communication style. A statistically significant difference in the number of teachers who prefer this communication style is expected compared to the number of those who prefer other communication styles.
2. Are there differences among teachers of different academic fields (sociolinguistics, science and pedagogy) in terms of their communication style dimensions?
H2: Teachers belonging to different academic fields differ significantly in their application of the individual communication style dimensions.
3. Are there differences among teachers of different academic fields in terms of their application of communication etiquette?
H3: Teachers belonging to different academic fields do not differ significantly in their application of communication etiquette.
4. Is there complementarity between the individual communication style dimensions and communication etiquette?
H4: There is complementarity between the individual communication style dimensions and communication etiquette.

Results and discussion

Table 4 shows that according to the data obtained from the accomplished CSI questionnaire (De Vries 2013) consisting of six communication style dimensions,

the most pronounced dimension of a teacher's communication style was *preciseness* ($M = 54.72$), followed by *emotionality* ($M = 51.36$), *expressiveness* ($M = 50.66$), *questioningness* ($M = 48.12$), *impression manipulativenness* ($M = 43.83$) and *verbal aggressiveness* ($M = 38.62$).

Communication style dimensions	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Preciseness	54.72	5.71		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Emotionality	51.36	7.08	0.00		0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
Expressiveness	50.66	6.60	0.00	0.25		0.00	0.00	0.00
Questioningness	48.12	6.63	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Impression manipulativenness	43.83	7.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Verbal aggressiveness	38.62	7.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Table 4: Results of the analysis of teachers' communication style dimensions (De Vries 2013)

Table 4 compares the communication style dimensions, with the numbers 1–6 at the table header (column titles) representing the six dimensions listed in the column on the left, in such order (1 = *preciseness*, etc.). It can be seen that there is no difference only between the second and third dimensions. The individual communication style dimension preferences were subjected to an analysis of variance with repeated measurements (repeated-measures ANOVA) and with L-S-D post hoc tests. In the table, the variables are shown from the one with the highest arithmetical mean to the one with the lowest. The overall result of the variance analysis is statistically significant ($F = 50,118$; $df = 23/235$; $p < 0.001$).

The teachers' communication styles were examined to clarify them (see Table 5). The scale that the teachers used to evaluate the claims ranged from 1 to 5, where 1 = I fully disagree and 5 = I fully agree (table header; the degree of stacking is shown as a percentage). By aggregating the percentage of the teachers' commitment to the degree of stacking four and five scales (I agree and fully agree), claims were made, to which more than 70% of the teachers were allocated. Table 5 shows the eight statistically significant statements (i.e. the statements at least 70% of the teachers preferred more than the other claims) among the total of 95 CSI (De Vries 2013) statements. The results present the essential characteristics of the teachers' communication style: when communicating with others, they always address the others in the usual manner and with full respect; they set aside enough time for anyone who wants to talk to them, and show interest in other people's problems; they can listen well, always try to consider the context of one's opinion during conversations, and they do not crack jokes that could hurt others' feelings. The results of the analysis suggest that most of the claims correspond to the *emotionality and expressiveness* dimensions.

No.	Communication style dimensions – aspects	Claims	M	SD	1 u %	2 u %	3 u %	4 u %	5 u %
2.	Preciseness – structuredness	When I tell a story, the different parts are always clearly related to each other.	3.86	0.70	0.80	2.30	20.90	61.60	14.30
15.	Verbal aggressiveness – derogatoriness	I never make fun of anyone in a way that may hurt his or her feelings.	3.95	0.99	1.90	6.60	20.50	36.80	34.10
16.	Questioningness – inquisitiveness	During a conversation, I always try to find out the background of somebody's opinion.	3.99	0.72	0.40	1.90	18.60	56.60	22.50
21.	Verbal aggressiveness – non-supportiveness	I can listen well.	4.14	0.78	0.80	2.70	11.60	51.90	32.90
45.	Verbal aggressiveness – non-supportiveness	I always show much understanding of other people's problems.	3.91	0.81	0.40	4.70	21.30	51.20	22.50
67.	Expressiveness – informality	I address others in a very casual way.	3.76	0.72	0.40	5.00	22.90	61.20	10.50
69.	Verbal aggressiveness – non-supportiveness	I always make time for someone who wants to talk to me.	3.87	0.78	0.00	4.70	24.00	51.20	20.20
93.	Verbal aggressiveness – non-supportiveness	I always treat people with much respect.	4.06	0.76	0.00	2.70	18.20	49.20	29.80

Table 5: Analysis of teachers' communication styles (only claims with statistically significant results) (De Vries 2013)

The often chosen dimension of *verbal aggressiveness* and its characteristic of *non-supportiveness* to which the teachers expressed a strong disagreement were interpreted reverently. This means that about 70% of the teachers were explicitly opposed to the speakers' verbal aggressiveness and non-supportiveness. The dominant dimensions of the teachers' communication style (in Table 4, the first two most prominent communication style dimensions according to De Vries 2013) were *preciseness* and *emotionality* (characteristics: communication structuredness, thoughtfulness, substantiveness, conciseness in expression, sentimentality, worrisomeness, tension and defensive stance). These two dominant communication style dimensions (preciseness and emotionality) correspond to Ury's (1994) *passive* or *compliant* communication–leadership style and Satir's (1972) *irrelevant* and *super-reasonable* forms of communication (see Table 1). The second most represented communication style of teachers (the third and fourth most pronounced dimensions according to De Vries 2013) has the *expressiveness* and *questioningness* dimensions (characteristics: communication dominance, talkativeness, humour,

informality, unconventionality, inquisitiveness, philosophicalness and argumentativeness). These are characteristics of Ury's (1994) *assertive* communication–leadership style and Satir's (1972) *congruent* form of communication. The third most represented communication style of teachers (fifth and sixth most pronounced dimensions according to De Vries 2013) has the dimensions of *impression manipulativeness* (ingratiation, charm, inscrutableness, concealingness) and *verbal aggressiveness* (angriness, authoritarianism, derogatoriness, non-supportiveness). These are the characteristics of Ury's (1994) *aggressive/rigid* and *manipulative* communication–leadership styles and Satir's (1972) *placate* and *blame* forms of communication.

When only the communication style dimensions were analysed, most of the teachers chose the dimensions of *preciseness* and *emotionality*. However, in the analysis of the questionnaire items according to the characteristics of the communication style dimensions, *questioningness* (characteristics: *unconventionality, inquisitiveness, philosophicalness and argumentativeness*) and *expressiveness* (characteristics: *conversational dominance, talkativeness, humour and informality*) came first and second, respectively. Reversible items of *verbal aggressiveness* also emerged, confirming the dominance of the *assertive* style. This difference in style choice was due to the sensitivity of De Vries' (2013) questionnaire. The examination of communication style dimensions showed precision and sensitivity in determining the basic characteristics of teacher behaviour in a communicative relationship. This means that the three-part classification of styles is not sufficiently precise in explaining the characteristics of particular communication styles or the dominance of a particular style. The reported results confirm, however, that CSI is an extremely precise and reliable questionnaire, which was confirmed by the results of the statistical analysis of its items (SD, Skew, Kurt and Ks-z are uniform; see Table 4). Hypothesis 1 was confirmed, but only by the results of the analysis of the characteristics of the communication style dimensions.

To test the second hypothesis (*The teachers belonging to different academic fields [sociolinguistics, science and pedagogy] do not differ significantly in the application of certain dimensions of communication styles*), the communication style dimensions were analysed by groups of teachers according to their academic fields (Table 6). MANOVA was carried out with the CSI questionnaire, where communication style was observed as a dependent variable and area as the independent variable. The post-hoc test that was used was the Scheffe test.

Variable	Field	N	M	SD	F	p
Expressiveness	Sociolinguistics	108	50.88	6.47	0.11	0.89
	Science	88	50.61	6.71		
	Pedagogy	61	50.38	6.82		
Preciseness	Sociolinguistics	108	55.56	5.78	2.03	0.13
	Science	88	54.08	5.70		
	Pedagogy	61	54.13	5.56		
Emotionality	Sociolinguistics	108	51.36	7.74	0.00	0.99
	Science	88	51.48	6.32		
	Pedagogy	61	51.44	6.84		
Questioningness	Sociolinguistics	108	48.31	7.00	1.28	0.28
	Science	88	48.73	6.17		
	Pedagogy	61	47.00	6.57		
Impression manipulativeness	Sociolinguistics	108	43.37	6.57	1.90	0.15
	Science	88	45.01	7.47		
	Pedagogy	61	42.92	7.74		
Verbal aggressiveness	Sociolinguistics	108	37.82	8.40	1.09	0.33
	Science	88	39.38	6.96		
	Pedagogy	61	38.95	6.86		

Table 6: Analysis of teachers' communication style dimensions (De Vries 2013) by the groups of teachers according to the academic field

The MANOVA results show that there is no statistically significant difference in communication style by academic field ($F = 0.94$; $df = 48/46$; $p = 0.58$). Furthermore, there was no statistically significant difference in communication style dimensions by academic field ($F = 0.89$; $df = 12/50$; $p = 0.50$). It can thus be concluded that the breakdown of the sample of respondents (teachers) by academic field (sociolinguistics, science and pedagogy) was not statistically significant in terms of expressing differences in the application of certain communication style dimensions; in other words, the second hypothesis was rejected. It can be presumed that the differences in the teachers' initial education did not significantly influence them in terms of their application. This is possibly due to the proper emphasis on the daily adoption of communication skills not only within specific communication-oriented courses offered within the framework of pedagogical and psychological education during their studies² but also possibly due to the

² The subject teachers at the Department of Educational Studies at the Faculty of Teacher Education (University of Zagreb) are given an opportunity to acquire professional teaching competence for the subjects they study as part of their undergraduate or graduate program.

teachers' efforts to obtain continuing professional development especially in this field.

To determine if there are differences among the teachers belonging to different academic fields in the use of communication etiquette (H3), simple ANOVA was carried out through a correlation matrix (one-way ANOVA), with the academic field as the independent variable and communication etiquette as the dependent variable. A Scheffe test was used as the post-hoc test, and the p-values are shown in Table 7. The results show that there is a statistically significant difference by academic field ($F = 4.29$; $p = 0.015$), with the participants in the field of pedagogy achieving higher results than the participants in the field of science. As for the other academic fields, no statistically significant difference was found between the groups in relation to communication etiquette. It can thus be concluded that the third hypothesis is partially confirmed.

Variable	No.	Academic field	N	M	SD	F (p)	Scheffe	
							2	3
Field	1	Sociolinguistics	108	21.53	2.84	4.29 (0.01)	0.40	0.18
	2	Science	88	20.92	3.46		-	0.01
	3	Pedagogy	61	22.44	3.07		0.01	-

Table 7: Analysis of the significance of the differences between teachers belonging to different academic fields in terms of respect for communication etiquette

By comparing the results of the knowledge demonstrated by the middle management (43.21%) (Bakić-Tomić 2003) and the results shown by the teachers in this research (71.8%), a higher percentage of demonstrated knowledge of communication etiquette is evident in the teachers, but it is still below the desirable 80% acquisition of communication etiquette knowledge and skills. While it may be assumed that there is a greater emphasis on communicative competence in teacher education, further research should be conducted to confirm this (especially due to the uneven curricula in the teaching orientations at different faculties).

Table 8 shows the correlation matrix between the dimensions of teacher communication styles and the knowledge they have shown in the field of communication etiquette. A correlation was found between communication etiquette and *informality* as a characteristic of the *expressiveness* dimension ($r = 0.27$ for $p < 0.01$). The *verbal aggressiveness* dimension is, in all its characteristics, inversely proportional to communication etiquette (angriness $r = -0.24$ for $p < 0.01$; authoritarianism $r = -0.25$ for $p < 0.01$; derogatoriness $r = -0.37$ for $p < 0.01$; non-supportiveness $r = -0.28$ for $p < 0.01$). This means that the teachers, in their communication with their students, do not show anger, are not authoritarian, do not humiliate, but support the students. When it comes to the communication style dimension of *questioningness*, the only negative correlation with communication etiquette was found in the characteristic of *argumentativeness* ($r = -0.29$

for $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, in the communication style dimension of *impression manipulativenness*, a negative correlation with communication etiquette was found in the characteristic of *charm* ($r = -0.18$ za $p < 0.01$) and ingratiation ($r = -0.20$ za $p < 0.01$); that is, the teachers do not flatter or try to charm their students. The dimension of *emotionality* correlates to communication etiquette only in the characteristic of *defensiveness* ($r = -0.15$ for $p < 0.05$), which is explained by the fact that the teachers do not show a defensive stance when communicating with their students.

By comparing the teachers' communication style dimensions and knowledge of communication etiquette, it can be concluded that *emotionality*, *preciseness* and *expressiveness* do not have a statistically significant correlation or complementarity with communication etiquette. Therefore, the teachers' communication etiquette does not support these aforementioned communication style dimensions but supports the following (in an inversely proportional manner): *impression manipulativenness*, *questioningness* and *verbal aggressiveness*. The hypothesis (H4) about the confirmation of the complementarity of communication etiquette with the communication style dimensions is thus partially confirmed because the three dimensions of *impression manipulativenness*, *questioningness* and *verbal aggressiveness* are supported by communication etiquette in an inversely proportional manner while the dimensions of *emotionality*, *preciseness* and *expressiveness* are not supported. This means that there is no correlation between communication etiquette and some of the communication style dimensions associated with assertive styles (*emotionality*, *preciseness* and *expressiveness*). However, there is a partial correlation with the »negative« communication style dimensions, such as the more aggressive the communication style, the more negative the communication etiquette.

Communication style dimensions	Characteristics of communication style dimensions	Etiquette
Expressiveness	Talkativeness	-0.03
	Conversational dominance	-0.11
	Humour	-0.06
	Informality	0.27**
Preciseness	Structuredness	0.11
	Thoughtfulness	0.08
	Substantiveness	-0.08
	Conciseness	-0.00
Emotionality	Sentimentality	-0.08
	Worrisomeness	0.08
	Tension	-0.04
	Defensiveness	-0.15*
Questioningness	Argumentativeness	-0.29**
	Inquisitiveness	-0.03
	Philosophicalness	0.00
	Unconventionality	-0.10
Impression manipulativeness	Charm	-0.18**
	Concealingness	-0.12
	Inscrutableness	0.00
	Ingratiation	-0.20**
Verbal aggressiveness	Angriness	-0.24**
	Authoritarianism	-0.25**
	Derogatoriness	-0.37**
	Non-supportiveness	-0.28**
Dimensions Total	Expressiveness	0.01
	Preciseness	0.04
	Verbal aggressiveness	-0.39**
	Questioningness	-0.16**
	Impression manipulativeness	-0.19**
	Emotionality	-0.06

Table 8: Correlation matrix of the teachers' communication style dimensions and communication etiquette

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

The aforementioned can be explained by the fact that the teachers' communication style expresses learned and corrected behaviour, behaviour that can be changed, while communication etiquette is represented by a habit that is often acted out unconsciously. For example, some teachers know what empathy is, but they are not empathetic in their daily work. They think they are, but they do not apply this knowledge or they do not know how exactly to apply it. Partial complementarity can be explained by the fact that teachers have only a partial knowledge of communication etiquette (i.e. communication culture, which also contains certain generally accepted patterns of behaviour that cannot be regarded as quality communication).

Conclusion

The research, through the use of the CSI questionnaire with six communication style dimensions and their 24 characteristics, has shown a more precise analysis of teacher–student communication behaviours compared to the generally accepted three-part classification of styles. The elementary school teachers in the City of Zagreb and Zagreb County prefer a *compliant* or *passive* style of communication, which means that they prefer the *preciseness* and *emotionality* communication style dimensions. However, a more precise analysis of communication style aspects has shown that teachers use both the *assertive* and *passive* communication styles, with preference for *expressiveness* from the *assertive* style and *emotionality* from the *compliant* style. On the basis of the results of the tests that were conducted for quality teacher communication knowledge or communication etiquette, it can be concluded that teachers have some knowledge of quality communication but do not fully apply it. The knowledge that they have is not in line with their assessment of the application of communication skills or styles. Here, a difference can be observed between the results obtained in terms of the communication style dimensions. The results show the uniformity of application of communication styles in relation to the different academic fields. The groups of sociolinguistics, science and pedagogy teachers did not show statistically significant differences between them in their application of communication styles or their dimensions. The only statistically significant difference was found between the groups of science and pedagogy teachers (the teachers in the pedagogy field primarily apply the *compliant* and *passive* communication styles while the others predominantly apply the *assertive* style). There is no difference in the choice of communication style or in the application of communication etiquette for certain teachers in different academic fields. It seems that teachers somewhat adjust their ways of communicating (possibly due to the school culture and the unwritten rules of communication in the teaching profession), but to fully understand this, it would be good to do further research on this subject.

References

- Bakić-Tomić, L. (2003). *Komunikološko-menadžerski profil rukovoditelja u hrvatskoj policiji*. Doktorska disertacija. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
- Brajša, P. (1993). *Pedagoška komunikologija: razgovor, problemi i konflikti u školi*. Zagreb: Školske novine.
- Bratanić, M. (1993). *Mikropedagogija-interakcijsko-komunikacijski aspekt odgoja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bratanić, M. (2000). *Paradoks odgoja. Studije i eseji*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Covey, S. R. (1995). *Sedam navika uspješnih ljudi*. Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga.
- De Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Siberg A. R., Van Gameren, K. and Vlug, M. (2009). The content and dimensionality of communication styles. *Communication Research*, issue 36, pp. 178–206.
- De Vries, R. E., Schouten, B. and Bakker-Pieper, A. (2013). The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI): A Six-Dimensional Behavioral Model of Communication Styles and Its Relation with Personality. *Communication Research*, 40, issue 4, pp. 506–532.
- Dubovicki, S. (2019). Futuristic Research Methods as an Encouragement for Predicting The Teaching of The Future. In: D. Matanović and A. Uemura (eds.). *Education and training as basis for future employment*. Osijek: Faculty of Education, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek and Faculty of Economics, Wakayama University, pp. 17–30.
- Jurčić, M. (2012). *Pedagoške kompetencije suvremenog učitelja*. Zagreb: Recedo.
- Jurić, V. (2005). Kurikulum suvremene škole. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, issue 2, pp. 185–186.
- Ginott, H. G. (1972). *Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers*. New York: NY: Macmillan.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2001). *Asian American ethnicity and communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirinić, G. (2019). *Vrijednosno orijentirana komunikacija*. Neobjavljena doktorska disertacija. Zagreb: Informacijsko – komunikacijski odsjek, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Kozmus, A. and Kirinić, G. (2010). Influence of the Teacher's Identification and the Contentment with the Profession on the Democratization of the School Field. In: V. Šimović, L. Bakić-Tomić and Z. Hubinkova (eds.). *Pre-Conference Proceedings of the Special Focus Symposium on 10th ICESKS: Information, Communication and Economic Sciences in the Knowledge Society*. Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, pp.109–117.
- Mušanović, M. (2001). Odgojno-obrazovne filozofije učitelja i akcijska istraživanja. In: V. Rosić (ed.). *Teorijsko-metodološka utemeljenost pedagoških istraživanja*. Rijeka: Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci, pp. 133–143.
- Myers, S. A., Edwards, C., Wahl, S. T. and Martin, M. M. (2007). The relationship between perceived instructor aggressive communication and college student involvement. *Communication Education*, 56, issue 4, pp. 495–508.
- Nacionalni okviri kurikuluma za predškolski odgoj i obrazovanje te opće obvezno i srednjoškolsko obrazovanje*. (2011). Zagreb: Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja Republike Hrvatske.
- Norton, R. W. (1983). *Communicator style: Theory, applications, and measures*. Beverly Hills: CA: Sage Publications.

- Peko, A., Varga, R., Mlinarević, V., Lukaš, M. and Munjiza, E. (2014). *Kulturom nastave (p)u učeniku*. Osijek: Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Fakultet za odgojne i obrazovne znanosti.
- Satir, V. (1972). *Selbtwert und Kommunikation*. Munchen: Pfeiffer.
- Schulz Von Thun, F. (2005). *Kako međusobno razgovaramo 1 (Smetnje i razjašnjenja)*. Zagreb: Erudita.
- Tot, D. (2010). Učeničke kompetencije i suvremena nastava. *Odgojne znanosti*, 12, issue 1, pp. 65–78.
- Ury, W. (1994). *Kako izbjeći »ne«, pregovaranje s nepopustljivima*. Zagreb: Durieux.
- Wahlroos, S. (1974). *Familiengluck kamm jeder lernen*. Frankfurt/M: Fischer.
- Watzlawick, P. (1967). *Menschliche Kommunikation*. Bern: Hans Huber.
- Zrilić, S. (2010). Kvaliteta komunikacije i socijalni odnosi u razredu. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 7, issue 2, pp. 231–242.

Giovanna KIRINIĆ (Osnovna škola Ive Andrića, Hrvaška)

KORELACIJA DIMENZIJ UČITELJEVIH KOMUNIKACIJSKIH STILOV IN KOMUNIKACIJSKEGA BONTONA

Povzetek: Razumevanje vzgojnih praks in spoštovanje potrebe po dvosmerni komunikaciji ter vzajemnih odnosih otrok, odraslih in učnega okolja zahtevata nenehno raziskovanje skupnega življenja in učenja vseh udeležencev. Razsežnosti učiteljevega komunikacijskega sloga omogoča temeljito analizo odnosa med učencem in učiteljem ter razumevanje določenega komunikacijskega sloga, ki je rezultat njihovega vedenja. Zato je bil cilj raziskave na vzorcu 257 osnovnošolskih učiteljev preučiti komunikacijske veščine ali komunikacijski bonton učiteljev in njihovo samooceno aplikacijo različnih komunikacijskih stilov pri njihovem vzgojno-izobraževalnem delu. Pri raziskavi sta bila uporabljena dva instrumenta: šestdimenzionalni vprašalnik o komunikacijskem slogu CSI (The Communication Styles Inventory, De Vries 2013) in vprašalnik o komunikacijskem bontonu, ki ga je po Watzlavikovih zakonih uredil Walroose (1974). Učitelji imajo raje skladen, pasiven slog komunikacije, to pomeni, da imajo raje dimenzije natančnosti in čustvenosti. Rezultati kažejo, da imajo učitelji nekaj znanja o dobri komunikaciji, vendar tega znanja ne uporabljajo v celoti.

Ključne besede: implicitna pedagogika, komunikacijska kompetenca, kakovostna komunikacija, kompetence učitelja

Elektronski naslov: gkirinic91@gmail.com