

Dissertations

Summer 6-1-2016

The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Employees with the Communication Satisfaction and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors

Edward R. De La Torre
Brandman University, edelatorre2882@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), [Organizational Communication Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

De La Torre, Edward R., "The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Employees with the Communication Satisfaction and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors" (2016). *Dissertations*. 52.
https://digitalcommons.umassglobal.edu/edd_dissertations/52

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by UMass Global ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UMass Global ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact christine.bombaro@umassglobal.edu.

The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Employees with the
Communication Satisfaction and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of Their
Supervisors

A Dissertation by
Edward De La Torre

Brandman University
Irvine, California
School of Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

May, 2016

Committee in charge:

Philip Pendley, Ed.D. Committee Chair

Sam Bresler, Ph.D.

Alan Enomoto, Ed.D.

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY

Chapman University System

Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership

The dissertation of Edward De La Torre is approved.



_____, Dissertation Chair
Philip Pendley, Ed.D.



_____, Committee Member
Sam Bresler, Ph.D.



_____, Committee Member
Alan Enomoto, Ed.D.



_____, Associate Dean
Patricia Clark White, Ed.D.

May 25, 2016

The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Workers with the
Communication Satisfaction with and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of

Their Supervisors

Copyright © 2016

by Edward De La Torre

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support my family, friends, teachers, and professors have given to me throughout the years and have spurred me to continue my learning, shared their thoughts and life experiences with me, and provided me with inspiration to continue to grow and transform as an individual.

ABSTRACT

The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Workers with the Communication Satisfaction with and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors

by Edward De La Torre

Each generation in the workplace shares characteristics that distinguish them from the generations before them. These differences in personality, behavior, and attitudes can result in intergenerational conflict, and these dynamics were identified by researchers when describing the interaction between young Millennial workers and their supervisors of the older generations. However, research did not explicitly test if these differences extend to the different communication styles that people exhibited in their verbal interactions. One such communication style paradigm, the Mok's Communication Styles Survey (MCSS), describes the actual communication style of an individual, and was used to see if Millennials communicated differently than their supervisors. The purpose of this study was to administer the MCSS to determine the communication style of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations. Also, the study investigated the relationship between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) and the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ), respectively.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	4
Organizational Communication.....	4
Communication Styles.....	5
The Three Generations in Today’s Workplace.....	8
Employee Engagement Factors.....	12
Statement of the Research Problem.....	13
Purpose Statement.....	14
Research Questions.....	15
Significance of the Problem.....	15
Definitions.....	16
Delimitations.....	19
Organization of the Study.....	20
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	21
Review of the Literature.....	21
Generations in the Modern Workplace.....	22
Causes of Intergenerational Conflict.....	26
Interpersonal Communication in the Workplace.....	28
Conversational Communication Styles.....	32
The Need to Understand and Mediate Communication Styles in the Workplace.....	38
Flexing Conversational Communication Styles.....	39
Practicing the Transformational Model of Communication.....	40
Employees’ Communication Satisfaction with their Managers.....	44
Employees’ Perceptions of their Managers as Competent Communicators.....	46
Conclusions.....	48
Synthesis Matrix.....	50
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	51
Overview.....	51
Purpose Statement.....	52
Research Questions.....	52
Research Design.....	53
Methodology.....	54
Population.....	56
Target Population.....	56
Sample.....	57
Sample Selection Process.....	58
Instrumentation.....	59
Mok’s Communication Styles Survey.....	59
Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory.....	61
Communicator Competence Questionnaire.....	61
Data Collection.....	62
Online Survey.....	63

Data Analysis	65
Limitations	67
Summary	69
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS.....	71
Overview.....	71
Purpose Statement.....	71
Research Questions.....	72
Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures	72
Population	73
Sample.....	74
Demographic Data	74
Industry of the Millennial Employment.....	75
Number of Years Worked in the Organization	76
Gender of Millennial Employees and Their Supervisors.....	76
Generational Cohort of the Supervisors.....	77
Presentation and Analysis of Data	78
Communication Styles of Millennial Employees	78
Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence Scales	79
Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles and Communication with Their Supervisors	83
Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles	84
Relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence of Supervisors	86
Summary.....	87
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
Summary of the Study	89
Purpose of the Study	89
Research Questions	89
Research Design.....	90
Population and Sample	90
Major Findings.....	90
Millennial Communication Styles	91
Communication Satisfaction with Millennials' Supervisors	92
Perceived Communicator Competence of the Millennials' Supervisors	92
Relationships between Millennial Communication Style and Satisfaction with and Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors.....	93
Relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence of Millennial Supervisors.....	94
Unexpected Findings	94
Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles	94
Conclusions.....	96
Millennials' Communication Satisfaction with their Supervisors	97
Supervisory Communicator Competence as Perceived by Millennial Employees.....	98
Relationship between Millennial Communication Style and Communication Satisfaction of Supervisors	99

Relationship between Millennial Communication Style and Communication Competence of Supervisors	100
Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles	101
Relationship between Millennial Communication Satisfaction with and Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors.....	102
Implications for Action	103
Recommendations for Further Research.....	106
Concluding Remarks and Reflections.....	110
REFERENCES	115
APPENDICES	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Industry of Millennial Employment	75
Table 2. Years Worked in Current Organization	76
Table 3. Gender of the Participants and Their Supervisors	77
Table 4. Generational Cohort of the Supervisors.....	77
Table 5. Millennial Employees' Dominant Communication Styles	78
Table 6. Results of the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory	80
Table 7. Results of the Communicator Competence Questionnaire	85
Table 8. Millennial Communication Styles and the Communication with Their Supervisors.....	87
Table 9. Relationships among Millennial Communication Styles	85
Table 10. The Relationships between Millennials' Communication Satisfaction with Their Supervisors and the Ratings of the Supervisors as Competent Communicators	87

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The first form of effective human communication began with the introduction of dance. In the pre-historic era, humans did not have the tool of language to communicate ideas and thoughts to one another, and instead used the physical form to connect with each other through expressive dance (Clampett, 2013). Over time, as humanity progressed, people developed words and the alphabet, created sentence structure and syntax, and eventually created various languages that evolved and are used today in various interactions, settings, and social groups.

The effective use of verbal communication is crucial across all organizations now that speech is the primary mode for transmitting thoughts and relaying messages from one person to another. Accurate verbal communication between a supervisor and an employee (vertical interaction) and between employee and employee (horizontal interaction) were just as important as communication between an employee and a customer (Laff, 2006; Madlock, 2008; Petitt, Goris, & Vaught, 1997). To be effective, communication must be open and able to travel freely across channels, and it may need to be coordinated between parties within an organization (Spiers, 2012). In fact, the technical aspects of communication were usually scrutinized by managers within an organization, but understanding the nuances in verbal communication among employees was often overlooked (Mishra, Boynton, & Mishra, 2014).

The verbal communication that occurs between two individuals is quite varied and comprised of several components. The two individuals must communicate a message using selected words from a common language, issue non-verbal cues to emphasize certain points and ideas in their message, and use a style in their verbal

delivery that often complements their specific personality, mood, or situation (Hamilton, 2011). Interestingly, researchers found that understanding another person's message depended less on the quality of the message and more on the style and non-verbal cues delivered during the interaction (Byron, 2007; Madlock, 2006). In fact, the controlled and confident communication style of Senator John F. Kennedy versus the nervous and accelerated style of Vice President Richard M. Nixon was thought to be a contributing factor in the historic perception of Kennedy's triumph in the first televised U.S. Presidential debate in 1960 (Jelphs, 2006).

As mentioned, an individual's communication style was thought to usually reflect his or her personality type. The Ancient Greeks, for instance, believed in four types of personalities with distinct communication styles—*Sanguine* people spoke energetically and expressively; *Phlegmatic* people spoke slowly and thoughtfully; *Melancholic* people spoke cautiously and courteously; and *Choleric* people spoke quickly and aggressively (Jourdain, 2004). The belief in four communication styles progressed through time and was repeated again by Carl Jung in 1933 (as cited by Hanke, 2009), except with modified descriptors for the styles that were generated by the Ancient Greeks—*Collaborator*, *Analyzer*, *Socializer*, and *Controller*, respectively—and again by Dr. Paul Mok (1975) who developed the Mok Communication Styles Survey (MCSS) to determine if an individual's communication style reflected that of an *Expressive*, *Analytical*, *Amiable*, or *Driver* (as cited by Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Mok (1975) believed that, with the knowledge of an employee's communication style, a manager would be able to *flex* his or her communication style to match the style of the employee to enhance the effectiveness of verbal communication.

Understanding the differences in communication styles that individuals shared could help the generational conflict plaguing the managers of the Baby Boomer and Generation (Gen) X generations that supervise Millennial employees (Chi, Maier, & Gursoy, 2013; Schullery, 2013). In today's workplace, those in the Baby Boomer and Gen X cohorts were typically in the middle- and upper-management levels of organizations. These managers shared similar values and attitudes, such as the importance of hard work, sacrifice, resilience, and respect for authority (Nahavandi, 2006). Given that these managers shared qualities, it would follow that their communication styles would also be similar. However, the Millennials, who grew up in a time of general prosperity, were coddled by both society and their parents, and were typically characterized as confident, team-oriented, positivistic, impatient, lazy, and entitled (Johnson, 2006; Schullery, 2013). Millennials, therefore, would likely have communication styles that differ from their supervisors. Unfortunately, research has yet to provide evidence that these generational cohorts indeed share different communication styles.

The differences in these communication styles may relate to the trouble that supervisors had in keeping Millennial employees engaged at work (Park & Gursoy, 2012; Schullery, 2013). Employee engagement was described as the interaction between motivation and work performance, in which a highly motivated employee was likely to perform well on the job and be expressly engaged in the work (Tillott, Walsh, & Moxham, 2013). The drivers behind employee motivation and performance were numerable, but research showed that employees' job stress, communication satisfaction with their supervisor, and perceptions of their supervisor as a competent communicator

affected their ratings of employee engagement (Madlock, 2008; Park & Gursoy, 2012). Thus, investigating the relationships of the differences in communication styles that potentially exist between the generations in the workplace, specifically those of supervisors in the Baby Boomer and Gen X generations and of their Millennial employees, with factors such as communication satisfaction and communicator competence, may lead to a greater understanding of how communication affects employee engagement.

Background

Organizational Communication

Organizational communication studies greatly researched the effectiveness of interactions between supervisors and their employees (vertical communication), as well as the effectiveness of the verbal exchanges from employee-to-employee (lateral communication; Goris, Vaught, & Pettit, 2000; Hamilton, 2011). Ensuring that an organization's infrastructure was able to support a free flow of information between all work groups, and that supervisors emphasized an open door policy to their employees when discussing what was on their minds were heavily studied and encouraged in the 1980s (Anderson & Dale, 1981; Penley & Hawkins, 1985), especially after the advent of the internet and introduction of electronic messaging systems in the 1990s (Pettit et al., 1997). Today, an organization's communication effectiveness was greatly judged on the immediacy in which information could be sent and received within an organization, and the versatility that existed in the transmission of the information (Krapels & Davis, 2000), such as through electronic mailing systems, teleconferencing, and remote video contact. However, less consideration was given to examining the humanistic side of

communication and the consequences that resulted from person-to-person contact (Mishra et al., 2014). In fact, research showed that the effective transmission of a message was more reliant on the non-verbal cues and communication style that a person used rather than the quality of the message itself (Jelphs, 2006). Interestingly, although most institutions in higher education pledged to educate and train young generations of students on how to be professional workers, the schools did not incorporate any courses on person-to-person communication within the curriculum (Bhatt, 2011). Luckily, the momentum for studying the human qualities associated with communication that started in Ancient Greece began to make its way into the consciousness of business school educators and human resource managers (Hynes, 2012).

Communication Styles

Much like people noted as having distinct personalities that characterized their general behavioral and cognitive tendencies, everyone has a distinctive communication style when relaying information to another person (Bakker-Pieper & de Vries, 2013). These communication styles were largely overlooked and unknown to both the communicator and the receiver of the information, as well as of the influence the communication style had in the delivery and reception of the message from one person to the other (Jelphs, 2006).

The Ancient Greeks were the first noted scholars to investigate the communication styles that people employed, and they theorized that most people could be characterized as sharing one of four different personality types (Jourdain, 2004). Sanguine people had a spirited style in their speech and invested a lot of energy and emotion when they communicated. Conversely, Phlegmatic people were cool and

reserved, usually choosing to communicate through facts and details. Melancholic people were supportive and oriented their speaking patterns toward people and relationships, and shared a sympathetic tone in their communication. Choleric people, on the other hand, preferred brief communication and usually drove the conversation, often covering many topics over the course of a discussion. The Ancient Greeks attributed these differences in communication styles to the excess of certain bodily fluids in different people. Although this physiological explanation of communication styles was eventually struck down over time, the theory of the varying communication styles was perpetuated (de Vries & Bakker-Pieper, 2010).

In the Romantic period of intellectual discovery, Carl Jung (as cited by Hanke, 2009) lent his own descriptors of the proposed communication styles that existed in organizations. Jung called Sanguine people Collaborators for their ability to talk freely with people to gain multiple perspectives before rendering decisions; Phlegmatic people were depicted as Analyzers for their desire to cover facts and figures and to delve into the nuances of a topic; Melancholic people were denoted as Socializers for emphasizing relationships and harmony between the people with whom they were close; and Choleric people were labeled Controllers for their forceful maneuvering in steering the conversation in the direction they wanted to go (Hanke, 2009).

Almost a century later, Dr. Paul Mok (as cited by Hartman & McCambridge, 2011) construed a similar framework to the communication styles proposed by Jung. However, Mok emphasized that an individual's communication style could be broken down into two scales: the rapidity and aggressiveness in which they spoke, and the focus of their discussion, whether it was on facts and details or on people and affiliations.

Based on this scale, four communication styles again arose, with Expressives noted as those who spoke hastily but were concerned with people and their connection to them; with Analyticals highlighted as those who spoke slowly and were eager to discuss the details and nuances of a topic; with Amiables described as those who also spoke slowly but were preoccupied with the feelings and thoughts of others; and with Drivers defined as those who spoke quickly and were concerned with getting facts and making decisions (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Although other researchers following Mok proposed their own take on the four communication styles, such as Edmonson's (2009) paradigm that emphasized the purpose behind each chosen style (i.e., Expressives and emotions, Systematics and processes, Sympathetics and relationships, and Directs and the big-picture), Mok developed the MCSS to determine the precise communication style that a person was likely to exhibit in conversation (as cited by Hartman & McCambridge, 2011).

Flexing a person's communication style. Unlike the previously noted scholars, Mok (as cited by Hamilton, 2011) believed that a speaker's communication style could be flexed as the situation allowed, even if the style was markedly different from the speaker's personality. In fact, Mok purported that Vice President Richard M. Nixon's inability to flex his communication style cost him the victory in the first televised presidential debate against Senator Kennedy because most of the public was smitten by the confident, assertive, and assured tone of the young senator even though Nixon was noted as having more informed and well-thought responses to the questions that were asked by the mediator (Jelphs, 2006; Nahavandi, 2006). Other researchers who supported Mok's paradigm and notion of flexing one's personal communication style

partially attributed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (N.A.S.A.) Challenger disaster with mission controls inability to understand the communication styles of the astronauts. That is, the frantic mission control staff could not adequately convey life-saving information to the astronauts aboard the space shuttle regarding spotty system diagnostics during takeoff with the controlled and clear speech that was needed in the seconds following takeoff (Jelphs, 2006). Thus, understanding communication styles and the effect styles have on the reception of information is important when there are already a great number of differences surrounding people when they attempt to communicate (Nahavandi, 2006).

The Three Generations in Today's Workplace

In today's workplace, three generations of people can generally be found working alongside one another: the Baby Boomer, Gen X, and Millennial generations. Those of the Baby Boomer (born 1946 thru 1964) and Gen X (born 1965 thru 1982) generations mainly hold the upper management and supervisory roles in working organizations, whereas those of the Millennial generation (born 1983 thru 2000) largely fill the entry level and rank-and-file positions within the organizations (Johnson, 2006). These generations represent unique characteristics and values given the shared experiences they lived through—a type of “family cords that tie people within the generational cohorts together” (Larson, 2013, p. 342).

Baby Boomers and Generation X. In the United States, Baby Boomers enjoyed the prosperous time in American history following World War II, as well as the social turbulence that encompassed the 1960s and 1970s. Due to these experiences, Baby Boomers developed a respect for order, authority, and stability, and they understand the

sacrifices that come with assuming responsibility (Nahavandi, 2006). Similarly, those in Gen X grew up in the 1970s and early 1980s, a time in which the United States was in a malaise due to social strife, foreign affairs, and energy crises (Gursoy, Geng-Qing Chi, & Karadag, 2013). Similar to the Baby Boomers, these experiences taught Gen X to seek wealth and security, but it also created a certain sense of cynicism toward life and urged them to embrace new discoveries that helped create a more efficient and resilient lifestyle (Ferri-Reed, 2013). Needless to say, the experiences of those characterized as Baby Boomers and Gen X crafted similar personalities among those who head today's organizations. Bakker-Piper and de Vries (2013) asserted that these shared personalities also influenced the development of similar communication styles among these generations, those of which were different from the young Millennial generation.

Millennial generation. The Millennial generation was raised in an era of rapid growth and success in the United States, in which the nation became a superpower and technological advances boomed. Being the sons and daughters of the previous generations, the Millennials were sheltered and catered to by their parents (McAlister, 2009). These Millennials grew up in the late 1980s and 1990s, in a time when their uniqueness was cherished and celebrated, and they were imbued with a great sense of confidence, a team-oriented approach to problem-solving, and a high comfort with technology (Johnson, 2006). As this generation entered the workforce, they, unfortunately, were depicted as entitled, impatient, and inattentive by the older generations who supervise and mentor them (Cekada, 2012; Schullery, 2013).

Generational conflict. Given the generations in the workplace held such distinct values, attitudes, and personalities partly as a result of the time in which they grew up,

there was a noticeable generational conflict within the different levels of organizations across the country (Chi et al., 2013). Since the Millennial generation was often preoccupied with the technological devices that were woven into the fabric of their lives and were constantly shifting their focus from one project to another, the older generations often cited this younger generation as lazy and inattentive (Schullery, 2013). Conversely, the Millennial generation often viewed the older generations with disdain for being slow, unappreciative, and unwilling to relinquish power due to the latter's preoccupation with ensuring safety and security for themselves and the organizations in which they served (Rikleen, 2014). As Nahavandi (2006) pointed out, what none of the generations may be aware of, however, was that a source of their cross-generational conflict might not be from their actions, but from the way they communicated their thoughts and ideas to each other.

Generations and communication styles. Given that each of the generations held different values, behaviors, and even personalities on a macro-level, it could reason that the generations also held different communication styles. Under Mok's (1975) communication styles paradigm, Drivers and Analyticals were similar in that they usually focused on facts and objective details. As a result, they tended to adopt a more neutral and cautious form of speech. Those of the Baby Boomer and Gen X generations may be apt to exhibit communication style characteristics of Drivers and Analyticals because they were more focused on establishing facts and details to ensure safety and security in the information they presented (Ferri-Reed, 2013). Amiables and Expressives on the other hand, were more heavily focused on talking about people, their relationships with others, and personal observations of the shared environment. Thus, the Millennial

generation might exercise communication style characteristics of Amiables and Expressives due to their emphasis on developing relationships with those around them, especially their supervisors (Madlock, 2006; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Walther, 1988). Although testing on these types of communication style differences between the generations was not done, it was possible part of the conflict between the generations was owed to the manner in which they communicated.

This type of intergenerational conflict could easily be avoided if employees were trained on the differences in communication styles and how to translate and receive messages from one cohort to the next (Steward, 2009). For instance, if an Amiable Millennial knew his or her supervisor was a Driver who desired only to talk quickly and efficiently about the tasks before them, the Millennial could take this communication style into account and not be offended by the supervisor's task-oriented approach. Similarly, if a Driver supervisor of the Baby Boomer generation understood that his or her Amiable Millennial employee desired to interact on a relational level before jumping into work on daily tasks, the supervisor might be more willing to engage the employee in personal chit-chat for a short time each day. This type of communication interplay could theoretically enhance the relationship between the supervisor and employee, and promote employee engagement as a consequence. However, given that the generations of workers in organizations were unaware of the interplay in communication styles (Hanke, 2009), the dissonance could affect the employee engagement factors among the Millennial generation.

Employee Engagement Factors

Employee engagement was depicted as the interaction between employee motivation and job performance. Employees described as highly engaged would be both highly motivated to perform their work and excel in actually doing it (Schullery, 2013). How motivation and performance spurred was widely studied, and some of the most salient factors contributing to high motivation and performance were communication satisfaction and communicator competence (Mishra et al., 2014).

Communication satisfaction. Communication satisfaction was shown to relate to higher motivation and performance (Donald & Lotz, 2006). Communication satisfaction often stemmed from communication accuracy between an employee and supervisor (Pettit et al., 1997); when a supervisor was able to clearly and completely relay messages and information to employees, the employees reported higher levels of motivation and scored higher on assessments of job performance. Supervisors that communicated their vision and expectations to their employees, as well as those who demonstrated high emotional intelligence (EI) by communicating empathy and concern for their employees' welfare, often garnered reports of higher communication satisfaction from their employees (Madlock, 2008; Tillott et al., 2013). Although Hynes (2012) believed that a supervisor who was able to *speak the language* of the employees (i.e., mirror employee communication styles) would earn higher ratings of communication satisfaction, Madlock (2008) insisted that such a relationship was not clearly established in current research.

Communicator competence. A supervisor's communicator competence was another factor associated with high employee motivation and job performance (Madlock, 2008). A supervisor considered to be a competent communicator often led employees

who were highly motivated and exhibited good job performance, whereas a supervisor who was not described as a competent communicator was often associated with employees who had low motivation and low job performance (Eadie & Paulson, 1984; McKinley & Perino, 2013). Supervisors were usually described as competent communicators if they exhibited certain EI skills, such as accurate perception of and response to their employees' non-verbal cues, and appealing to their employees through charismatic speech by using language, gestures, and voice control to persuade them into understanding and accepting their messages (Byron, 2007). Thus, supervisors who demonstrated communication styles similar to their employees' would theoretically garner higher ratings of communicator competence than supervisors whose communication styles differed greatly from their employees' (Pavitt, 1990). As Hanke (2009) put it, "recognizing (communication) styles in yourself and others helps us to build influence and build relationships, and to become better communicators" (p. 22).

Statement of the Research Problem

The assertion that individuals within the different generations had similar personalities was established through detailed research. In fact, the individuals within each generation were noted as sharing similar values, work behaviors, and outlooks on the world (Ferri-Reed, 2013). However, the assumption that people in each generation shared similar styles of communication had not been tested. Moreover, the idea that members of the Millennial generation (described as outgoing, positive, and confident) shared communication styles had not been verified (Rikleen, 2014).

In the workplace, numerous studies established differences in the technical aspects of communication between workers and their supervisors at each level of an

organization's hierarchy (Anderson & Dale, 1981). Specifically, communication differences existed in the channels, transmission, and flow of information from vertical (e.g., supervisor-to-subordinate) and lateral (e.g., between groups) perspectives. However, the notion that the generations of different workers in today's organizations have different communication styles had not been explored (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010).

Although the MCSS was developed to identify the different communication behaviors and manners that people shared as a team-building and self-discovery tool, it has yet to be used to validate that shared communication styles that exist within each of the generations (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). In fact, the use of a communication styles instrument in determining the significant differences in styles between generations of people has not been conducted either (Hynes, 2012).

Exploring the relationships that communication styles have on various engagement factors at work among Millennial employees has yet to be thoroughly conducted and recorded (Donald & Lotz, 2006). More to the point, what effects these communication styles have specifically on employees' communication satisfaction and perceptions of supervisory communication competence has yet to be researched and identified (Madlock, 2008).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this descriptive, bivariate correlational study was to determine the communication styles of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations, the correlation between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and the correlation between perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the Interpersonal

Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) and the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ), respectively.

Research Questions

1. What are the communication styles of Millennial employees as measured by the MCSS?
2. What are the level of Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?
3. What is the relationship between the Millennials' communication styles, as measured by the MCSS, and the Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and the Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?

Significance of the Problem

Past research showed evidence that people within each generation tended to share different values, beliefs, and personalities from people in generations that lived before and after them (Schullery, 2013). These recognized differences extended to the generations employed in the modern U.S. workplace, and Millennials were found to communicate greatly different from those of the older generations by having a heavier reliance on technology as the medium for a majority of their interactions (Lazarus, 2015). These differences led to noticeable generational conflicts in the workplace and investments in training among current organizations to instruct employees on understanding these dissimilarities (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Schullery, 2013). However, no study concretely tackled whether or not Millennials interacted differently than the older

generations based on their communication styles (Chi et al., 2013; Jourdain, 2014). Thus, the objective of this study was to fill the research gap regarding the possibility of communication style differences between the generations, particularly between Millennial employees and their supervisors.

Moreover, if communication style differences existed between Millennial employees and their supervisors, there was yet to be a study that explored how these differences related to the communication satisfaction and perceptions of supervisory communicator competence experienced by the Millennial employees (Hanke, 2009; Madlock, 2008; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Business schools in higher education were yet to address the need for instructing students on the existence of communication styles in workplace communication (Hynes, 2012), nor did most of the training programs developed by current organizations that instruct employees on generational differences incorporate information regarding communication style differences (Bhatt, 2011). Thus, if communication style differences existed and were discovered to be significantly correlated to Millennials' communication satisfaction with and perceptions of communicator competence of their supervisors, an argument could be made for the inclusion of communication styles in the curriculum of business schools and in the instructional content of organizational training programs.

Definitions

Several operational and theoretical definitions were used throughout this study regarding generations, communication styles, communication satisfaction, and communicator competence.

Communicator Competence. Communicator competence is closely related to communication satisfaction, but fundamentally different in that it indicates how effective an individual is at relaying a message clearly and completely within the context of the social and environmental situation of any conversation (Downs, Smith, Chatham, & Boyle, 1986). For the purpose of this study, communicator competence indicated how effective an individual was at accomplishing the objectives of the conversation (McKinley & Perino, 2013). The objective of a conversation between a supervisor and employees could be motivational or to provide them with learning. Competent communicators usually employed various interactive resources to relay their thoughts and ideas, such as through their use of the language and voice, as well as the timing of the message (Madlock, 2008), which were measurable through the CCQ.

Communication Satisfaction. Communication satisfaction had innumerable theoretical definitions in past research. For the purpose of this study, as within similar studies conducted by Madlock (2006) and Myers and Goodboy (2014), communication satisfaction was the reported satisfaction an individual received from feeling comforted and validated from another individual. Specifically, communication satisfaction reflected the level of emotional appreciation and gratification an employee received when engaging in conversation with his or her supervisor. This type of communication satisfaction was measured through the ICSI.

Communication Styles. Communication between two individuals is about relaying information or a new idea and involves thinking and feeling about the message an individual is trying to convey and responding to that message through one's own thoughts and feelings (Bhatt, 2011). How individuals communicated was closely tied to

their personality because an individual's motivations and emotions were also guided by the broader personality traits (Bakker-Pieper & de Vries, 2013). Thus, for the purpose of this study, a communication style characterized the behavioral and emotive manner an individual exercised when engaged in conversation to signal how the meaning of a message should be interpreted, filtered, and understood (Duran & Zakahi, 1984; Hamilton, 2011). The MCSS model characterized four such communication styles as Expressive (animated and self-oriented), Amiable (considerate and relationship-oriented), Analytical (detailed and fact-oriented), and Driven (deliberate and task-oriented; Hartman & McCambridge, 2011; Mok, 1975).

Generations. As Larson (2013) explained, “demographics describe people in quantifiable terms of their shared attributes” (p. 340). One type of demographic is the age of a group of people; a group of people born in a certain time span are often combined into a specific demographic known as a *generation* of people. These generations often held a set of shared experiences due to the social and geo-political events that occurred in their formative years (Ferri-Reed, 2013). These shared experiences created *family chords* (Larson, 2013), and give birth to certain values, perspectives, and behaviors among the people within the generation (Gursoy et al., 2013). For the purpose of this study, the generations that currently staff the U.S. workplace comprised of Baby Boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964), Generation X (those born between 1965 and 1982), and Millennial (those born between 1983 and 2000) employees (Johnson, 2006; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Nahavandi, 2006).

Delimitations

A few delimitations were made in the study concerning the population, instrumentation, and variables investigated. The first delimitation was that the target population of the study, which was Millennials currently employed within the Southern California area. Millennials were targeted in this study due to the limited resources available in reaching a larger targeted population and the required convenience of the study. This targeted population reduced the generalizability of the results to a regionalized part of the country.

The second delimitation was that the target population comprised of those born from 1983 to 2000, and the age range of the sampled Millennial employees was 18 to 32 years old (i.e., those born between 1983 and 1997). Hence, a small portion of the Millennial generation (those born between 1998 and 2000) was excluded from participating in the study. However, given the majority of the Millennials fell within the age range legally allowed to work without a permit, it was fair to assume that the sample was representative of the employed Millennial population.

The third delimitation was that the sample of Millennial employees surveyed in this study was influenced by human resource administrators who informed these employees of the study (for a full discussion of how these administrators were contacted regarding the survey, please see the Research Design section of Chapter III). It was possible that human resource administrators who recognized good relations between the Millennial employees and their supervisors disseminated the information about the survey to those employees in hopes of capturing favorable ratings of communication satisfaction and supervisory communicator competence within the study. Thus, the

results of the study were predisposed by the actions and inactions of the human resource administrators.

Organization of the Study

In the following chapters the relationship between Millennial employees' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with and perceptions of their supervisor's communicator competence was examined and analyzed. In Chapter II, the development of and current framework of Mok's (1975) communication styles paradigm, as well as the past research concerning the employee engagement factors of communication satisfaction and communicator competence, are examined more closely. In Chapter III, the methodology of this quantitative study, the population and sample, and the instrumentation used in the study is discussed, and in Chapter IV the relationship between the Millennial employees' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with and perceptions of their supervisor's communicator competence is examined through a correlation analysis. In Chapter V, the conclusions from the analysis, recommendations for future studies related to the topic, and how supervisors should interact with their Millennial employees is outlined.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research regarding characteristics of the generations in today's workforce, the different communication style paradigms that attempt to define the complex intricacies in verbal conversations between individuals, and the impact of these dynamics on employees' communication satisfaction and perceptions of communicator competence toward their managers varied as separate topics of study. No single study attempted an investigation into the interplay between the generations and their communication styles, and the resulting communication satisfaction and perceptions of managerial communicator competence. Thus, a review of the current literature concerning the different generations in the workplace, sources of generational conflict, models of communication styles, and the various communication variables was conducted to provide an academic foundation for the study.

Review of the Literature

The three generations comprising today's workforce showed distinct characteristics that often caused conflict between colleagues belonging to the different generational cohorts, especially between Millennial employees and their older managers. Among the characteristics that separated the generations, the different communication styles that individuals exhibited within the different cohorts could contribute to the disparity. These disparities may be reflected in employees' communication satisfaction with and their perceptions of their managers' communicator competence, so a discussion of the past research regarding the generations, their communication styles, and the aforementioned employee engagement factors was necessitated by the research questions posed in this study.

Generations in the Modern Workplace

The three generations of individuals in today's workplace (Baby Boomers, Generation Xers, and Millennials) were divided into separate age cohorts. Individuals within these cohorts shared attributes—behaviors and attitudes that took shape through shared life experiences as a result of being born in close approximation with other individuals in their cohort. These life experiences triggered the development of emotions and memories that guided their shared perceptions of the world around them, and created a set of family chords that linked these individuals together (Larson, 2013). These common perceptions also gave light to the creation of motivations and values that individuals within the generations upheld throughout their lifetimes. By extension, work values and job preferences were often shared between individuals within the respective generations, as were end-goals such as work satisfaction, job quality, and other extrinsic rewards (Gursoy et al., 2013; Nahavandi, 2006). Thus, the disparities in the characteristics comprising each generation led to documented incidences of intergenerational conflict in today's organizations.

Baby Boomers. Baby Boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964) grew up in a time of prosperity and of growing global conflict. They therefore developed a preference for steadiness and consistency. Baby Boomers believed that “stability in work was extremely important and was a great source of pride in their lives” (Smith, 2012, p. 19). They were characterized as workaholics, cherished hard effort and sacrifice, valued loyalty and teamwork, and were upwardly mobile throughout their long careers (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Gursoy et al., 2013). When interacting with others, Baby Boomers preferred communication that was brief and meaningful (Dysart, 1963), and could easily identify

and process body language to infer the mood and motivations of their colleagues (Walmsley, 2011). However, when observed by researchers in the field, Baby Boomer workers preferred plain, direct words when discussing projects and work assignments, while keeping in mind that the ultimate goal was getting the job done (Gursoy et al., 2013).

Generation Xers. Generation Xers (those born between 1965 and 1982) grew up in a time of political and social malaise, and were therefore skeptical toward authority and rules, and valued independence and resilience (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Gursoy et al., 2013). Gen Xers enjoyed flexibility in their work, were self-motivated, and were known to take on multiple tasks as long as they could set their own priorities (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Smith, 2012). After seeing their parents become workaholics and distant as a result of their careers, Gen Xers valued work-life balance and preferred face-time with their colleagues (Smith, 2012; Walmsley, 2011). In collective observations of Gen Xers in the workplace, they generally displayed good personal interaction by communicating informally, but messages had to be concise and clear (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Walmsley, 2011).

Similarities between Baby Boomers and Gen Xers. Although the Baby Boomers and Gen Xers were raised in two distinct periods in American history, there were some notable similarities in the values and behaviors between the two cohorts. Both generations worked hard, put responsibility ahead of pleasure, and became increasingly driven by upholding policies and traditions in their organizations (Ferri-Reed, 2013). The generational cohorts also valued direct communication, with an emphasis on clarity and brevity. As mentors, Baby Boomers and Gen Xers brought something new to the lives of

the young by igniting new ideas and challenging perceptions of an ever-changing world (Johnson, 2006). Thus, as managers, Baby Boomers and Gen Xers shared a common goal in socializing and instructing Millennials, albeit with certain value and communication preferences that conflicted with the younger generation.

Millennials. Millennials (those born between 1983 and 2000) were raised in an era in which the United States was growing rapidly as a superpower in the global economy, as a world leader in technological advancements, and as a powerhouse in the geo-political landscape. Just as Americans championed themselves for being on top of the world, they also championed their children, sheltered them, and placed them as a top priority in their lives (McAlister, 2009; Steward, 2009). Millennial children were showered with attention, prized for being individuals, and honored for simply participating in competitive events (Cekada, 2012); this imbued Millennials with a high confidence and belief they could achieve anything (Johnson, 2006; Smith, 2012). This optimistic generation became increasingly empowered as they aged, especially with the introduction of technological inventions such as the Internet and mobile connection devices (Behrens, 2009; Johnson, 2006; McAlister, 2009). Like no other generation before them, Millennials lives became intertwined with technology, whether it was to seek entertainment and escapism through video games, to maintain contact with friends and family instantaneously through electronic messaging systems and mobile phones, or to gain information on almost any given topic through the Internet (Roehling, Vander Kooi, Dykemia, Quisenberry, & Vandlen, 2011; Walmsley, 2011). The combination of being socialized into confident, tech-savvy, and knowledgeable young adults, however, also debilitated the generation in certain ways.

Although extraordinarily tech-savvy and exceptional problem-solvers, Millennials developed a narcissistic attitude and unfamiliarity with not having their expectations met in most circumstances (Behrens, 2009; Gursoy et al., 2013). These problems were thought to stem from being coddled by their *helicopter* parents, and from the luxury of growing up in a world that was becoming increasingly wired and connected, one in which waiting for information and the delivery of products became immensely shortened (Cekada, 2012; Steward, 2009). Due to being raised in a time of constant stimulation and movement, Millennials were easily bored, expected variety in their work, and craved constant interactivity with others (Rikleen, 2014; Smith, 2012). Additionally, Millennials were raised with constant appreciation and praised for being exceptional in anything they attempted (Wheless & Berryman-Fink, 1985), so as adults they were generally unused to criticism and sensitive to being corrected, especially in public (Roehling et al., 2011).

In the workplace, Millennials were well-equipped to interact with the generations that came before them, nor were they socialized well enough to engage each other in meaningful face-to-face interactions (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011; Walmsley, 2011). Millennials were not as challenged by their parents nor by the world around them to fight for their successes and prove their points of view as much as Baby Boomers and Gen Xers had to in their formative years. As a result, Millennials were highly similar in their impressionability (Schullery, 2013; Taniguchi & Aune, 2013), were uncomfortable and inexperienced with questioning authority, and were unwilling to acknowledge what they did not know or ask for help when needed (Johnson, 2006). Millennials allocated fewer personal resources and less energy in their jobs than the older generations because Millennials' focus and personal motivations stemmed from sources outside of their work

(Park & Gursoy, 2012). They also placed low importance on developing skills associated with professional success due to the over-confidence they acquired in their upbringing (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011; Wheelless & Berryman-Fink, 1985). Despite this, Millennials desired immediate recognition and promotion from their managers for performing their daily duties (Gursoy et al., 2013), and grew impatient and frustrated when their personal inquiries and desires for praise from their managers went unanswered (Rikleen, 2014). Although not all Millennials were alike and portrayed all of the behaviors specified above, studies showed that, as a generational cohort in the workplace, Millennials were more like-minded than individuals in the older generations (Schullery, 2013).

Causes of Intergenerational Conflict

Intergenerational differences in perspectives, attitudes, and behaviors often created conflict and personal barriers in the modern workplace, resulting in high employee turnover and decreased productivity (Chi et al., 2013). Most of the conflict between attitudes and behaviors stemmed from value-based differences—philosophies and guiding principles developed through childhood and adolescence (Schullery, 2013). These value differences among the generations were prevalent among Western European cultures, including the United States (Nahavandi, 2006). People naturally preferred to interact with people they liked and shared commonalities with, and avoided or moved away from those they did not like and were greatly dissimilar from; thus, generations of individuals usually form sharply divided opinions toward the Millennials (Madlock, 2006). For instance, Baby Boomers and Gen Xers placed a heavy emphasis on their careers when defining their lives, but work was not as instrumental in Millennials' lives

and instead merely played a supporting role in providing for the lifestyle that they desired (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Thus, members of the older generation were apprehensive about inviting younger employees to join in projects at work, often believing that the younger generation did not toil as hard and lacked respect for the purpose of their work (Nahavandi, 2006; Schullery, 2013). Also, the older generations regarded Millennials as entitled, and that they were “unlikely to give whole-hearted effort to anything that does not suit their over-active attention spans” (Schullery, 2013, p. 257).

Friction in the generational divide did not only flow from the old to the young because older employees had more positive perceptions of the old generation (Chi et al., 2013). Young employees often viewed their older managers as slow and resistant to change, and as overly tied to their jobs. Moreover, Millennials generally worked out of a sheer need for survival, valuing free time more than work time and preferring to develop quick solutions to problems rather than investing long hours on a project (Ferri-Reed, 2013; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Moreover, Millennials, as digital learners, prefer to learn at their own pace through online media, rather than spending time in one-on-one training or formal classroom settings, so they had requisite time for reflection and practice (Matulich, Papp, & Haytko, 2008). Additionally, Millennials grew increasingly frustrated when engaging in face-time with managers who desired to understand an emotional component to a situation. Millennials instead preferred to instant message or write emails as the basis for their communication (Lazarus, 2015; Matulich et al., 2008). Despite this, if a Millennial were to fail on a certain task, such as servicing the needs of a customer, the Millennial was likely to blame their manager for their shortcomings rather

than to admit fault and seek help to ensure preparedness when encountering the same problem in the future (Steward, 2009).

Organizations took some measures to bridge the generations working side-by-side in the workplace by having older and younger employees work on short-term projects in cross-generational groups. These groups were successful when they comprised of workers from different functions in the organization, usually because trust must be given to the respective expert in the specific functions regardless of the age of the employee (Johansen, 2002; Keller, 2001). This instantaneous trust allowed for interactions to occur without interference from prejudices and preconceptions, such as notions about an employee's age that distorted communication and understanding, and taught employees how to deal with ambiguity and cope with stress (Keller, 2001; Krapels & Davis, 2000; Saphiere, Mikk, & de Vries, 2005). Additionally, Millennials learned to solve complex problems on their own or coordinate a solution among peers, which helped them to appreciate the experience and expertise that older employees brought to the project (Johansen, 2002; Krapels & Davis, 2000). Despite these noted successes, intergenerational conflict continued to plague the workplace, with differences in communication styles possibly contributing to the dissonance (Saphiere et al., 2005).

Interpersonal Communication in the Workplace

Studies on communication in the workplace usually focused on one of the six components in interpersonal interaction: the speakers (who did the talking), the message (what was talked about), the location (where the conversation was held), the medium (the mode of interaction), the manner (how the message was relayed), and the flow of the interaction (the pattern or rhythm of the conversation; Saphiere et al., 2002). As

aforementioned, dance was one of the first forms of communication, preceding spoken words to communicate messages interpersonally. The messages transmitted from the dances of pre-historic people involved patterns, rhythm, movement, and creativity, and, much like spoken conversations, could be not recaptured the exact same way a second time (Clampett, 2013). Now, with much of the communication between individuals occurring through conversational interactions, researchers studied how these communications impacted the relationships, performance, leadership, and other various characteristics of organizations (White, Harvey, & Kemper, 2007). Within the past several decades especially, executive managers took notice of the importance of effective communication in their organizations and began to rely on researchers to provide them with information on how to develop and maintain the systems and flow of communication within the workplace (Anderson & Dale, 1981; Spiers, 2012).

Systems and flow of communication in the workplace. Executive managers within organizations became interested in the optimal manner in which the direction of communication should be managed in the workplace. Researchers such as Pettit et al. (1997) and Clampett (2013) concluded that there were certain rules that managers should adhere to when communicating with their staff (i.e., top-down communication). These rules include setting clear specifications and guidelines for work that was requested, and establishing expectations and deadlines for what must be accomplished (Penley & Hawkins, 1985). However, when it came to communication between employees (i.e., lateral communication), the conversations should be allowed to be more informal and not constricted with rules and policies, such as only allowing conversations about work to be communicated between one another (Walther, 1988). In fact, Vora and Markoczy (2012)

discovered that the more frequently employees were allowed to engage in informal communications with one another, the more engaged they were at work and the more likely they were to ask questions, seek feedback, and discuss outcomes during work meetings. Thus, it became clear to executive managers that employees' informal lines of lateral communication became extremely influential in the performance and success of an organization (White et al., 2007). With this in mind, studies shifted toward examining the layers and nuances of the interactions that managers shared with their employees in hopes of encouraging the development of the informal lines of communication between managers and employees.

Dynamics of manager-to-employee communications. Although researchers established that initiating structure in discussions with employees was important for task clarity and work performance (Penley & Hawkins, 1985; Vora & Markoczy, 2012), other studies demonstrated great dimensionality to the impressions that employees' had of their managers. More importantly, it was discovered by Walther (1988) in his study on the communication between managers and employees within a bank that informal interactions helped build positive dispositions toward the managers. In fact, opening lines of communication between managers and employees helped the employees feel included in the management of the workplace, adding to their sense of security and belonging to the organization (Spiers, 2012).

To make employees feel engaged and connected to the organization, researchers determined that managers needed to be more open and considerate toward the thoughts and personal experiences of their employees (Behrens, 2009; Laff, 2006). Managers should inquire about how their employees carried along with their day, become active

listeners by prescribing advice and offering solace when needed, and be completely present and authentic when responding to employees' expressed problems (Groysberg & Slind, 2012; Spiers, 2012). In fact, studies conducted by Penley and Hawkins (1985) and Hynes (2012) showed that managers who were perceived as more responsive and caring were related to employees with higher job performance and greater project success. It was theorized that, when managers were more personable with their employees, those employees felt empowered to open up their minds and provide ideas to change and improve the organization, which helped both parties gain recognition and praise if those ideas were implemented, thus perpetuating the positive cycle (Behrens, 2009; Fix & Sias, 2006). In addition to pinpointing the kinds of conversations that were of most value between managers and employees, there was little examination into non-verbal aspects of interactions between managers and employees—aspects that could be far more important than the verbal communication occurring between them.

Non-verbal communication between managers and employees. The focus of many communication studies between managers and employees was on the direct conversations they shared, with little attention given to the non-verbal components of those interactions (Mishra et al., 2014). Part of this stemmed from the growing trend to communicate through technology, such as mobile phones and videoconferencing, and, of course, email and instant messaging (Laff, 2006). Yet, studies on the retention and impact of a conversation between the parties showed that most of the impressions remembered from the interaction stemmed from non-verbal components of the discussion. Specifically, verbal words, the style of speech, and the body language associated with the interaction contributed to 7%, 38%, and 55% of the retention of the

message, respectively (Jelphs, 2006). In fact, Bhatt (2011) discovered that even though employees engaged with their managers because of the expressed interest and concern those managers gave them, employees responded most to the demeanor and custom of the manager when recalling the conversation. Thus, an examination of the communication styles characterizing the discussions may offer more insight into how an employee regards and responds to their managers than what was discussed between them.

Conversational Communication Styles

According to Downs et al. (1986), an individual was presumed to have an unconscious set of cognitive rules that framed and guided his or her manner of interaction. In conversation, these rules were expressed to convey how the meaning of a message should be taken, interpreted, filtered, and understood from one person to another (Duran & Zakahi, 1984). In a sense, these rules comprised the communication style—“the preferred manner in which an individual offers and receives information through a pattern of verbal and non-verbal behaviors” (Saphiere et al., 2005, p. 5). Unknowingly, an individual’s communication style reflected his or her underlying values and beliefs, and in many ways these values and beliefs were influenced by culture and personality (Bakker-Pieper & de Vries, 2013; Saphiere et al., 2005). Thus, according to these studies, communication was not simply about doing or acting—it was about thinking and feeling. These two facets of communication were often ignored or overshadowed by the technical and systemic aspects of organizational communication in the past few decades to the extent that managers received little training on understanding the different communication styles of their employees (Bhatt, 2011). As Rautakoski (2012) pointed out, having managers operate without any knowledge of communication styles in their

interactions with employees was counter-productive when molding such managers to become effective communicators—communicators that could “competently and comfortably, through their own communication skills and those of others, represent who they were and what they thought of the world around them” (p. 827).

The classic model of conversational communication styles. Although organizations were slow to train managers on the existence and navigation of communication styles, the study of communication styles began as far back as Ancient Greece (Hanke, 2009; Jourdain, 2004). The Ancient Greeks theorized that people could be characterized by one of four personality types, and each of these personalities was linked to an excess of a particular bodily fluid within an individual and connected to a particular style of communication. As Jourdain (2004) summarized, Sanguine people were spirited individuals that invested a lot of emotion and energy in their interactions with others; Phlegmatic people were cool and steadfast, and usually communicated knowingly about the facts and details of the world they knew; Melancholic people were soft-hearted and oriented toward people and relationships, often speaking sympathetically and apologetically; and Choleric people were assertive and demanding, preferring to speak briefly and be involved in many things at once. This personality and communication style model was upheld by society until the 18th century, when it was discovered that bodily fluids were not necessarily associated with a particular personality (Hanke, 2009; Jourdain, 2004). Still, the general four-communication style model was perpetuated in Carl Jung’s studies of personality, but instead of using the Ancient Grecian terms to delineate the personality and communication styles, he labeled Sanguine people

as Socializers, Phlegmatic people as Analyzers, Melancholic people as Collaborators, and Choleric people as Controllers (Hanke, 2009).

Perpetuation of the classic model of conversational communication styles.

Researchers within the last few decades took the communication style model that was developed by the Ancient Greeks and forwarded by Carl Jung and put their own personal spin on the four styles. Edmonson (2009) declared that the personality types could be determined by analyzing an individual's communication style. In so doing, Expressives could be recognized by their high energy, quick-speaking demeanor; Systematics could be pinpointed by their plodding emphasis on facts and figures; Sympathetics could be identified by their inclinations to listen to and respond quickly to the needs of another; and Directs could be spotted by their desire to keep the conversation brief and focused on outcomes of a situation. O'Berry (2010), much like Carl Jung before him, used the phrases of Relational Innovator, Logical Processor, Hypothetical Analyzer, and Reactive Stimulator to describe the same communication styles, respectively. However, Mok (1975) and later Hartman and McCambridge (2010), unlike past researchers, were able to develop and refine a psychometric instrument to determine the communication style of an individual—the Mok Communication Styles Survey (MCSS).

Mok's Communication Styles Survey. The MCSS was a 67-item survey that measured the pace in which an individual spoke—with a high pace rating associated with high assertiveness and a low pace rating associated with low assertiveness—and the responsiveness in which an individual acted toward another person—with a high responsiveness rating tied to a prioritization toward relationship building and a low responsiveness rating tied to a prioritization toward task completion (Hartman &

McCambridge, 2010). The dimensionality of responsiveness and prioritization of response in communication styles was supported in separate studies by Hamilton (2011) and Vora and Markoczy (2012). Based on an individual's answers to the items, an individual was characterized as having one of four different communication styles: an Expressive who spoke quickly and prioritized relationships; an Analytical who spoke slowly and prioritized tasks; an Amiable who spoke slowly and prioritized relationships; and a Driver who spoke quickly and prioritized tasks (Hartman & McCambridge, 2010; Mok, 1975). Thus, given the four communication styles represented in the survey, the MCSS had its origins deeply rooted in the first communication style theories established by the Ancient Greeks. However, not all researchers chose to build on the theories of the past when developing other models of communication styles.

Other conversational communication style models. Recognizing that communication styles were closely tied to personality types, de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Siberg, van Gameren, and Vlug (2009) decided to use the Big Five Personality Type paradigm as a guide for developing a new conversational communication style model. This model incorporated a contemporary sample of individuals in developing the dimensionalities of the communication model rather than relying on the four dimensions established by the Ancient Greeks. The researchers conducted a lexical study with the expressed aim to pinpoint words that created the dimensions for the communication styles. The results showed that there were seven unique dimensions: expressiveness, preciseness, niceness, supportiveness, aggressiveness, assuredness, and argumentativeness. To conduct a second study to examine if these dimensions were truly significant and independent of one another, de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings, and

Shouten (2011) developed the CSI as the testing instrument; the results of the study showed that “the CSI was in the psychometric alignment with the lexical communication dimensions” (p. 519). In other words, each of the dimensions was distinct and significantly different from one another in characterizing an individual’s communication style. In a recent attempt to determine which communication dimensions correlated the most with effective leadership, Bakker-Pieper and de Vries (2013) determined that expressiveness—the tendency to talk and steer conversations to a desired topic—and preciseness—the tendency to communication in an organized and well-structured manner—were closely related with effective leadership. Given these results, if expressiveness and preciseness were vectored together, four communication styles would still be identified, as in the classic model. However, regardless of the dimensionality of communication styles, recent studies into the generations within the workplace demonstrated that differences in communication styles likely existed between the employees of different generations.

Generational communication styles and behaviors. Although studies regarding the generational differences in communication styles were sparse, there were some findings regarding the common communication behaviors of individuals comprising the three generations in the workplace. Wheelless and Berryman-Fink (1985) recognized that the communication behaviors exhibited by Baby Boomers in the workplace, particularly men, were tempered from participation in team-sports and military experience. This meant that Baby Boomers generally spoke plainly and quickly, and focused on the task at hand. Muchinsky (1977) supported these conclusions by explaining that Baby Boomers did not want to be burdened with the task of sifting out information when in conversation,

nor did they want vital information withheld from them. Eadie and Paulson (1984), however, expanded their description of Baby Boomers' communication behaviors by identifying that they were either characterized as noble selves—individuals who took care of themselves first and preferred direct, immediate, and organized communications—or as rhetorical reflectors—individuals who focused on the needs of others by obtaining information on a problem and relaying several possibilities for a solution. Similar to Baby Boomers, Sagie (1996) discovered that Gen Xers who were front-line managers in various service organizations initiated well-structured, task-oriented interactions with their employees, and encouraged them to participate in detailed discussions to solve problems and set goals with their peers. In essence, these researchers concluded that Baby Boomers and Gen Xers communicated in a manner that would be characterized as a Driver or Analytical according to the MCSS because they primarily focused on tasks in their conversations at work.

As mentioned in the section explaining the psychological differences between Millennials and the older generations, Millennials approached others with a level of confidence and desire for connectedness that was unlike the generations that came before them. Taniguchi and Aune (2013) explained that Millennials greatly prized the intimate relationships they developed with others and believed all messages sent and received were consequential to the relationship. In a sense, Millennials were raised to feel responsible for maintaining positive relationships with others at all times. As Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) concluded, Millennials received a lot of attention from authority figures throughout their lives—from their parents, coaches, and teachers—and expected the same level of openness and transparency in their communication with their managers.

Moreover, McAlister (2009) discovered that Millennials were relationship multi-taskers who used a wide variety of communication tools to regulate their shared experiences and emotions throughout their lives. Thus, these researchers collectively demonstrated that Millennials' communication style was attuned to the Amiable and Expressive manner of conversation because they focused so heavily on interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

The Need to Understand and Mediate Communication Styles in the Workplace

As Jourdain (2004) suggested following a study on the sources of organizational conflict across various business firms, understanding communication styles can help “resolve conflict within teams in the workplace since conflict usually stems from issues related to the style of interaction, information needs, and the focus of interactions between people” (p. 23). Jelphs (2006), a proponent of conducting training seminars to educate managers on soft-skill training in today's organizations, believed that truly effective managers recognized and understood their own communication styles and preferences, and reflected on how these behaviors could impact and be received by others. Echoing these findings in their studies on EI and communication, Bradberry and Greaves (2009) and Smeltzer (1987) recognized that an individual's communication style shaped their relationships. In terms of leadership, Bridbord and DeLucia-Waack (2011), Rehling (2004), and Vora and Markoczy (2012) found that successful leaders were able to change their manner of communication to overlap the style of their employees; when communication styles were complementary, work groups were generally more successful at achieving the desired goal than the groups that were characterized by style dissonance. Indeed, following studies on communication and managerial effectiveness, Clampett

(2013) imparted that when communications “break down, there is a failure to co-orient; but effective communicators can forecast the actions of others, their responses, and their interpretation” (p. 41). Therefore, as Bernstein and Norwood (2008) suggested in their studies on communication styles and ethnic communities, by understanding and monitoring their own communication styles, managers could accommodate the communication style differences inherent in the organizations they led and increase comfort and engagement among the employees to achieve a desired goal. But as other researchers discovered, communication styles were actually more fluid than originally thought and could be changed to fit particular settings and audiences.

Flexing Conversational Communication Styles

The notion of flexing, or adapting, an individual’s communication style to fit the circumstances surrounding a conversation was hotly studied and debated over the past decade. As Nahavandi (2006) stated, the basis for flexing an individual’s communication style stemmed from “the interactionist view of individual differences in that heredity and the environment interact to influence the development of these differences” (p. 62). In essence, an individual’s personal characteristics provided a behavioral zone of comfort that came naturally to him or her and was comfortable to perform. However, this did not mean that his or her mode of interaction could not be altered; he or she could learn to behave differently, especially when certain characteristics, such as communication styles, demanded a change given the context of the environment (Edmonson, 2009; Nahavandi, 2006). As it was, individuals needed to recognize the interdependent relationships in the world in which they lived and the way those relationships influenced each other. More importantly, an individual should strive to bring out and stimulate the development of the

personal effectiveness of those with whom they associated (Neck & Manz, 2007). Thus, any conversational message that an individual provided to another would be influenced by the other person's own experiences and mindset, and it was up to the individual offering the message to relay it in such a manner that it could be accepted and understood by the receiver (Dysart, 1963; Edmonson, 2009; Neck & Manz, 2007), even if it meant curtailing the communication style to fit the other person's preferences (Hanke, 2009; Rehling, 2004).

Practicing the Transformational Model of Communication

The Transformational Model of Communication promoted the idea that, because interpersonal relationships were reciprocal, to communicate effectively individuals must determine and understand their own communication style, understand the qualities of each communication style, and learn how to communicate with people using styles different from their own (Hamilton, 2011; Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). By doing this, the truth and meaning of a message was comprehended better by the other person receiving the message, and they were more likely to respond with a clear and honest message in return (Hamilton, 2011; Hanke, 2009; Rehling, 2004). In a study that had employees of various service organizations attempt to relay messages in the style of the person they were addressing, researchers discovered increased productivity and work harmony were also associated with this practice (Edmonson, 2009).

The Transformational Model did not stipulate that communicators needed to always match the communication styles of those they addressed. Indeed, attempting to mold an individual communication style so it was attuned to a large audience comprised of various individuals with differing communication styles would be impossible. Instead,

individuals needed to understand one another's communication style and anticipate the needs of the environment and circumstances surrounding the message being relayed (Bridbord & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Rehling, 2004). For instance, when strapped for time, a manager may need to focus on the task and speak quickly and urgently to his or her employees given the need to meet a deadline. Nevertheless, as some researchers determined, an effective communicator was most concerned about making his or her communication understandable and persuasive to achieve the best desired result (Bhatt, 2011; Rehling, 2004). To summarize, communicators had to balance between matching their communication style to the receiver's and to the situation at hand, remembering that the ultimate goals of communication were to recognize what the other person was feeling, explain what was thought to be important, and to be mindful of the environment and how it dictated the need for a specific response (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009; Rehling, 2004).

Managers flexing communication styles for their employees. As Kegan and Lahey (2001) expressed regarding how managers should speak with their employees, "when we practice thoughtful, non-attributing forms of communication with ongoing regard for how things are communicated, [speaking] can have transformational potential for both the manager and the employee" (p. 102). Although it was hard for managers to change what they thought toward other people, situations, and circumstances given their preconceptions, managers could still control and change their behaviors, such as their communication styles, to accommodate their employees (Anderson & Dale, 1981; Kegan & Lahey, 2001; White et al., 2007). As Clampett (2013) explained, skilled communicators could identify and eliminate destructive speech patterns, both within themselves and others, and establish or reinforce constructive ones. Hence, managers

that understood the differences in the work values of the generations and their preferred style of communication, and encouraged the adoption of communication styles that aligned with these style preferences, were likely to create a workplace environment that fostered leadership, motivation, and energy (Gursoy et al., 2013). These findings were substantiated further in studies among grade school teachers and their students by Mazer (2013) and Myers and Goodboy (2014), who discovered that, in the case of the selected classes, when high school teachers spoke with warm vocal cues and infused information with humor as they relayed course content and guidelines for an assignment, the students were energized, engaged, and emotionally interested in the coursework.

At times managers could find it difficult to read the communication styles of their employees; in those circumstances, an easy solution would be to simply ask employees how they preferred to be addressed. Demonstrating this type of concern and appreciation for employees' thoughts and feelings established a level of trust between the managers and their employees, and enhanced the employees' engagement at work (Mishra et al., 2014; Reznik, Roloff, & Miller, 2012). This kind of attentiveness to employee communication needs, as well as a manager's ability to tie his or her own personal experiences with those of the employees while providing precise instructions and guidance, provided evidence of a *listening culture* within an organization (de Vries et al., 2011; Larson, 2013; Spiers, 2012). The perpetuation of a listening culture and responding quickly to employees' needs enhanced employee engagement and was related to high group performance because employees were more willing to share their perspectives in developing solutions to unique problems (Vora & Markoczy, 2012). It was exactly these types of behaviors that managers credited as the deciding factors in

their advancement to top-level positions in a 2010 survey of Fortune 500 Executive Vice Presidents (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Thus, there was evidence of a long-term incentive for managers to respond to the communication style preferences of Millennial employees.

Flexing communication styles for Millennial employees. As Chi et al. (2013) discovered after performing data analysis on Millennial employees' perceptions of their managers and of how they led organizations across various industries, Millennials responded best to work environments that encouraged transparency, open-door interaction with managers, and a minimization of the power distance between managers and their employees. Again, these findings were supported by Myer and Goodboy's (2014) study between Millennial students and their instructors at a particular high school when the students expressed appreciation for their teachers' ability to overlap their communication style with those of the students, and responded quickly to the students' questions and comments. In addition, when such interpersonal dynamics were lacking between managers and their Millennial employees in various U.S. hotels, Park and Gursoy (2012) discovered that the employees lost a sense of significance of, enthusiasm for, and challenge with their work. A good way to keep this from happening was for managers to respond to the communication needs of their Millennial employees and provide them with suitable training to ensure that they had the necessary emotional capacity and institutional support to speak up and engage their managers in discussions on continuous improvement (Behrens, 2009; Groysberg & Slind, 2012). When a manager accomplished these actions, employees were often cited as being satisfied with

the communication prowess of their managers, as well as distinguishing their managers as competent communicators (Eadie & Paulson, 1984; Walther, 1988).

Employees' Communication Satisfaction with their Managers

In early studies on organizational communication, an open communication environment and the immediacy in which managers responded to employees' needs were determined to be the most important factors in determining an employee's communication satisfaction at the workplace (Downs & Hazen, 1972; Muchinsky, 1977). Studies also showed that employees were more satisfied with communication within their organizations if they had direct access to their managers when receiving crucial information, and when the organization's communication properties and practices were aligned with employees' expectations (Muchinsky, 1977; Walther, 1988). Furthermore, the more employees and managers agreed on the meaning behind their communications, the more satisfied an employee was with their organization's communication standards (Hatfield & Huseman, 1982). However, evidence suggested that outside of the organization's communication climate, protocols, and technological advantages, a manager's communication behaviors and the employee's perceived relationship with the manager were related to employees' communication satisfaction more than any other variable (Hatfield & Huseman, 1982; Muchinsky, 1977). Determining the communication behaviors that managers exhibited, as well as the appropriate unit of analysis to connect an employee's communication satisfaction with those styles were the next challenges that researchers faced.

Generally speaking, researchers discovered that managers exhibiting human-oriented qualities in their communication styles, such as being expressive and supportive

of their employees' work, and who promoted group cohesion through the established communication protocols, had employees who were very satisfied with their interactions at the workplace (de Vries et al., 2011; Smeltzer, 1987). Other studies showed that employees who were supervised by managers that offered direct and precise communication while encouraging their employees to participate openly in their organization's decisions were also satisfied with the communication they experienced at work (Goris et al., 2000; Madlock, 2006; Walther, 1988). Likewise, when employees did not experience positive and supportive communication from their managers and felt that they had low job control and encouragement to participate in the organization's development, employees expressed dissatisfaction with their communication at work (Kawada & Otsuka, 2011). Most importantly, however, researchers further discovered that employees responded best to managers whose communication behaviors matched their own preferred behaviors (Pettit et al., 1997; Sparks, Bradley, & Callan, 1997). This overlap in communication behaviors was especially helpful in ensuring that, after a major incident at work, such as an acquisition by another company, the employee's job stress was reduced and communication satisfaction with the organization remained high (Donald & Lotz, 2006). Needless to say, the connection between shared communication behaviors among employees and their managers gave credence to the notion that Millennial employees appreciated managers who were friendly, supportive, and expressive in their communications.

Millennial employees' communication satisfaction with their managers.

Current researchers reported that interpersonal satisfaction by Millennial employees toward their managers was heavily related to the managers' ability to clearly

communicate their vision and expectations to employees regarding their work, and to the upbeat and positive manner in which managers regarded their employees (Madlock, 2008; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Rucker, 2007; Wagenheim & Rood, 2010). These findings were corroborated by Myers and Goodboy (2014) who determined that Millennial college students were more likely to report higher affect toward and satisfaction with the communications of their instructors who were perceived as humorous, clear, and approachable. Jorfi, Bin Yacco, and Shah (2012) explained that Millennials preferred managers with high EI because these managers were able to respond to their emotions and explain things in a manner that was instantly understood and relatable to how Millennials approached new ideas. Thus, hypothetically, managers with high EI would be able to adapt their own communication style to the style of their Millennial employees, namely as Expressives and Amiables according to the MCSS model. Although measuring to see if Millennial employees recognized as Expressives or Amiables under the MCSS reported higher communication satisfaction with their managers has yet to be done, McKinley and Perino (2013) demonstrated that managers who were recognized as incompetent communicators had employees who were also dissatisfied with their managers' communication abilities.

Employees' Perceptions of their Managers as Competent Communicators

As some of the aforementioned research showed, employees' communication satisfaction with their managers related to their perception of the managers' communication competence. Pettit et al. (1997) discovered in their examination of the moderators between organizational communication and employee satisfaction that when employees were satisfied with supervisory communication, they tended to trust their

supervisors, accepted their influence, and perceived the communication as accurate. Moreover, Byron (2007) determined that managers who more accurately perceived their employees' non-verbal emotional expressions received higher ratings of satisfaction and communicator competence from their employees than managers who did not accurately perceive their employees' non-verbal emotional expressions. Communicator competence, although related to communication satisfaction, was a different variable because communication competence was largely "thought of as communication adaptability—to adapt one's interaction goals and behaviors according to the perceived socio-interpersonal relationship" with another person (Duran & Zakahi, 1984, p. 42). Stated another way, communication competence was "characterized as the accurate perception of social situations and of people in them, decisions about what to say, and careful modulation of voice and action when giving expression to such decisions" (Downs et al., 1986, p. 121).

In various studies conducted among different organizations involving managers of different sexes and functions, employees believed managers who were more empathetic, better listeners, and emotionally supportive were more competent communicators than managers who were otherwise (Downs et al., 1986; Jorfi et al., 2012; Wheelless & Berryman-Fink, 1985). In short, managers who could successfully develop and manage interpersonal relationships, and facilitate positive social interactions, would likely have more satisfied employees and be described as a competent communicator (Byron, 2007; Chory & McCroskey, 1999) by their Millennial employees.

Millennial employees and their perception of competent communicators. In their studies on organizational communication, communication styles, and

communication competence between managers and their employees, Eadie and Paulson (1984) concluded that perceptions of communicator competence were situational, with each communication behavior being perceived as competent in different circumstances. Indeed, as Pavitt (1990) explained in studies on differing perceptions about what constitutes a competent communicator, “we decide to the extent in which the behaviors and traits in our impressions of the communicator match the behaviors and traits of an idealized communicator” (p. 10). Most people used themselves as a frame of reference for determining expectations of a competent communicator; thus, recognizing the communication styles in oneself and in others should help people build relationships and become better communicators (Hanke, 2009). Managers needed to understand that their communication competence was a vital factor in their organization’s internal effectiveness (McKinley & Perino, 2013), and that to appeal to the interests of their followers, competent communication called for employing resources—such as language, gestures, and voice to create the appeal (Madlock, 2008)—so managers could appreciate Millennials’ communication styles and adapt their own styles to guide their interactions with their employees. Furthermore, given that Millennial employees were, presumably, inclined to be expressionistic, supportive, and friendly (i.e., to exhibit qualities of Expressives and Amiables under the MCSS), it followed that managers who likely channeled those communication characteristics would be described as competent communicators.

Conclusions

The review of literature on generational differences, intergenerational conflict in the workplace, communication styles, and employees’ perspectives on communication

satisfaction with their managers and their communicator competence yielded interesting findings. As past research demonstrated, each generation in the workplace had different values, attitudes, behaviors, and psychological characteristics. The Baby Boomers and the Generation Xers, being raised in times of social unrest and political upheaval, shared characteristics in their work values and attitudes toward their responsibilities. These characteristics differed greatly from Millennials, who were raised in nearly constant economic growth and political stability. The characteristics that differentiated the generations possibly extended to the communication styles exhibited by the individuals within the age cohorts.

There were several communication style models that were studied in modern communication research, with the *classic* model having origins in Ancient Greece, culminating in the MCSS model comprising of four distinct communication styles—Expressives (assertive and outgoing), Amiables (supportive and caring), Drivers (quick and concise), and Analyticals (detailed and exhaustive). Although other communication style models were developed, such as the CSI, the MCSS was one of the few models with an assessment tool designed for identifying an individual's specific style. At this point in the research, no studies used the MCSS to test whether a generation predominately communicated with a particular communication style.

Since researchers showed that Millennial employees tended to communicate differently than their managers of the older generations, and that they preferred managers who expressed qualities of Amiable and Expressive communicators (according to the MCSS), it would not be surprising if Millennials were generally Amiables or Expressives. Furthermore, given that Millennial employees were generally more satisfied

with managers who aligned (or perhaps adapted) their communication style with the Millennials' style, it was likely that Millennial employees who were characterized with Amiable or Expressive communication styles were more satisfied with the communication of their managers than employees who were not. Also, given that Millennial employees generally perceived their managers as competent communicators when they exhibited outgoing, caring, and supportive communication behaviors, it was likely that Millennial employees who were characterized as Amiable or Expressive rated their managers as competent communicators more highly than employees who were not. The purpose of the current study aimed to explore these possibilities, since past research had yet to test these hypotheses.

Synthesis Matrix

The synthesis matrix for the study is included in Appendix A. The matrix portrays a tabulated summary of the sources used to provide the academic foundation for the current study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

A communication style described the general behaviors an individual exhibited when engaged in conversations with another individual. In this study, the Mok Communication Styles Survey (MCSS) was used to determine the communication styles that characterized the conversational behavior of Millennial employees. Since people within each generation usually shared similar values, ideas, and behaviors, it was likely that Millennials had common communication styles.

The Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) was a tool that determined the level of satisfaction an employee experienced when communicating with his or her immediate supervisor at work. The ICSI asked employees to reflect on the relationship they had with their supervisor and to answer questions regarding how they felt toward their supervisor's communication style (Madlock, 2008). In this study, the ICSI was employed to gauge Millennial employees' level of communication satisfaction with their supervisors. As supervisors were of a different generation than their Millennial employees and communicated differently, the Millennial employees' level of communication satisfaction could vary by communication style.

The Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ) was developed to report the level of competency an employee believed his or her supervisor had at communicating thoughts and the desire for action. The CCQ asked employees to focus on their supervisor's general behavior and to answer questions regarding how competent the supervisor was at communicating with the appropriate behaviors (Madlock, 2008). In this study, the CCQ was deployed to measure the communication competence of

supervisors, as perceived by their Millennial employees. Again, as supervisors were of a different generation than their Millennial employees, the Millennial employees' ratings of their supervisors' communicator competence could vary by communication style.

This chapter presents the overall methodology for the research study. It begins with a presentation of the purpose statement and research questions. This is followed by a detailed description of the research design, the population and the sample of the study, the data collection process, and the analysis of the data. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research methodology.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this descriptive, bivariate correlational study was to determine the communication styles of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations, the correlation between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and the correlation between perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) and the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ), respectively.

Research Questions

1. What are the communication styles of Millennial employees as measured by the MCSS?
2. What are the levels of Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?

3. What is the relationship between the Millennials' communication styles, as measured by the MCSS, and the Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and the Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative research design using data from three instruments to address the research questions. A quantitative study collects and analyzes numerical data to provide information and make generalizations about the characteristics of a population (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). A bivariate correlational analysis involves the use of numerical data to determine the strength of the relationship between two characteristics of a population (Patten, 2012). As this study involved the collection and analysis of numerical data to determine the relationships between pairs of characteristics of a population, specifically the communication styles of a population (i.e., Millennial workers) and two distinct attitudes of population (i.e., communication satisfaction and perceived communicator competence of supervisors, respectively), a bivariate correlational study was appropriate for the research design.

To collect quantifiable data concerning communicative and attitudinal characteristics of a population, surveys were used in this study. As McMillan and Schumacher (2010) reported, surveys were the typical means of obtaining representative data on traits, opinions, attitudes, and other psychological constructs of a population. Thus, three survey instruments, the MCSS, ICSI, and CCQ, were used to collect the quantitative data for the study.

To conduct quantitative analysis of data, several software packages exist to aid in the statistical analysis. For the purposes of this study, the quantitative analysis of the data was conducted through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to determine the communication styles, communication satisfaction, and perceptions of supervisor communicator competence by the Millennial generation.

Methodology

Research Question 1 (RQ1) was addressed through a descriptive analysis of quantitative data from the MCSS. The MCSS scored the strength of a Millennial employee's communication styles according to the frequency of identified behaviors pertaining to each style. The style with the highest count denoted the predominant communication style for each Millennial employee. Although the data used to determine the communication style were nominal at face, the data level was also ratio because it was possible to score an absolute zero for a communication style (meaning that an employee did not portray behaviors of that communication style), and scoring twice as much in one style versus another entailed that the style was twice as strong in characterizing the communication behavior of an employee than another style.

Research Question 2 (RQ2) was addressed by the descriptive analysis of data from the ICSI and the CCQ. The instruments determined the level of communication satisfaction Millennial employees had with their supervisors, and their perception of their supervisor's communicator competence, respectively. The data from the instruments were interval-level and expressed the strength of the communication satisfaction with and the communication competence of the Millennials' supervisors.

Research Question 3 (RQ3) was determined by a correlation analysis between the variables from the MCSS and the ICSI and CCQ, respectively. Specifically, the data on communication styles from the MCSS were correlated with the data on communication satisfaction from the ICSI to determine the strength of the relationship between the two variables; similarly, the data on communication styles from the MCSS were correlated with the data on supervisor's communicator competence from the CCQ to determine the strength of the relationship between those two variables. The strength of the relationship between each communication style of the Millennial employees and the associated communication satisfaction with and communicator competence of their supervisors provided insight into how communication styles affected the interactions between Millennials and the older generations.

The data were compared statistically to determine significant differences between the variables of two samples using t-tests, and the strength of correlations through the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (or R-statistic) and coefficient of determination (or R-squared statistic) between the variables in the final step of the analysis. According to Patten (2012), the calculation of t-tests (or t-scores) can be used to estimate the normal value of a sample mean and its relative significance compared to another sample mean. Therefore, t-tests were used to determine the predominant communication styles of the Millennial employees and the relative communication satisfaction and rating of supervisor's communication competence for each communication style to satisfy RQ1 and RQ2, respectively. Also, to determine the relationships between variables, Lind, Marchal, and Walthen (2013) explained that the calculation of an R-statistic described the strength of the relationship between two

variables and the R-squared statistic determined how much of the relationship was described by the interaction between the two variables. Thus, these statistics were calculated to determine the relationship of the Millennials' communication styles between the communication satisfaction with and ratings of supervisor's communicator competence by the Millennial employees.

Population

According to Field (2013), a population is the total set of individuals that meet certain criteria. In this study, employed individuals within a specific generation comprised the population. Specifically, the population of the study was Millennials (those born between 1983 thru 2000) employed in the current U.S. workforce. Rikleen (2014) estimated that 30% of the U.S. workforce was comprised of Millennial employees and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014) estimated the total U.S. workforce was 146.0 million employees; thus, the total Millennial employee population in the United States was approximately 44.0 million. The Millennial employees in the study comprised of men and women of various ethnic and social backgrounds, representative of various industries and organizations, including private business, education, government, and non-profit institutions. An additional criteria of the study was that the employees needed to have a supervisor who was a member of either the Baby Boomer (those born between 1946 and 1964) or the Gen X (those born between 1965 and 1982) population.

Target Population

The target population of a study is a specified set of individuals that “conform to a specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of the research” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 129). The target population of this study was

employed Millennials of the Southern California region who were born between 1983 thru 1997 (those of legal working age without the need of a special legal permit). Again, assuming that the Millennial population in California was 30% of the workforce, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015) reported that the total workforce in the Southern California region was 6.2 million, the total target population was approximately 1.9 million. Furthermore, the targeted Millennials were employed in professional organizations and held white-collar positions, which comprised 38.4% of the total workforce according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), as opposed to being employed in non-professional organizations performing other kinds of work. Thus, the total targeted population was 38.4% of 1.9 million, or 0.7 million Millennial employees. All of these employees were assumed to have the necessary online access to participate in the study.

Sample

Field (2013) explained that a sample is a representative subset of a population that shares the criteria of the population being studied. In this study, a sample of the population was Millennials who were employed in the U.S. workforce that were members of a certain geographic region—namely Southern California.

According to Salkind (2011), for a population of approximately 1.0 million people, to achieve a 90% confidence level in the statistical analysis of the results, the sample size must be at least 271 participants. Therefore, the target sample of the study was 271 Millennials of the Southern California region who were employed in professional organizations for at least three months. In addition, the Millennial

employees in the sample were 18 to 32 years of age, and comprised of men and women of various ethnic and social backgrounds.

Sample Selection Process

As McMillan and Schumacher (2010) observed, “In survey research, the researcher selects a sample of respondents from a target population and administers the questionnaires to collect information on variables of interest” (p. 235). However, the practice of randomly selecting participants, as mentioned by the researchers, was only possible if a researcher had the access and means to randomly select participants for the study. Given the resources for this study were limited, a sponsor had to be contacted to act as the liaison between the researcher and the participants (i.e., the Millennial employees in the Southern California region). Specifically, the Professionals in Human Resources Association (PIHRA), Chapter 30 was solicited to sponsor the study and inform its 4,000 individual members of the survey. Chapter 30 comprised of human resource administrators in organizations that were representative of the Southern California region, and they were persuaded to take interest in the study as the results promised to enhance their understanding of how communication style differences affected the engagement factors surrounding the Millennial generation who were staffing more and more of their organizations each year. Moreover, Chapter 30 was regionalized into separated districts, with each district led by a different chair and administration. These districts were contacted separately to participate in the study, so this study employed cluster sampling because this type of sampling was characterized by the identification of “convenient, naturally occurring groups to employ the random sampling of participants” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 135). With the aid of the

organizations represented in PIHRA, Millennial employees were contacted by their human resource administrators for participation in the study on a voluntary basis. If the Millennials were interested in participating, they were given the researcher's contact information to make individual contact.

When potential participants contacted the researcher, the researcher determined if they met the Millennial age group criteria. If the participant met the criteria, they were provided the online address of the website for the study that was hosted through SurveyMonkey. Before starting the study, the Millennials agreed to an electronic informed consent form (see Appendix B) to acknowledge that they understood participation in the study was voluntary and that their answers would be kept private and confidential. Moreover, they were assured that only the collective responses to the survey would be compiled and summarized for the purposes of the study.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in this study: the MCSS, the ICSI, and the CCQ. These three instruments were compiled together and posted to SurveyMonkey, the online website that Millennial employees used to participate in the study. A summary of each of the instruments follows.

Mok's Communication Styles Survey

The MCSS was a 67-item instrument that asked Millennial employees to indicate whether certain communication behaviors were reflected in their interactions with others (Mok, 1975). If the communication behavior was conducted by the employee, a "yes" button was selected to indicate that the employee identified with the behavior. If the communication behavior did not reflect the employee's typical behavior, a "no" button

was selected instead. After reading all 67 items and placing a “yes” or “no” on the appropriate behaviors, the number of affirmative responses was tallied. Given each communication behavior coincided with a specific communication style (Driver, Analytical, Amiable, and Expressive), the communication style with the highest number of affirmative responses was considered the predominant style exhibited by the employee. Seventeen was the highest score possible for any communication style as 17 communication behaviors were assigned to each of the communication styles. It should be noted that one item counted toward two communication styles instead of only one, which was why there were 67 items on the survey instead of 68 items (i.e., 17 behaviors for 4 communication style). See Appendix C to view a copy of the MCSS.

Reliability and validity. The MCSS used in this study was a modified version of the original assessment developed by Mok (1975). Hartman and McCambridge (2011) created this version of the MCSS by building off of the work of Alessandra and Hunsaker (1993) and Merrill and Reid (1999), researchers who conducted studies on communication styles to pinpoint the four categories used in this survey. Hartman and McCambridge (2011) successfully used this version of the MCSS to identify communication styles of various people “in both undergraduate and graduate communication classes and in executive development programs over the past 10 years” (p. 30). Thus, the survey had anecdotal evidence of being a reliable and valid instrument for determining the communication styles in Mok’s (1975) communication style paradigm.

Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory

The ICSI was a 19-item survey that asked Millennial employees to identify how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements describing the interactions they had with their immediate supervisors. These statements ranged from asking direct questions regarding the employees' feelings toward the conversations they had with their supervisors, to how comfortable and genuine the supervisors made them feel. The employees indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). See Appendix D to view a copy of the ICSI.

Reliability and validity. Although the initial ICSI was developed by Hecht (1978) and used a 7-point Likert scale, the version of the ICSI used in this study was modified by Madlock (2008) to incorporate a 5-point Likert scale and include a lead-in sentence (*When communicating with my immediate supervisor, I feel...*) that preceded each item. To determine reliability and validity of the instrument, Cronbach's alpha was used in past studies. According to Salkind (2011), Cronbach's alpha "is a special measure of reliability known as internal consistency, where the more consistently an individual item's score varies with the total score on the test, the higher the value" (p. 111). These past studies reported good reliabilities with scores ranging from 0.72 to 0.93 (Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994) and demonstrated strong construct validity. Madlock's 2008 study had a Cronbach alpha of 0.94 as well.

Communicator Competence Questionnaire

The CCQ was a 12-item survey that asked Millennial employees to identify how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements describing the communication practices of their supervisors. These statements ranged from asking questions regarding the

supervisors' listening skills to how they spoke to their employees. The employees indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). See Appendix E to view a copy of the CCQ.

Reliability and validity. The CCQ was developed by Monge, Backman, Dillard, and Eisenburg (1982) and was not modified for this study. A past study reported scale reliability of 0.93 (Madlock, 2006), and a Cronbach alpha of 0.90 was calculated for Madlock's 2008 study.

Data Collection

The proposal for the study was presented to the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval to begin data collection. The background of the study, its purpose, and the methodology were also presented to the IRB. After deliberating about the quality, feasibility, and viability of the study, the IRB provided consent for the researcher to begin collecting data for the study.

As aforementioned, with the support of the PIHRA and the human resource administrators representing organizations across various industries, Millennial employees were solicited to participate in the study. The human resource administrators were forwarded an email providing the overview and purpose of the study, and were asked to forward the message to the relevant personnel within their organizations. The message explained that the study would be hosted through SurveyMonkey and that it comprised a survey compiled from three different instruments (the MCSS, ICSI, and CCQ). The email also ensured the administrators and the employees that participating in the study was fully voluntary, and that individual results would be kept confidential.

Online Survey

The three instruments (MCSS, ICSI, and CCQ) were made available through SurveyMonkey for online access by the Millennial employees who volunteered to participate in the study. When the employees logged in the study's website, they were immediately taken to a landing page that thanked them for participating in the study. The webpage explained the purpose of the study (i.e., to examine if Millennials' had predominant communication styles, and the relationship between the communication styles and Millennials' communication satisfaction with and the perception of their supervisors' communication competence), and ensured confidentiality of the individual results.

The second page of the website presented the employees with an electronic informed consent form to acknowledge that their participation in the study was purely voluntary (see Appendix B). After signing off on the agreement by checking the appropriate box, the structure of the study was outlined to the employees on the next webpage.

Survey structure. The first section of the study asked employees to answer six demographic questions pertaining to their sex, age, and years worked in their organization; the sex and estimated age of their immediate supervisor; and the industry in which their organization operated (see Appendix F). These demographic questions were included in the first section of the Madlock's (2008) study and were included in this study to validate the age of the Millennial employees, to certify that the supervisors were members of the Gen X or Baby Boomer generation, and to provide context into the amount of time the employee worked within the organization and its industry.

The second section of the study consisted of the 67-item MCSS to determine the communication style of the employees. In the title page for the MCSS, it was explained that the communication paradigm examined in the study conveyed that people generally communicated through one of four different styles and the survey was used to determine if there were consistent communication styles that characterized those of the Millennial generation. The MCSS was not named outright in an effort to hinder the employees' attempts to research the communication paradigm and figure out their communication style before answering any questions. In this way, the employees were not able to tailor their answers to any pre-determined communication style.

The third and fourth sections of the study consisted of the 19-item and 12-item ICSI and CCQ, respectively. Similar to the title page of the MCSS, the title page for the ICSI and CCQ sections provided a short summary explaining that the employees' satisfaction with their supervisors' communication behavior and the perceptions of their supervisor's communication competence would be determined by these two instruments. In the fifth and last section of the survey, the employees were again thanked for their participation and provided the opportunity to leave their email address if they wanted to learn their communication style. The employees were ensured that their email address would not be shared with any outside parties and that providing their email address was optional. Moving from this webpage officially ended the survey and took the employee to SurveyMonkey's sign-out page (see Appendix G for the complete online survey).

Using SurveyMonkey's response tracking applications, once 271 Millennial employees took the survey, the data of the results from the three instruments were extracted from the website and placed into a Microsoft Excel worksheet. Before

conducting a statistical analysis of the results, the data were examined to ensure that each of the employees that participated in the study was truly a Millennial (i.e., 18 thru 32 years old) and supervised by someone of the Gen X or Baby Boomer generation (i.e., 33 thru 70 years old). If the employee was not a member of the Millennial generation or did not have a supervisor of the Gen X or Baby Boomer generation, his or her results were discarded from the study, and the study continued to be functional on SurveyMonkey until data from 271 valid participants were collected.

Data Analysis

As Baumberger, Rugh, and Mabry (2012) explained, “a quantitative study’s findings can be generalized to a population about which information is required” (p. 255). In the case of this study, the Millennial generation’s communication style, communication satisfaction, and perceptions of supervisors’ communicator competence was determined through an analysis of the quantitative data. The statistical analysis of the data was summarily conducted using the SPSS software.

To address RQ1, the determination of the Millennials’ communication styles was conducted through a descriptive statistical analysis of the data provided from the MCSS. First, the counts for the items related to each communication style for every employee were totaled to determine a frequency score for each style. Thus, the total score for each of the communication styles indicated the most common number of communication behaviors exhibited by the Millennial employees characterized by that style. Second, the proportion of the communication styles that characterized the sample of employees were calculated as percentages. As Patten (2012) explained, percentages “describe how many participants per one hundred have each score” (p. 103). Thus, the frequencies and

percentages for each of the communication styles described the relative proportion of the sample of employees that were characterized as exhibiting one of the predominant communication styles.

Much like the preceding research question, RQ2 was addressed using descriptive statistical analyses. Mean scores of the Millennial employees' reported communication satisfaction with and ratings of their supervisors' communication competence were determined. As Patten indicated, "mean scores are the balancing point in a distribution" (p. 117). The mean scores were calculated to describe the average level of communication satisfaction with and the ratings of supervisory communication competence among the sample of Millennial employees.

RQ3 was addressed by a correlation analysis between the Millennial employees' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisor, and the Millennial employees' communication styles and the ratings of their supervisors' communicator competence. As Lind et al. (2013) explained, "a correlation analysis involves a group of techniques that measure the relationship between two variables" (p. 392). Furthermore, McMillan and Schumacher (2010) said that "in a bivariate correlational study, researchers obtain scores from two variables for each subject and then use the pairs of scores to calculate a correlation coefficient" (p. 226). Therefore, the count of the communication behaviors for the predominant communication style of the Millennial employees was correlated with their ratings of communication satisfaction and of their supervisor's communicator competence, separately, to arrive at two different correlation coefficients. These correlation coefficients described the amount of variability that was shaped between the two sets of variables; the higher the coefficient,

the higher the variability that could be explained by the relationship between the two variables (Lind et al., 2013).

Furthermore, in addressing RQ3, Salkind (2011) warned that “even if a correlation coefficient is significant, it does not mean that the amount of variance accounted for is meaningful; the coefficient of determination, or R-squared, determines the meaningfulness of the relationship” (p. 260). Thus, an R-square statistic was also calculated for each of the correlations to determine the meaningfulness of the relationships between the communication styles and the respective communication variables.

Limitations

There were three main limitations of the study. The first limitation pertained to the sample of Millennial employees who were meant to represent the U.S. Millennial population. Since the sample consisted of employees in organizations in the Southern California region, the generalizability of the results was limited in its scope. It could be that the Millennial employees of the Southern California region were representative of the Millennials in the state, and perhaps the western region of the United States, but the employees may not have been representative of the Millennial employees throughout the nation. Each region, much less each state, has a different sub-culture with varying values, traditions, and socialized behaviors. Thus, if the study produced results that showed the Millennial employees sharing a common communication style, this could be a characteristic of only the Millennials living in the western region of the United States. Results from other regions of the country could demonstrate that Millennials had different communication styles depending on where they lived, or they might not have

shared communication styles in other regions of the country at all. Without a doubt, replication of the study in the other regions of the country would help in strengthening the generalizability of the results.

The second limitation of the study regarded the use of the MCSS to determine the communication style of the Millennial employees. The MCSS posited that the Millennials only communicated in one of four possible communication styles. The MCSS was therefore limiting in its ability to capture the full complexities of the Millennials' communication behaviors. That is, perhaps Millennial employees had a communication style that was a blend of two styles outlined in the MCSS, but the results of the study may portend that the Millennials did not have a common communication style as defined by the MCSS. Thus, replicating the study using a different instrument that assessed communication styles from a different paradigm would help in determining the exact behaviors that Millennials exhibited when they communicated and if those behaviors were significant enough to characterize the generation.

The third limitation of the study pertained to the study's measurement of the Millennial employee's communication style in a single moment in time. One of the reasons the study might discover that the Millennials indeed shared a common communication style could be a function of the Millennials' age and not a true characteristic of the generation. The Millennials might communicate similarly due to being young and sharing qualities as a result of their youth (such as being more outgoing and energetic than when they become older). In time, as the Millennials age and mature, their communication styles may change and, either collectively or not, they would score differently on the MCSS in the future. Thus, replication of the study in several years

would help in verifying that the shared communication style of the Millennial employees was truly characteristic of the Millennial generation throughout time.

Summary

The purpose the study was to administer the MCSS to determine the communication style of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations. Also, the study investigated the statistical level of correlation between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the ICSI and the CCQ, respectively.

To address the research questions, the study employed a quantitative research design using three survey instruments: the MCSS, the ICSI, and the CCQ. The instruments were compiled into a single 98-item survey and Millennial employees accessed the survey online through the SurveyMonkey website. The survey also included six demographic questions to provide context into the age of the employees, the age of their supervisors, and other characteristics pertaining to their professional organizations. Survey tracking capabilities available through SurveyMonkey allowed for periodic scanning of the data to ensure that only responses provided by true Millennials with supervisors representative of the Gen X or Baby Boomer generations were included in the study.

The population of the study was Millennials (those born between 1983 and 2000) currently employed in the U.S. workforce. The targeted population was Millennials in Southern California who were born between 1983 and 1997, employed in professional organizations, and held white-collar positions. The Bureau of Labor (2014) estimated

this target population at 0.7 million Millennial employees. The sample of the study was 271 Millennials of the Los Angeles-Orange County region of California who were employed for at least three months in their current position.

Data collected from the survey were analyzed by research question. For RQ1, descriptive statistics were used to determine the predominant communication styles among the Millennial employees, and inferential statistics (t-tests) were used to determine if a single communication style significantly characterized the Millennials. For RQ2, descriptive statistics were used to determine the mean ratings of the Millennial employees' communication satisfaction with and perceptions of their supervisors' communicator competence, and inferential statistics (t-tests) were used to determine if Millennials with certain communication styles were more satisfied with the communication of their supervisors or perceived their supervisors to be competent communicators. For RQ3, correlations were conducted between Millennials' communication styles and their ratings of communication satisfaction and their supervisor's communicator competence, respectively, to determine if any relationships between the variables were significant.

CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

This chapter reviews the research that was conducted to determine the communication styles of Millennial employees in the Southern California region and the data conducted through the deployment of an online survey comprising items from Mok's (1975) Communication Styles Survey (MCSS), the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI), and the Communication Competence Questionnaire (CCQ). It also presents the findings from the quantitative analysis of the data collected through the online survey. The results of the analysis are shared in an effort to answer the research questions that were posed in this study regarding the Millennial employees' communication styles, their ratings of communication satisfaction with and the communicator competence of their supervisors, as well as the relationships between their communication styles and these communication variables.

Overview

This chapter begins with a review of the purpose statement and the research questions that guided the study. The methods used and the data collection process are discussed next, followed by a summary of the population of the study. The sample of the targeted population is shared, as well as the demographic data that were gleaned from the participants. A presentation of the findings for each of the three research questions follows, and a summary of the results is provided at the end of the chapter.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this descriptive, bivariate correlational study was to determine the communication styles of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations, the correlation between the Millennials' communication styles and their

communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and the correlation between perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI) and the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ), respectively.

Research Questions

1. What are the communication styles of Millennial employees as measured by the MCSS?
2. What are the levels of Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?
3. What is the relationship between the Millennials' communication styles, as measured by the MCSS, and the Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors, as well as the Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?

Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures

To collect data from Millennial employees regarding their communication styles, their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, and their perceptions of their supervisors' communicator competence, an online survey that combined items from the MCSS, ICSI, and CCQ was created through SurveyMonkey. When the researcher was granted permission to begin data collection by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the online address link to the survey was immediately emailed to known family, friends, and colleagues who qualified as Millennials. In certain cases, the survey link was emailed to non-Millennial colleagues who knew or had contact information for other known

Millennials, and those non-Millennials were urged to contact those Millennials to participate in the study.

The researcher also contacted several of the district chairs of the Professionals in Human Resources Association (PIHRA) Chapter 30 region with the survey access information. These chairs were also emailed a copy of the information flyer (see Appendix H) meant to be distributed to members of the organization within their respective districts for further dissemination to potential Millennial employees who could participate in the study. The majority of these district chairs shared the informational flyer with their members at regional meetings.

The data collection process progressed until 271 Millennial employees participated in the study. SurveyMonkey sent daily electronic updates to the researcher on the number of participants who took the online survey, as well as provided a participant counter on its website. After 28 days of hosting the survey through SurveyMonkey, the minimum number of participants was reached. The participant momentum seemed to remain consistent for several additional days, and by 32 days a total of 296 qualified Millennial employees participated in the survey. At that time, the data collected through SurveyMonkey was sent to a professional statistician to perform the quantitative analysis of the study. The quantitative analysis was conducted through the use of SPSS software, and the results were reported to the researcher in a face-to-face meeting.

Population

As previously mentioned, the population of the study was Millennials (those born between 1983 and 2000) employed in the current U.S. workforce. More importantly, the

target population of this study was employed Millennials of the Southern California region who were born between 1983 and 1997 (those of legal working age without the need of a special permit). The Millennial employees in the study comprised of men and women of various ethnic and social backgrounds, representative of various industries and organizations, including private business, education, government, and non-profit institutions. Also, the employees had a supervisor who was a member of either the Baby Boomer (those born between 1946 and 1964) or the Gen X (those born between 1965 and 1982) population, and had the necessary online access to participate in the study.

Sample

In this study, the sample of the employed Millennial population were those of the Southern California workforce. Specifically, 296 Millennials of the Southern California region who were employed in professional organizations for at least three months participated in the study. Through an electronic informed consent page presented before the start of the survey questions, the participating Millennials acknowledged that their involvement in the study was purely voluntary and that their answers would be kept private and confidential.

The Millennial employees in the sample were 18 to 32 years of age, and comprised of men and women of various ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds. Specific details regarding the demographics of the participating Millennial employees is discussed in the next section.

Demographic Data

Several questions regarding demographic qualities of the Millennial employees and their supervisors were posed in the survey, including the industry in which the

Millennials were employed, their years of employment, their gender and the gender of their supervisors, and the generational cohort of their supervisors. A question regarding whether the participant was a member of the Millennial generation was also included in the demographic section of the survey, but this was used as a filtering agent for the collected data. Technically, there were 312 participants in the study, but 296 actually belonged to the Millennial generation; the data from the remaining 16 participants were discarded from the study.

Industry of the Millennial Employment

Of the 296 participating Millennial employees, 294 participants provided answers for the industry of their current employment. The results are shared in Table 1.

Table 1

Industry of Millennial Employment

Industry	n	%
Construction	8	2.7
Education	90	30.6
Financial	13	4.4
Government	45	15.3
Healthcare	28	9.5
Manufacturing	6	2.0
Technology	21	7.1
Other	83	28.2
Total	294	100

Note. N = 294

The primary industry that the Millennial employees were employed in was education (n = 90, 30.6%), and other industries not specified as an option in the question item was the second most common response (n = 83, 28.2%). Millennial employees were also employed in government (n = 45, 15.3%), healthcare (n = 28, 9.5%),

technology (n = 21, 7.1%), financial (n = 12, 4.4%), and manufacturing (n = 6, 2.0%) industries.

Number of Years Worked in the Organization

Of the 296 participating Millennial employees, all of the participants provided answers for the number of years worked in their current organizations. The results are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Years Worked in Current Organization

Years Worked	n	%
Less than 3 Months	33	11.1
Between 3 Months and 1 Year	55	18.6
Between 1 Year and 2 Years	49	16.6
Between 2 Years and 3 Years	21	7.1
Between 4 Years and 5 Years	47	15.9
More than 5 Years	91	30.7
Total	296	100

Note. N = 296

The length of time the Millennial employees had worked in their respective organizations varied. Specifically, 11.1% (n = 33) indicated they had worked in their organization for less than three months, 18.6% (n = 55) indicated they had worked in their organization between three months and one year, 16.6% (n = 49) indicated they had worked in their organization between one and two years, 7.1% (n = 21) indicated they had worked in their organization between two and three years, 15.9% (n = 47) indicated they had worked in their organization between four and five years, and 30.7% (n = 91) indicated they had worked in their organization for more than five years.

Gender of Millennial Employees and Their Supervisors

All of the participating Millennial employees shared information regarding their gender and the gender of their supervisors. The results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Gender of the Participants and Their Supervisors

	n	%
Participants		
Male	82	27.7
Female	214	72.3
Total	296	100
Supervisors		
Male	159	53.7
Female	137	46.3
Total	296	100

Note. N = 296

The Millennial employees that participated in the study were predominantly female (n = 214, 72.3%). However, the supervisors of the Millennial employees were identified as 46.3% female (n = 137) and 53.7% male (n = 159).

Generational Cohort of the Supervisors

All of the participating Millennial employees indicated the generational cohort of their supervisors in the study. Table 4 provides the results.

Table 4

Generational Cohort of the Supervisors

Generation	n	%
Baby Boomer	100	33.8
Generation X	196	66.2
Total	296	100

Note. N = 296

The supervisors of the Millennial workers predominantly belonged to Generation X (n = 196, 66.2%) with approximately one-third from the Baby Boomer generation (n = 100, 33.8%).

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The following sections present the results of the quantitative analysis of the data that was collected through the online survey. The findings for each of the research questions is discussed separately and sequentially.

Communication Styles of Millennial Employees

All 296 Millennial employees completed the question items necessary to determine their communication style through the MCSS section of the online survey. As previously stated, the dominant communication style was determined by the counts of the question items pertaining to the behaviors characterized by each style. Although all of the Millennials completed this part of the survey, only 254 Millennials exhibited a dominant communication style. The remaining 42 Millennials had two or more communication styles that could not be determined because the counts of question items pertaining to the behaviors characterizing the styles were the same and could not be further distinguished from one another. The results of the MCSS section of the online survey is described in Table 5.

Table 5

Millennial Employees' Dominant Communication Styles

Communication Style	n	%
Driver	79	31.1
Amiable	110	43.3
Analytical	37	14.6
Expressive	28	11.0
Total	254	100

Note. N = 254

Two communication styles comprised the majority of the Millennial employees participating in the study. The results showed that 110 Millennials, or 43.3%, were

identified with the Amiable communication style, and that 79 Millennials, or 31.1%, were identified with the Driver communication style. The combined score of these two communication styles was 189 Millennials, or 74.4%.

Of the other two communication styles, 37 Millennials, or 14.6%, were characterized with the Analytical communication style, and 28 Millennials, or 11.1%, were characterized with the Expressive communication style. The combined score of these two communication styles was 65 Millennials, or 25.6%.

Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence Scales

The means for each item on the ICSI and the CCQ were calculated based on the 296 Millennial employees that participated in the study. The means explained the level of agreement the Millennials had with items pertaining to their communication satisfaction with and the ratings of communicator competence of their supervisors based on a 5-point Likert scale. The possible responses in the Likert scale for both the ICSI and the CCQ were *Strongly Disagree* (1.0), *Disagree* (2.0), *Neutral* (3.0), *Agree* (4.0), and *Strong Agree* (5.0). The findings for each of these two communication scales are discussed separately.

Communication satisfaction with supervisors. The mean scores for items pertaining to the Millennial employees' responses to their communication satisfaction with their supervisors based on the ICSI is presented in Table 6. It should be noted that, of the 19 items of the ICSI, eight items were negatively-scaled with the remaining eleven items positively scaled. As such, an equivalent score of a 1.0 or 2.0 (i.e. *Strongly Disagree* or *Disagree*) on a negatively-scaled item (i.e., an unappreciative response) was

a score of a 4.0 or a 5.0 (i.e., *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*) on a positively-scaled item (i.e., an appreciative response).

Table 6

Results of the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory

Item	n	M
With my supervisor...		
1. He/she lets me know I am communicating effectively.	295	3.84
2. I feel nothing is ever accomplished.*	296	2.09
3. I would like to continue having conversations like ours.	295	3.73
4. I feel he or she genuinely wants to get to know me.	295	3.73
5. I feel very dissatisfied with our conversations.*	295	2.08
6. I feel like I have something else to do.*	296	2.53
7. I am able to present myself as I want him/her to view me.	296	4.02
8. He/she shows me that he/she understands what I say.	296	3.94
9. I feel very satisfied with our conversations.	296	3.76
10. He/she expresses a lot of interest in what I have to say.	295	3.79
11. I feel I do not enjoy our conversations.*	296	1.99
12. He/she does not provide support for what he/she says.*	296	2.13
13. I can talk about anything.	295	3.58
14. I feel that we can get to say what we want.	296	3.70
15. I feel that we can laugh easily together.	296	3.94
16. I feel conversations flow smoothly.	296	3.91
17. He/she changes the topic when we discuss feelings.*	296	2.54
18. He/she say things that add little to the conversation.*	294	2.37
19. We often talk about things that I am not interested in.*	295	2.40

Note. An * denotes a negative-scale item.

The results showed that the mean responses for the positively-scaled (i.e., appreciative) items in the ICSI fell within the 3.58 to 4.02 range, or the *Agree* response, and the mean responses for the negatively-scaled (i.e., unappreciative) items fell within the 1.99 to 2.54 range, or the *Disagree* to *Neutral* response.

Of note were the mean scores for item number 7, (*With my supervisor, I am able to present myself as I want him/her to view me*, $M = 4.02$), and for item number 11 (*With my supervisor, I feel I do not enjoy our conversation*, $M = 1.99$). The mean scores for these items indicated that, more so than any of the other items in this inventory, Millennials *agreed* that they were able present themselves to their supervisors as they wanted to present themselves, and that Millennials *disagreed* that they did not enjoy the conversations with their supervisors.

Communicator competence of supervisors. The mean scores for items pertaining to the Millennials employees' ratings of the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors is displayed in Table 7. It should be noted that of the 12 items of the ICSI, two items were negatively-scaled and the remaining eleven items were positively scaled. Again, this meant that an equivalent score of a 1.0 or 2.0 (i.e., *Strongly Disagree* or *Disagree*) on a negatively-scaled (i.e., unappreciative) item was a score of a 4.0 or a 5.0 (i.e., *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*) on a positively-scaled (i.e., appreciative) item.

Table 7

Results of the Communicator Competence Questionnaire

Item	n	M
My immediate supervisor...		
1. Has a good command of language.	296	4.17
2. Is sensitive to my needs of the moment.	296	3.81
3. Typically gets right to the point.	296	3.84
4. Pays attention to what I say to him or her.	296	4.00
5. Deals with me effectively.	296	3.93
6. Is a good listener.	295	3.86
7. Is difficult to understand when he/she is writing.*	296	2.16
8. Expresses his/her ideas clearly.	295	3.94
9. Is difficult to understand when he/she speaks to me.*	296	2.05
10. Generally says the right thing at the right time.	296	3.67
11. Is easy to talk to.	295	3.90
12. Usually responds to messages quickly.	296	3.86

Note. An * denotes a negative-scale item.

The results showed that the mean responses for the positively-scaled (i.e., appreciative) items in the CCQ fell within the 3.67 to 4.17 range, or the *Agree* response, and the mean responses for the negatively-scaled (i.e., unappreciative) items fell within the 2.05 to 2.16 range, or the *Disagree* response.

Of note were the mean scores for item number 1, (*My immediate supervisor has a good command of language*, $M = 4.17$), item number 4 (*My immediate supervisor pays attention to what I say to him or her*, $M = 4.00$), and item number 9 (*My immediate supervisor is difficult to understand when he or she speaks to me*, $M = 2.05$). The mean scores for these items indicated that, more so than any of the other items in this questionnaire, Millennials *agreed* that their supervisors had good command of language

and that their supervisors paid attention to what they said, and that Millennials *disagreed* that their supervisors were difficult to understand when speaking to them.

Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles and Communication with Their Supervisors

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, or R-statistic, was calculated to determine the strength of the relationships between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, as well as their perceptions of their supervisors' communication competence. The significance of the relationships were also calculated through the interaction of the t-test for the sample means of each of the communication styles and the communication variables. In addition, the coefficient of determination, or R-squared statistic, was computed for each of the relationships between the Millennial's communication styles and the communication variables to determine the meaningfulness of the relationships. The results of these relationships are depicted in Table 8.

Table 8

Millennial Communication Styles and the Communication with Their Supervisors

Communication Style		Communication Satisfaction	Communicator Competence
Driver (n=291)	Pearson Correlation	.260**	.094
	R ²	.068	.009
Amiable (n=286)	Pearson Correlation	.113	.170**
	R ²	.013	.029
Analytical (n=282)	Pearson Correlation	.218**	.124*
	R ²	.048	.015
Expressive (n=286)	Pearson Correlation	.072	.013
	R ²	.005	.000

Note. N = 296; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01 (two-tailed)

The results of the study show that there was a weak, though significant relationship between the Millennials who exhibited Driver communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisor ($N = 291$, $R = 0.260$, $p < 0.01$), but not with the perceived communication competence of their supervisors. On the other hand, there was a weak, though significant relationship between Millennials who were characterized as Amiables and their perceived communication competence of their supervisors ($N = 286$, $R = 0.170$, $p < 0.01$), but not with their satisfaction of their supervisor's communication skills. Similarly, a weak, though significant relationship was found between Millennials who were characterized as Analyticals and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors ($N = 282$, $R = 0.218$, $p < 0.01$) and the perceived communication competence of their supervisors ($N = 282$, $R = 0.124$, $p < 0.05$). No significant relationships were discovered between Millennials who exhibited Expressive communication styles and their communication satisfaction with and their perceived communicator competence of their supervisors.

In addition, the coefficient of determination (R-squared) for each of the significant relationships was small, with the only notable coefficients between Millennials with Driver communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors ($R^2 = 0.068$), and between Millennials with Analytical communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors ($R^2 = 0.048$).

Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles

In addition to investigating the relationships between Millennial communication styles and the aforementioned communication variables with their supervisors, there were significant relationships discovered between the communication styles of the Millennials

as determined by the MCSS. The significance of these relationships were determined by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, or R-statistic, and the interaction of the t-scores of the sample means, as well as through the coefficient of determination, or R-squared statistic, that expressed the meaningfulness of each of the relationships. The results of these relationships is displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

Relationships among Millennial Communication Styles

		Driver	Amiable	Analytical	Expressive
Driver	Pearson Coefficient	1	.062	.355**	.149*
	R ²		.004	0.127	0.022
	N		282	279	283
Amiable	Pearson Coefficient		1	.082	.259**
	R ²			.007	.067
	N			276	279
Analytical	Pearson Coefficient			1	-.126*
	R ²				.016
	N				275
Expressive	Pearson Coefficient				1
	R ²				
	N				

Note. N = 296; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01 (two-tailed)

The results of the study showed several significant relationships between the communication styles of the Millennial generation. There was a moderate, significant relationship between Millennials who exhibited qualities of the Driver communication style and those of the Analytical communication style (N = 279, R = 0.355, p < 0.01), and a weak, significant relationship between the same Millennial Drivers and those of the Expressive communication style (N = 283, R = 283, p < 0.05). Also, there was a weak,

significant relationship between Millennials characterized as Amiables and those of the Expressive communication style ($N = 279$, $R = 0.259$, $p < 0.05$). In contrast, there was a weak, significant inverse relationship between Millennials described as Analyticals and those of the Expressive communication style ($N = 275$, $R = -0.126$, $p < 0.05$).

The coefficient of determination was also small for each of the significant relationships, though the most notable coefficients were those that existed in the relationship between Millennials of the Driver communication styles and those of the Analytical communication style ($R^2 = 0.127$), and the relationship between Millennials of the Amiable communication style and those of the Expressive communication style ($R^2 = 0.067$).

Relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence of Supervisors

In addition to other significant findings outside of those examined through the research questions, a notable relationship was discovered between Millennials' ratings of communication satisfaction with and of the communicator competence of their supervisors. Similar to previous relationships, the Pearson R and coefficient of determination were calculated for this interaction. The significance of the relationship is presented in Table 10 below.

Table 10

The Relationships between Millennials' Communication Satisfaction with Their Supervisors and the Ratings of the Supervisors as Competent Communicators

		Communicator Competence
Communication Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.443**
	R ²	.196

Note. N = 296; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01 (two-tailed)

As determined by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, the relationship between the Millennials' ratings of communication satisfaction with and the communicator competence of their supervisors was moderate and significant (N = 285, R = 0.443, p < 0.01). The coefficient of determination for the relationship was notable (R² = 0.196) and expressed some meaningfulness to the interaction between the communication variables.

Summary

There were several key findings from the results of the study. The demographic data showed that a majority of the Millennials who participated in the study were female over males (72.3% to 27.7% respectively), whereas the split between the gender of their supervisors was more equal (53.7% male to 46.3% female). In addition, the industry that most represented the Millennials in the study was the education field (30.6%), and the span of time that most Millennials had been working in their current organization was more than five years (30.7%).

The communication styles that described the Millennials of the study the most were the Amiable style (43.3%) and the Driver style (31.1%). There were also significant relationships discovered between the Millennials of different communication styles. Specifically, there was a moderate, significant relationship between Millennials

characterized as Drivers and those characterized as Analyticals, and a weak, significant relationship between Millennials described as Amiables and those described as Expressives.

With regard to the communication scales surveying the Millennials communication satisfaction with their supervisors and the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, the Millennials generally agreed they were able to present themselves in a way that their supervisors should view them when communicating. Also, Millennials agreed their supervisors had good control of language when conversing with them, and that their supervisors paid attention to them when they spoke. Moreover, Millennials generally disagreed that they did not enjoy the conversations with their supervisors, and that their supervisors were difficult to understand when they spoke. Most importantly, it was discovered that the relationship between a Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and the ratings of the supervisors as a competent communicator was moderate and significant.

The relationships between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with and the perceived communication competence of their supervisors revealed that Millennials described as Drivers and Analyticals were significantly satisfied with their supervisors' communication, as were Amiables, albeit to a less significant degree. Also, Millennials characterized as Amiables significantly believed their supervisors to be competent communicators, as were Analyticals though to a less significant degree.

A detailed interpretation of the results, considerations regarding the limitations of the study, and proposed ideas for future studies are discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter begins with a restatement the purpose and research questions of the study, followed by a summary of the findings of the study. Based on the findings, conclusions were drawn and implications for action are presented, along with recommendations for future research. The chapter concludes with closing remarks from the researcher.

Summary of the Study

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this descriptive, bivariate correlational study was to determine the communication styles of Millennial employees working in professional service organizations, the correlation between the Millennials' communication styles and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors as determined by the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI), and the correlation between perceived communicator competence of their supervisors as determined by the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ).

Research Questions

The research questions stemming from the purpose of the study were threefold. (1) What are the communication styles of Millennial employees as measured by Mok's (1975) Communication Styles Survey (MCSS)? (2) What are the levels of Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors and Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ? (3) What is the relationship between the Millennials' communication styles, as measured by the MCSS, and the Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors, as

well as the Millennials' perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as measured by the ICSI and the CCQ?

Research Design

The methodology of the study consisted of combining the MCSS, ICSI, and CCQ into a single online survey hosted through SurveyMonkey and disseminating the online link for the survey to working Millennials within the Southern California region. The bulk of the Millennials were informed of the survey through the administrators within their organizations who were members of Chapter 30 of the Professionals in Human Resources Association (PIHRA). The quantitative results of the study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Population and Sample

Based on the target population size of over 1.0 million working Millennials in the Southern California region, to reach a 90% confidence level in the findings of the study, the sample size needed to be comprised of at least 271 Millennials. The participants varied in demographic characteristics, as well as gender and work industries.

When the data collection of the study was completed, 312 people participated in the survey, of which 296 were qualified Millennials who met the age requirement (being born between 1983 and 2000). The quantitative data from these 296 Millennials were analyzed to determine the results of the study.

Major Findings

Several major findings were discovered as a result of the quantitative analysis discussed in the previous chapter. These findings are addressed according to each of the research questions that formed the purpose of the study.

Millennial Communication Styles

According to the results of the MCSS, the majority of the Millennials who participated in the study exhibited two predominate communication styles. The most salient communication style was Amiable as described by the MCSS, a style characterized as slow and calm in speech and tone, and more people-focused than other styles, as well as one preoccupied with relationships and relaying observations of the shared environment to others. The second most salient communication style was Driver as described by the MCSS, a style highlighted by speaking rapidly and being action-oriented—of gathering facts and making decisions quickly (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). These two communication styles combined comprised nearly 75% of the Millennial sample.

The minority of the Millennials that participated in the study exhibited two other communication styles. The Expressive style (one characterized with high-energy, enthusiasm, being self-oriented, and also people-focused) and the Analytical style (one described as speaking slowly but eager to discuss facts, figures, and to delve into the nuances of topics; Ferri-Reed, 2013) formed roughly 25% of the Millennial sample.

The results therefore indicated that most of the targeted Millennial population spoke with an Amiable or Driver communication style, and that the likelihood they spoke with an Expressive or Analytical style was much smaller. Thus, these findings partially supported the researcher's expectation (based on the findings of Hartman & McCambridge, 2011, and Ferri-Reed, 2013) that the Millennial population would be predominantly characterized with an Amiable or Expressive communication style rather than a Driver or Analytical communication style.

Communication Satisfaction with Millennials' Supervisors

According to the results of the ICSI, the Millennials in this study expressed that they were satisfied with their supervisors' communication abilities. The Millennials generally agreed with appreciative statements regarding their supervisor's communication, and disagreed with unappreciative statements about their supervisors. The Millennials were especially agreeable to their ability to present themselves as they desired to their supervisors, as well as being appreciative of the daily conversations they had with their supervisors.

These findings did not support the researcher's expectation that Millennials would express dissatisfaction with their supervisor's communication abilities, which might have entailed a kind of communication dissonance with their supervisors.

Perceived Communicator Competence of the Millennials' Supervisors

According to the results of the CCQ, the participating Millennials believed their supervisors were competent communicators. The Millennials generally agreed with positive statements regarding their supervisor's communication competence and disagreed with negative statements about their supervisors. Of note, the Millennials highlighted that their supervisors exercised good command of language and that their supervisors paid attention to what the Millennials expressed in their conversations.

These findings did not support the researcher's expectation that Millennials would not perceive their supervisors as competent communicators, which would have entailed another sign of communication style dissonance between Millennials and their supervisors.

Relationships between Millennial Communication Style and Satisfaction with and Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors

After correlating the results of the MCSS with the ICSI and the CCQ, respectively, several relationships were determined. Millennials with Amiable and Analytical communications styles were significantly satisfied with and perceived their supervisors to be competent communicators. Millennials with a Driver communication style were also significantly satisfied with their supervisor's communication skills, but they did not significantly perceive their supervisors to be competent communicators. Although significant, all of these relationships were statistically weak, and the level of communication satisfaction and of the perceived communicator competence between Millennials and their supervisors as explained by the Millennials' communication style was very small. That is, finding that a Millennial scored highly as an Amiable, Analytical, or Driver only minimally explained why they were satisfied with and perceived their supervisors to be competent communicators.

In addition, no significant relationships were identified between Millennials with an Expressive communication style and their satisfaction with and the perceived communication competence of their supervisors.

These findings partially supported the researcher's expectation that Drivers and Analyticals, presumably sharing common communication styles with their supervisors, would be significantly satisfied with and perceive their supervisors to be competent communicators. Moreover, Expressives and Amiables, presumably having less compatible communication styles with their supervisors, were expected to be dissatisfied with and to not perceive their supervisors to be competent communicators.

Relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Communicator Competence of Millennial Supervisors

An additional finding of the study was outside of the research questions posed by the study: a moderate, direct relationship between Millennials' scores of communication satisfaction with their supervisors on the ICSI and scores of the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors on the CCQ. That is, if a Millennial was generally satisfied with the communication skills of their supervisor, the Millennial had also identified their supervisor as a competent communicator. Therefore, the outcome that a Millennial was satisfied with their supervisor's communication skills could, to some extent, explain why they also identified their supervisor as a competent communicator, and vice versa. Although not posed as a part of the research questions, the finding that the Millennials' communication satisfaction was moderately correlated with their ratings of their supervisors as competent communicators was not surprising, given perceptions of competence and satisfaction would be logically related.

Unexpected Findings

There were several unexpected findings discovered from the quantitative analysis of this study. These unexpected findings consisted of relationships between the Millennials' communication styles identified by the MCSS, and between the levels of communication satisfaction with and perceptions of supervisory communicator competence identified by the ICSI and the CCQ, respectively.

Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles

By correlating the results of the communication styles as determined by the MCSS, the most significant, direct relationship between the communication styles among

the Millennials was between Drivers and Analyticals; Millennials who highly exhibited communication behaviors of a Driver greatly shared communication behaviors with those identified as an Analytical, and vice versa. Given the moderate relationship between the communication styles, a small level of interaction between Drivers and Analyticals could be explained by a Millennial scoring high on one of the communication styles; the outcome that a Millennial exhibited a Driver communication style also entailed that the Millennial exhibited communication behaviors of an Analytical because the Millennial scored highly as a Driver, and vice versa.

To a less significant degree, direct relationships were identified between Expressives and Drivers, and between Expressives and Amiables. Thus, Millennials who scored highly on communication behaviors of an Expressive also shared communication behaviors with Drivers and Amiables, respectively, and vice versa. Given the weak significance of the relationship, the outcome that a Millennial exhibited an Expressive communication style also entailed that the Millennial exhibited communication behaviors of a Driver and an Amiable. Moreover, these relationships could be minimally explained because the Millennial scored highly as an Expressive, and vice versa.

A weak, inverse relationship was also discovered between Millennials who exhibited communication behaviors of an Analytical and those who exhibited communication behaviors of an Expressive. This meant that Millennials identified as Analyticals usually did not exhibit communication behaviors of an Expressive, and vice versa.

Conclusions

There were several conclusions drawn from the results of the study, which both answered the research questions and provided insight into the unexpected findings from the survey. The conclusions from the research questions are addressed first, followed by those from the unexpected findings.

Millennials' Communication Behaviors

As Bakker-Pieper and de Vries (2013) stated, how an individual communicated was closely tied to their personality because an individual's motivations and emotions were also guided by their broader personality traits. Due to this interaction between an individual's internal personality and their external communication behaviors, Duran and Zakahi (1984) and Hamilton (2011) concluded that a communication style characterized the behavioral and emotive manner an individual exercised when engaged in conversation to signal how the meaning of a message should be interpreted, filtered, and understood. Also, given that Johnson (2006) and McAlister (2009) concluded that Millennials were very sheltered, catered to, and constantly cherished and celebrated in their upbringing throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Cekada (2012) and Schullery (2013) believed that the Millennials grew up to be confident and relationship-oriented, yet overly cautious, impatient, and fastidious in nature.

When reflecting on Mok's (1975) communication style model, given Amiables and Expressives were more heavily focused on talking about their relationships with others and their personal observations of the shared environment, it was expected for the Millennials to exhibit these communication behaviors as determined by the MCSS. In partial confirmation of this expectation, the Amiable communication style characterized

the Millennials that participated in the survey more than any other style. This confirmed that many Millennials chose to be respectful, polite, and relationship-oriented in their communication style. However, given that the Expressive communication style characterized the Millennials the least, it cannot be concluded that many Millennials were also over-confident, impatient, and fastidious.

Still, given that the Driver communication style characterized the second-highest proportion of Millennials, and together with the Amiable communication style represented three-fourths of the communication styles of those surveyed, Millennials could also be characterized as heavily focused on talking about their relationships with others and their observations of the shared environment just as much as they were about establishing facts and details in delivering recommendations for decisions and actions. This conclusion was, in fact, consistent with the findings of Ferri-Reed (2013), Madlock (2006), and Myers and Sadaghiani (2010).

Millennials' Communication Satisfaction with their Supervisors

As Madlock (2006) and Myers and Goodboy (2014) reported, communication satisfaction was the reported contentment an individual received from feeling comforted and validated by another individual. Also, Madlock (2008) and Tillott et al. (2013) concluded that supervisors who communicated their vision and expectations to their employees, as well as those who communicated empathy and concern for their employees' welfare, garnered reports of higher communication satisfaction from their employees. It was expected that Millennials would be generally dissatisfied with the communication skills of their supervisors, especially if the Millennials exhibited relationship-oriented communication behaviors and their supervisors did not, so the

communication results of the ICSI were expected to be unfavorable toward the Millennials' supervisors. However, this was not the case as Millennials generally expressed favorable and appreciative attitudes toward their supervisors' communication abilities.

In fact, it was noted by the Millennials that they felt comfortable presenting themselves and their opinions openly to their supervisors, and that their supervisors had a good command of language. These results were consistent with Hynes' (2012) claim that supervisors who were able to speak the language of their employees (i.e., mirror their employee's communication styles) would earn higher ratings of communication satisfaction. Thus, there was a possibility that even though supervisors inherently possessed a different communication style from their Millennial employees, they were able to adjust their communication style to better reflect those of their employees—namely those of the Amiable and Driver communication styles.

Supervisory Communicator Competence as Perceived by Millennial Employees

As McKinley and Perino (2013) described, communicator competence indicated how effective an individual was at accomplishing the objectives of the conversation. Byron (2007) posited that supervisors were usually described as competent communicators if they exhibited certain emotionally intelligent behaviors, such as accurate perception of and response to their employees' non-verbal cues, and appealing to their employees through charismatic speech by using language, gestures, and voice control to persuade them into understanding and accepting their messages. Given that Millennials, as Amiables and Expressives, were expected to have communicative differences with their supervisors and would not be satisfied with their supervisors'

communication skills, supervisors were expected to be described as incompetent communicators. However, the results of the study did not support this expectation.

The results of the study showed that Millennials described their supervisors as competent communicators quite appreciatively and favorably. In fact, supervisors were described as focused, rendered appropriate direction to their employees, and treated employees fairly and respectfully. This conclusion supported Pavitt's (1990) assertion that a supervisor who demonstrated a communication style that was similar to his or her employees' would garner higher ratings of communicator competence than supervisors whose communication styles differed from their employees. Thus, there was further evidence to support the notion that when supervisors were able to adjust their communication style to reflect those of their employees, they would be regarded as competent communicators by their employees.

Relationship between Millennial Communication Style and Communication

Satisfaction of Supervisors

The results of the correlational analysis between Millennial communication styles, as determined by the MCSS, and their communication satisfaction with their supervisors, as determined by the ICSI, showed that Millennials characterized as either Drivers or Analyticals were significantly satisfied with the communication skills of their supervisors. Given that the combined proportion of Millennials who were described as Drivers or Analyticals represented 45.7% of those surveyed, it cannot be concluded that the majority of Millennials with a distinct communication style were either significantly satisfied or dissatisfied with their supervisors' communication skills. These findings

perpetuated Madlock's (2008) statement that a relationship between communication styles and communication satisfaction was not clearly established in the research.

Still, given that there were Millennials who could not be characterized with having a distinct communication style and were therefore excluded from the correlation analysis, and that the most Millennials expressed satisfaction with their supervisors when focusing only on the results of the ICSI, it may be that the majority of the surveyed Millennials were actually satisfied with their supervisors' communication skills. Thus, further research would need to be conducted to conclusively determine whether or not Millennials' communication styles related to their satisfaction with a supervisor's communication skills.

Relationship between Millennial Communication Style and Communication Competence of Supervisors

The results of the correlation analysis between Millennial communication styles, as determined by the MCSS, and the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors, as determined by the CCQ, showed that Millennials characterized as Amiable and Analyticals significantly regarded their supervisors as competent communicators. Given that the combined proportion of Millennials who were described as either Amiables and Analyticals represented 57.9% of those surveyed, it was concluded that the majority of Millennials with a distinct communication style significantly regarded their supervisors as competent communicators. These findings therefore supported Hanke's (2009) claim that a relationship might exist between communication styles of employees and their supervisors and the perceived communicator competence of those supervisors.

Also, in contrast to the inconclusive findings regarding the relationship between Millennial communication styles and their satisfaction with their supervisor's communication skills, given that the results of the CCQ showed that the Millennials—including those without a distinct communication style—were generally agreeable to statements regarding their supervisors as competent communicators, it was concluded that a relationship between a Millennials' communication style and the perception of their supervisors as competent communicators existed.

Though, it should be noted that an employee's communication style might have had an influencing effect on their ratings of their supervisor as a competent communicator. For instance, given that a large number of Millennials within the sample were described as Amiable in their communication style, and that Amiables are characterized as having appreciative and relationship-oriented behaviors, it may be that the Millennials' overall Amiable nature influenced their decisions to describe their supervisors as competent communicators. Thus, a Millennial's communication style is likely a confounding factor in the ratings of their supervisor's communication skills.

Relationships between Millennial Communication Styles

The unexpected finding that relationships existed between the communication styles determined by the MCSS provided additional validity to the communication style paradigm posited by Mok (1975). According to Mok, Amiables and Expressives were similar in that they focused their communication toward relationship-building whereas Drivers and Analyticals were more task-oriented in their communication behaviors. Also, Expressives and Drivers were more quick and action-oriented in their speech patterns, whereas Amiables and Analyticals were more slow and conversational in their

interactions (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Thus, Amiables and Drivers were direct opposites on the communication style spectrum, as were Expressives and Analyticals.

Given the results demonstrated that Amiables and Expressives, as well as Drivers and Analyticals, were directly and significantly correlated with one another, the assertion that these pairs of communication styles were related to one another was supported by this study. Also, given that Expressives and Analyticals were inversely and significantly correlated with one another, and no correlation was exhibited between Drivers and Amiables, the added assertion that these pairs of communication styles were directly opposite from one another was supported by this study. Moreover, the validity of the MCSS as a tool for determining the communication style based on Mok's paradigm was supported as well.

Relationship between Millennial Communication Satisfaction with and Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors

The unexpected finding that a relationship existed between the Millennials' communication satisfaction with their supervisors, as determined by the ICSI, and the Millennials' perceptions of their supervisors as competent communicators, as determined by the CCQ, demonstrated added validity to these instruments as tools for capturing an individual's feelings of communication satisfaction with and the communicator competence of their supervisor, respectively. Given the direct, moderately significant relationships between the results of the ICSI and the CCQ, meaning that a Millennial who was satisfied with his or her supervisor's communication skills was also be likely to rate the supervisor as competent communicators (and vice versa), validity for the psychological connection between being satisfied with the communication of an

individual and perceiving him or her as a competent communicator was demonstrated. Thus, the correlation between the communication satisfaction of Millennials and the perception of their supervisors as competent communicators enhanced the understanding of what it meant to be an effective communicator and strengthened the usage of the ICSI and the CCQ as tools for determining the components of interpersonal communication.

Implications for Action

Based on the findings and conclusions from the study, three implications for action were suggested.

As Ferri-Reed (2013), Lazarus (2015), and Schullery (2013) theorized, generational conflict in the workplace stemmed from the technical differences in how the younger generation preferred to communicate using texting, email, and instant messaging, whereas supervisors of the older generations preferred telephone and face-to-face interactions. Due to these technical differences, organizations invested in training to instruct employees and their supervisors on navigating through these communication dissimilarities. However, this study was not able to support the claim that Millennials were at odds with the communication behaviors of their supervisors. This implied that other sources of communication conflict may exist in the workplace outside of those thought to be related to generational differences. Thus, the first implication for action is that further research must be conducted to determine more accurately identify these differences the level of impact they have in describing the communication conflict between supervisors and their employees. For instance, some issues may arise out of differences in life circumstances, such as socioeconomic dissimilarities or differences in life experience. Needless to say, future studies should be conducted to determine these

characteristics in an effort to better define the communication conflict within the workplace that other researches originally attributed to generational differences.

This study provided information in an attempt to address the research gap identified by Chi et al. (2013) and Jourdain (2014) regarding the specific communication styles that characterize Millennials; thus the second implication for action is that training on the differences in communication styles must be implemented to instruct employees and supervisors on these often overlooked interpersonal dynamics. Given the salient communication styles exist within the Millennial population, it became apparent that organizational training should incorporate discussions on the modes in which these different generations of workers unconsciously choose to communicate. In other words, supervisors and their employees need to be enlightened about the dynamics caused by differences in communication styles. In addition, as Bhatt (2011) pointed out, incorporating this learning content in on-boarding orientations would help develop the social and emotional intelligence of the younger generation (especially as they enter the workforce), as well as fine-tune the management practices of the supervisors.

The primary step in getting content regarding communication styles incorporated into professional training courses is to expose human resource and training managers of various organizations to the findings of this study. This endeavor could be achieved by reporting the results to the members of PIHRA and other similar professional groups, while urging human resource and training managers to incorporate information regarding communication style differences in the training exercises of their orientation programs. It may help to appeal to their interests in using interpersonal inventories by showcasing how the MCSS can be applied in conjunction with other interpersonal inventories in the

training programs they develop. For instance, the MCSS, a tool for determining communication domains, can be used in conjunction with a more well-known inventory such as the DISC, a personality assessment, to provide employees with a fuller understanding of themselves and to demonstrate how these instruments may be related. Regardless, through these actions, knowledge and interest regarding communication styles and the implications from the differences that exist between groups of individuals may help attenuate the generational conflict in the workplace.

Given that this study also answered questions posed by Hanke (2009), Madlock (2008), and Myers and Sadaghiani (2010), by exploring how the different communication styles among the Millennials relate to their communication satisfaction with and their perceptions of supervisory communicator competence, the third implication for action is for the incorporation of discussions on communication styles to be added to the curriculum in business schools. Hynes (2012) identified that business schools in higher education had not addressed a need for instructing students on the existence of communication styles in workplace communication. Now that connections between communication styles and the Millennials' communication satisfaction with and the perceived communicator competence of their supervisors were made, this credibility now exists. Learning about the different communication styles would be of interest to the Millennial (and future) generations, and they would be able to use this knowledge when they become supervisors of the younger generations of the future. This would help to improve the communication satisfaction experienced in the workplace, and continue to ensure that supervisors are regarded as competent communicators by their employees.

The first step toward the incorporation of communication styles in business curriculum is to continue to conduct studies that support and further this area of research. By producing the results of this study and inspiring other researchers and inquiring groups to investigate the dynamics between communication styles and other interpersonal outcomes, the importance and credibility of teaching communications styles in the landscape of higher education will become even more apparent and viable.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several recommendations for research can be made based on this study. First, a future study should consider surveying the communication styles of the supervisors as this study only surveyed the communication styles of Millennial employees. In this way, the communication styles of Millennials and their supervisors could be compared to one another and correlational analyses could be conducted to determine if there were higher ratings of communication satisfaction with supervisors, as well as perceptions of communicator competence, when the communication styles were similar versus dissimilar. The correlations discovered would provide further insight into the role of communication styles in affecting the interpersonal dynamics between employees and their supervisors.

Second, aside from surveying the level of communication satisfaction and perceptions of communicator competence that Millennial employees had toward their supervisors, surveying the communication satisfaction and perceptions of communicator competence that supervisors had toward their Millennial employees should also be considered. Determining if supervisors were generally more or less satisfied with their employees, as well as if they consider their employees to be competent communicators,

would be interesting to discover in itself, yet also determining how ratings in these variables change when they interplay with communication styles of supervisor's employees is even more intriguing. By including the supervisors' own ratings of communication satisfaction and communicator competencies of their employees in a future study, more light could be shed on the interpersonal dynamics between supervisors and their employees.

Third, the study should be replicated on different groups of Millennial employees, but with certain characteristics of the employees and their organizations being highlighted further in the demographic questions of the survey. For instance, since some Millennial employees may in fact be supervisors themselves (and their responses on the ICSI and CCQ may therefore be influenced by their association as a supervisor), it would help to include an item asking if the employees managed any employees. In addition, whether or not the organization is composed of unionized employees might help in qualifying the participating Millennials even further. That is, it may be that the employees' responses to the ICSI and the CCQ may be influenced by political factors raised from being in a collective bargaining unit. Also, results from employees associated with these characteristics (being a supervisor or a member of a union) might be compared against those of employees with "normal" characteristics (not being a supervisor nor a member of a union) to determine if these characteristics lead to significant differences in employees being satisfied with or perceiving their supervisors as competent communicators. If such significant differences are found, these types of variables would be considered confounding variables in the Millennial employees' ratings of their supervisors communication skills in both the ICSI and CCQ.

Fourth, in a continued effort to increase the generalizability of the results, the study should be conducted among different target populations in various regions of the country. The results of this study are generalizable to Millennials within the Southern California region, but determining whether these results are generalizable to the larger population of Millennials, specifically those in the U.S., can occur only if the study is replicated across different states and settings. Results in different regions may demonstrate that Millennials exhibit specific communication style preferences based on geographic differences, thereby suggesting that communication styles were heavily influenced by external forces, such as sub-cultures, rather than internal forces, such as an individual's personality. Also, replicating this survey in other parts of the globe may help in providing further information as to the extent that generational characteristics can be used to characterize different generations of people around the world.

Fifth, outside of surveying Millennials who work in various industries, it would behoove future researchers to survey Millennials who work in specific industries. For instance, this study displayed results of Millennials from various industries, yet over 30.0% of those surveyed worked in the education industry. Since education is known for employing teachers and service workers, they may share a common personality type or mode of communication that is sensitive to the feelings and emotions of their students. Moreover, the type of role and the length of service that Millennials had in that role within the organization should be questioned further in the demographic questions. For instance, given that many Millennial employees within the study worked in Education, if many had worked several years of experience instructing young children, this may give reason as to why the Amiable communication style was the most prevalent style of those

surveyed in the study. Thus, if Millennials in other targeted industries were surveyed, and their role and years of service within that role were questioned, differences in the work environment, service role, and length of service may also give rise to differences found in communication styles among the Millennial population.

Sixth, aside from surveying Millennials who work in a specific industry, targeting men and women for equal gender representation would help in identifying gender differences within the Millennial population. For example, in this study over 70.0% of those surveyed were female. This might have affected the results since Amiables, again the most prevalent communication style, exhibit communication behaviors that are highly feminine (i.e., relationship-oriented, considerate, and cautious) versus Drivers who exhibit behaviors that are more masculine (i.e., action-oriented, quick, and decisive). Thus, the effect of gender on the results of the study and the interplay it may have on communication styles exhibited by the Millennial population could be explored further if the results of female and male Millennials were compared against one another.

Seventh, the idea that Millennials could be characterized with one or two communication styles should be examined further by stratifying the participants in future studies by age. That is, communication style differences may exist between different sub-groups in age among the Millennials, where older Millennials (e.g., those born between 1983 and 1990), might exhibit different behaviors from younger Millennials (e.g., those born between 1993 and 2000). Of course, given that younger Millennials were not fully in the workforce yet because they would be roughly 16 to 23 years of age, some time would need to elapse until this study could be conducted. Still, if differences existed, examining the interplay in the ratings of communication satisfaction and

communicator competence of supervisors between younger and older Millennials might provide additional context as to which Millennials were generally more congruent with their supervisors with regard to their communication preferences. Of course, if no significant differences between older and younger Millennials were found, then the generalizability of the results characterizing the entire Millennial generation, from this and future studies, would be further strengthened.

Eighth, as previously mentioned as an implication for action, further studies should be conducted to determine other characteristics besides generational differences that might contribute to communication conflict within the workplace. The conflict might stem from a host of other interpersonal differences and issues, such as dissimilarities in socioeconomic levels and acquired life experience. Although differences in work values and personality types have already been established in the research as sources of conflict within the workplace, conducting interviews and other qualitative methods among employees within various explorations regarding their frustrations and issues with their supervisors should help in establishing sources of work conflict even further. It may also help to include the ICSI and the CCQ as quantitative measurements with these interviews so that low scores of communication satisfaction and communicator competence from employees towards their supervisors may be discovered based on the repeated frustrations and issues employees have towards their supervisors, thereby pinpointing the sources of communication conflict within the workplace.

Concluding Remarks and Reflections

The concept of this study was in development since I was first introduced to the existence of communication styles in a training program ten years ago. In the training

program, the communication styles were introduced alternatively as four different work styles that existed in the workplace. At the training seminar, my co-workers and I completed a personality inventory to determine our individual work style. After we were done with the questionnaire, my co-workers and I were separated in the four corners of the testing room by the trainer. As we stepped into the corners, the co-workers in each quadrant were directed to pull chairs that were standing against the wall and to situate them so that we could all see the trainer, who was standing in the middle of the room. I was designated as a Driver, and my co-workers and I within the quadrant arranged our chairs together quickly.

When we turned our attention back to the trainer, and once all the other groups had finished arranging their chairs, the trainer went on to explain the qualities of the different work styles and pointed to the arrangement of our chairs as a physical example of our different types. In one corner, the orderly and process-oriented Analyticals arranged their chairs in a straight line so that each member of the group had the same view of the trainer. In the Amiable corner, the co-workers had arranged themselves into a circle as a way of symbolizing their communal spirit and orientation toward equality and relationships. The third corner comprised of Stars (or Expressives), and these lively and enthusiastic workers had planted themselves in random order all around the quadrant, as if they were actual stars dotting the sky. Lastly, the corner comprising the Drivers in which I was represented had formed an arc as if we were a flock of birds with the senior-most leader at the head of the flock as if to symbolize our respect for rules and authority. The physical manifestation of our work styles made me instantly intrigued by the

personality paradigm, and it was at that moment that I devoted my dissertation study to this interesting topic.

When beginning my research on the work style paradigm, I realized there was no credible research conducted on this topic. Luckily, when I further examined related topics to this paradigm, I stumbled upon the communication style model that was presented by Mok (1975), which had incorporated nearly the same ideas from the work style paradigm. Pivoting off from this point, I was led deeper into the field of communication and interpersonal dynamics, and my dissertation topic took form.

As I thought about how I wanted to use the communication style paradigm in my dissertation, I considered a current work problem that I witnessed between members of the Millennial generation and their supervisors. It seemed as if Millennials were communicating one way with specific goals in mind, and yet the supervisors were communicating in another way and concluded different goals from the same information. This dissonance made me consider how communication styles could be used to explain the apparent dissatisfaction Millennials (and supervisors) had in these workplace interactions, and so my dissertation topic was formed. From this string of events, I was able to construct a reasonable argument to conduct the research presented in this study.

In terms of the research process, my interactions with others—whether it was with participants or supporters of the study—represented an educational and fruitful experience. Choosing a topic that was of interest and relevance to an issue in current society helped in getting participants to take the survey, spurred further interest and curiosity from others, and imbued me with the motivation and desire to complete the research study. I realized that discovering the answers to my research questions would be

interesting on an academic level and help provide practical applications as well. Thus, my feeling of responsibility and commitment toward aiding society as an academician grew from this experience, and propelled me to consider research that investigates this field of study even further.

The findings of this study were fascinating to me because of the predictions that were not validated in the results, rather than because of those that were affirmed. As stated before, I thought Millennials would score highly as Amiables and Expressives, since this generation seemed to be one characterized by being social and relationship-oriented. But the fact that a good deal of Millennials exhibited Driver qualities showed me that the Millennial generation was also preoccupied with being task-oriented and getting things done. Also, given that Amiables and Drivers were on such opposite spectrums in terms of communication behaviors, it seemed that Millennials were better-rounded than I originally thought. Moreover, the finding that Amiables could rate their supervisors as competent communicators and yet not be fully satisfied with their supervisor's communication skills was also intriguing. This denoted the possibility that just because a person could be seen as a competent speaker, writer, or expressionist, we may not be satisfied with how they communicate using these behaviors. In other words, the idea that communication competence and satisfaction were two distinct constructs seemed irrational to me, but now that I was provided evidence that these two components of communication were not the same, my understanding of interpersonal dynamics was widened.

It is my hope that the findings from this study will be used to further future studies within this academic field, and that the cumulative results can be used to

incorporate changes in organizational trainings and business school curricula wherever possible. Some aspirations of mine will be to continue in this area of research and to attend conferences to present these and future findings, publish the findings in reputable academic journals, and compose a book that synthesizes my research on interpersonal communication styles. Understanding the communication differences that exist between us as people and even societies will aid our understanding about what makes us unique as individuals and build our appreciation for what we contribute to one another as a race of people. We are all born with different personalities and characteristics, are raised with different beliefs and practices, and our behaviors and choices are tempered by our experiences. Thus, our communication styles and preferences are formed throughout our lives, but once we recognize how we communicate with one another, we can open ourselves to understanding how others communicate and to finding common ground in our motivations and behaviors. From this stepping point, our relationships will be able to build and prosper, whether they exist in the workplace or in our personal lives.

REFERENCES

- Alessandra, T., & Hunsaker, P. (1993). *Communicating at work: Improve your speaking, listening, presentation, and correspondence skills to get more done and get what you want at work*. New York, NY: Fireside.
- Anderson, J., & Dale, A. L. (1981). The impact of certain types of downward communication on job performance. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 17(4), 51-59.
- Bakker-Pieper, A., & de Vries, R. E. (2013). The incremental validity of communication styles over personality traits for leader outcomes. *Human Performance*, 26, 1-19.
- Baumberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2012). *Real world evaluation* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Behrens, W. (2009, Spring). Managing millennials: They are coming to a workplace near you. *Marketing Health Services*, 19-21.
- Bernstein, A. G., & Norwood, R. S. (2008). Ethnic differences in public participation: The role of conflict communication styles and sense of community. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 37(2), 119-138.
- Bhatt, N. J. (2011). Communication consciousness: The need to incorporate the other facets of communication in communication education. *The IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 5(3), 12-22.
- Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0*. San Diego, CA: TalentSmart.

- Bridbord, K., & DeLucia-Waack, J. (2011). Personality, leadership style, and theoretical orientation as predictors of group co-leadership satisfaction. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 36*(3), 202-221.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). *Labor force statistics from the current population survey: Employed persons by occupation, sex, and age*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat09.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). *Western information office: California economy at a glance*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/regions/west/california.htm#>
- Byron, K. (2007). Male and female managers' ability to 'read' emotions: Relationships with supervisor's performance ratings and subordinates' satisfaction ratings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*(1), 713-733.
- Cekada, T. L. (2012, March). Training a multigenerational workforce: Understanding key needs and learning styles. *Professional Safety, 40-44*.
- Chi, C. G., Maier, T. A., & Gursoy, D. (2013). Employees' perceptions of younger and older managers by generation and job category. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*(1), 42-50.
- Chory, R. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (1999). The relationship between teacher management communication style and affective learning. *Communication Quarterly, 47*(1), 1-11.
- Clampett, P. G. (2013). *Communication for managerial effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- de Vries, R. E., & Bakker-Pieper, A. (2010). Leadership equals communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge

- sharing, and leadership outcomes. *The Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(3), 367-380.
- de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F. E., & Shouten, B. (2011). The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI): A six-dimensional behavioral model of communication styles and its relation with personality. *Communication Research*, 40(4), 506-532.
- de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Siberg, R. A., van Gameraen, K., & Vlug, M. (2009). The content and dimensionality of communication styles. *Communication Research*, 36(2), 178-206.
- Donald, F., & Lotz, T. (2006). Stress and communication across job levels after an acquisition. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 37, 1-8.
- Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. D. (1972). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 14(3), 63-74.
- Downs, V. C., Smith, J., Chatham, A., & Boyle, A. (1986). Elderly perceptions of a competent communicator. *Communication Research Reports*, 3(1), 120-124.
- Duran, R. L., & Zakahi, W. R. (1984). Competence or style: What's in a name? *Communication Research Reports*, 1(1), 42-47.
- Dysart, L. A. (1963, June). *Wanted: Effective communicators; getting the message across*. Paper presented at the regional convention of The Desk and Derrick Clubs of North America, Los Angeles, CA.
- Eadie, W. F., & Paulson, J. W. (1984). Communicator attitudes, communicator style, and communication competence. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 48(3), 390-407.

- Edmonson, J. (2009, January). Let's be clear: How to manage communication styles. *T+D Magazine*. Retrieved from <https://www.td.org/Publications/Magazines/TD/TD-Archive/2009/09/LetS-Be-Clear-How-to-Manage-Communication-Styles?mktcops=c.human-capital~c.learning-and-development~c.mgmt&mktcois>
- Ferri-Reed, J. (2013, January). Leading a multi-generational workforce. *The Journal for Quality & Participation*, 12-14.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fix, B., & Sias, P. M. (2006). Person-centered communication, leader-member exchange, and employee job satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports*, 23, 35-44.
- Goris, J. R., Vaught, B. C., & Pettit, Jr., J. D. (2000). Effects of communication direction on job performance and satisfaction: A moderated regression analysis. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 37(4), 348-368.
- Groysberg, B., & Slind, M. (2012, June). Leadership is a conversation. *Harvard Business Review*, 76-84.
- Gursoy, D., Geng-Qing Chi, C., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32(1), 40-48.
- Hamilton, C. (2011). *Communicating for results* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Hanke, S. (2009). Communication styles: What is your impact on others? *Professional Safety*, 54, 5.

- Hartman, J. L., & McCambridge, J. (2011). Optimizing millennials' communication styles. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 74(1), 22-44.
- Hatfield, J. D., & Huseman, R. C. (1982). Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: Moderating effects of individual characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2), 349-357.
- Hecht, M. L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 253-264.
- Hynes, G. E. (2012). Improving employees' interpersonal communication competencies: A qualitative study. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 75(4), 466-475.
- Jelphs, K. (2006). Communication: Soft skill, hard impact? *Clinician in Management*, 14, 33-37.
- Johansen, J. T. (2002). Stress and communication. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(2), 86-90.
- Johnson, K. (2006). The millennial teacher: Metaphors for a new generation. *Pedagogy*, 6(1), 7-22.
- Jorfi, H., Bin Yacco, H. F., & Shah, I. M. (2012). Role of gender in emotional intelligence: Relationship among emotional intelligence, communication effectiveness and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Management*, 29(4), 590-597.
- Jourdain, K. (2004). Communication styles and conflict. *The Journal for Quality & Participation*, 23-25.
- Kawada, T., & Otsuka, T. (2011). Relationship between job stress, occupational position, and job satisfaction using a brief job stress questionnaire. *Work*, 40, 393-399.

- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2001). *How the way we talk can change the way we work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Keller, R. T. (2001). Cross-functional project groups in research and new product development: Diversity, communications, job stress, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3), 547-555.
- Krapels, R. H., & Davis, B. D. (2000). Communication training in two companies. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 63(3), 104-110.
- Laff, M. (2006, July). Got stress? *T+D Magazine*, 31-36.
- Larson, C. U. (2013). *Persuasion: Reception and responsibility*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Lazarus, D. (2015, June 9). More firms hang up on voice mail. *Los Angeles Times*, p. C2.
- Lind, D. A., Marchal, W. G., & Walthen, S. A. (2013). *Basic statistics for business and economics* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Madlock, P. E. (2006). Do differences in displays of nonverbal immediacy and communicator competence between male and female supervisors effect subordinate's job satisfaction. *Ohio Communication Journal*, 44(5), 61-77.
- Madlock, P. E. (2008). The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45(1), 61-78.
- Matulich, E., Papp, R., & Haytko, D. L. (2008). Continuous improvement through teaching innovations: A requirement for today's learners. *Marketing Education Review*, 18(1), 1-7.
- Mazer, J. P. (2013). Associations among teacher communication behaviors, student interest, and engagement: A validity test. *Communication Education*, 62, 86-96.

- McAlister, A. (2009). Teaching the millennial generation. *American Music Teacher*, 59(1), 13-15.
- McKinley, C. J., & Perino, C., (2013). Examining communication competence as a contributing factor in health care workers' job satisfaction and tendency to report errors. *Journal of Communication in Healthcare*, 6(3), 158-165.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Merrill, D. W., & Reid, R. H. (1999). *Personal styles and effective performance: Make your style work for you*. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book.
- Mishra, K., Boynton, L., & Mishra, A. (2014). Driving employee engagement: The expanded role of internal communications. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 51(2), 183-202.
- Mok, P. (1975). *Interpretation manual for communicating styles and technology*. Richardson, TX: Training Associates Press.
- Monge, P. R., Backman, S. G., Dillard, J. P., & Eisenburg, E. M. (1982). Communicator competence in the workplace: Model testing and scale development. *Communication Yearbook*, 5, 505-528.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1977). Organizational communication: Relationships to organizational climate and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20(4), 592-607.
- Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25(1), 225-238.

- Myers, S. A., & Goodboy, A. K. (2014). College student learning, motivation, and satisfaction as a function of effective instructor communication behaviors. *Southern Communication Journal*, 79(1), 14-26.
- Nahavandi, A. (2006). *The art and science of leadership* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2007). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- O'Berry, D. (2010, October 13). Overcoming communication styles can boost business effectiveness. *Right Vision News*, p. 13.
- Park, J., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Generation effects on work engagement among U.S. hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 1195-1202.
- Patten, M. L. (2012). *Understanding research methods* (8th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pycszak Publishing.
- Pavitt, C. (1990). The ideal communicator as the bias for competence judgements of self and friend. *Communication Reports*, 3(1), 9-14.
- Penley, L. E., & Hawkins, B. (1985). Studying interpersonal communication in organizations: A leadership application. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(2), 309-326.
- Pettit, J. D., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B. C. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34(1), 81-98.
- Rautakoski, P. (2012). Self-perceptions of functional communication performance during total communication intervention. *Aphasiology*, 26(6), 826-846.

- Rehling, L. (2004). Improving teamwork through awareness of conversational styles. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67(4), 475-482.
- Reznik, R. M., Roloff, M. E., & Miller, C. W. (2012). Components of integrative communication during arguing: Implications for stress symptoms. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 48(4), 142-158.
- Rikleen, L. S. (2014, February). Where they're coming from. *Communication World*, 31(2), 14-17.
- Roehling, P. V., Vander Kooi, T. L., Dykemia, S., Quisenberry, B., & Vandlen, C. (2011). Engaging the millennial generation in class discussions. *College Teaching*, 59(1), 1-6.
- Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication research measures: A sourcebook*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Rucker, M. L. (2007). Self-construal, interpersonal communication satisfaction, and communication style: Engendering differences. *Human Communication*, 10(4), 437-450.
- Sagie, A. (1996). Effects of leader's communication style and participative goal setting on performance and attitudes. *Human Performance*, 9(1), 51-64.
- Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Statistics for people who think they hate statistics*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saphiere, D. H., Mikk, B. K., & de Vries, B. I. (2005). *Communication highwire*. Boston, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 252-265.

- Smeltzer, L. R. (1987). The relationship of communication to work stress. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 24(2), 47-58.
- Smith, R. (2012, April 19). Talking 'bout our generations. *Kitchener Post*, p. 19.
- Sparks, B. A., Bradley, G. L., & Callan, V. J. (1997). The impact of staff empowerment and communication style on customer evaluations: The special case of service failure. *Psychology & Marketing*, 14(5), 475-493.
- Spiers, C. (2012, June). A no-nonsense approach to stress management. *Occupational Health*, 64(6), 16-17.
- Steward, K. (2009). Lessons from teaching millennials. *College Teaching*, 57(2), 111-117.
- Taniguchi, E., & Aune, K. (2013). Communication with parents and body satisfaction in college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 61(7), 387-395.
- Tillott, S., Walsh, K., & Moxham, L. (2013). Encouraging engagement at work to improve retention. *Nursing Management*, 19(10), 27-31.
- Vora, D., & Markoczy, L. (2012). Group learning and performance: The role of communication and faultlines. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(11), 2374-2392.
- Wagenheim, M., & Rood, A. S. (2010). The relationship between employee satisfaction with organizational communication and customer orientation. *Managing Leisure*, 15(1), 83-95.
- Walmsley, A. L. (2011). Closing the communication gap. *Educational Horizons*, 90(1), 25-26.

Walther, J. B. (1988). Communication satisfaction in the bank: An audit evaluation. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 25(3), 79-85.

Wheless, V. E., & Berryman-Fink, C. (1985). Perceptions of women managers and their communicator competencies. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(2), 137-148.

White, P. C., Harvey, T. R., & Kemper, L. (2007). *The politically intelligent leader*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Literature Matrix

	Charact eristics of Baby Boomer s and Generati on X	Charact eristics of Generati on Y	Sources of Intergene rational Conflict	Organiza tional Communi cation - Technica l Studies	Communi cation Studies - Personal ity and Type Theory	Communi cation Style Flexing	Relation ships with Communi cation Satisfacti on	Relation ships with Communi cator Compet ence	Quantit ative Method ology - Correla tional Analysi s
Anderson , J. & Dale, A.L. (1981).				X		X			
Bakker- Pieper, A., & de Vries, R.E. (2013).					X				
Baumber ger et al. (2012).									X
Behrens (2009).		X		X		X			
Bernstein , A.G., & Norwood, R.S. (2008).					X				
Bhatt, N.J. (2011).				X	X	X			
Bradber ry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009).					X	X			
Bridbord, K., & DeLucia- Waack, J. (2011).					X	X			
Byron, K. (2007).								X	
Cekada (2012).		X							
Chi, et al. (2013).			X			X			

Chory, R.M., & McCroskey, J.C. (1999).								X	
Clampett (2013).				X	X	X			
de Vries & Bakker-Pieper (2010).							X		
de Vries et al. (2009).					X				
de Vries et al. (2011).					X	X			
Donald, F., & Lotz, T. (2006).							X		
Downs, C.W., & Hazen, M.D. (1972).							X		
Downs et al. (1986)					X			X	
Duran, R.L., & Zakahi, W.R. (1984).					X			X	
Dysart (1963).	X					X			
Eadie, W.F., & Paulson, J.W. (1984).					X			X	
Edmonson, J. (2009).					X	X			
Ferri-Reed, J. (2013).	X		X						
Field, A. (2013).									X
Fix, B., & Sias, P.M. (2006).				X					
Goris et al.							X		

(2000).									
Groysberg, B., & Slind, M. (2012).				X		X			
Gursoy et al. (2013).	X	X	X			X			
Hamilton (2011).					X	X			
Hanke (2009).					X	X		X	
Hartman, J.L., & McCambridge, J. (2011).		X				X			
Hatfield, J.D., & Huseman, R.C. (1982).							X		
Hynes (2012).				X					
Jelphs (2006).				X	X				
Johansen, J.T. (2002).			X						
Johnson, (2006).	X	X							
Jorfi et al. (2012).							X	X	
Jourdain (2004)..					X				
Kawada, T., & Otsuka, T. (2011).							X		
Kegan, R., & Lahey, L.L. (2001).						X			
Keller (2001).			X						
Krapels, R.H., & Davis, B.D. (2000).			X						

Laff, M. (2006).				X					
Larson (2013).	X					X			
Lazarus (2015).			X						
Lind et al. (2013).									X
Madlock (2006).			X				X		
Madlock (2008)..							X	X	
Matulich et al. (2008).			X						
Mazer (2013).						X			
McAlister (2009).		X			X				
McKinley & Perino, (2013).							X	X	
McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (2010).									X
Mishra et al. (2014).				X		X			
Muchinsky (1977).					X		X		
Myers, K.K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010).			X		X		X		
Myers, S.A., & Goodboy, A.K., & (2014).						X	X		
Nahavandi, A. (2006).	X		X			X			
Neck, C.P., & Manz, C.C. (2007).						X			
O'Berry, D. (2010, October 13).					X				

Park & Gursoy (2012).		X				X			
Patten (2012).									X
Pavitt, C. (1990).								X	
Penley, L.E., & Hawkins, B. (1985).				X					
Pettit et al. (1997).				X			X	X	
Rautakoski, P. (2012).					X				
Rehling, L. (2004).					X	X			
Reznik et al. (2012).						X			
Rikleen (2014).		X							
Roehling et al. (2011).		X							
Rucker (2007).							X		
Sagie, A. (1996).					X				
Salkind (2011).									X
Saphiere et al. (2005).			X	X	X				
Schullery (2013).		X	X						
Smeltzer, L.R. (1987).					X		X		
Smith, R. (2012).	X	X							
Sparks et al. (1997).							X		
Spiers (2012).				X		X			
Steward (2009).		X	X						
Taniguchi, E., & Aune, K. (2013).		X			X				

Vora & Markoczy (2012).				X	X	X			
Wagenheim, M., & Rood, A.S. (2010).							X		
Walmsley, A.L. (2011).	X	X							
Walther (1988).				X			X		
Wheeles, V.E., & Berryman-Fink, C. (1985).		X			X			X	
White, P.C., Harvey, T.R., & Kemper, L. (2007).				X		X			

APPENDIX B

Participant Electronic Informed Consent Form

INFORMATION ABOUT: The Relationship of Communication Styles of Millennial Workers with the Communication Satisfaction with and Perceptions of Communicator Competence of Their Supervisors

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY

16355 LAGUNA CANYON ROAD

IRVINE, CA 92618

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Edward De La Torre

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE ELECTRONIC SURVEY: The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship of the communication styles of millennial workers with their expressed communication satisfaction with and perceptions of communicator competence of their supervisors. The study will employ the Mok's Communication Styles Survey (MCSS) to determine your communication style, the Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory (ICSI), and the Communicator Competence Questionnaire (CCQ) to define these relationships. Also, you will be asked several personal questions related to your demographics, your supervisor, and the organization that you currently work in. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this electronic survey, you can withdraw at any time. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your responses will be kept confidential and anonymous. You will have the opportunity to provide your email address at the end of the survey should you happen to gain results regarding your communication style. Providing your email address is purely

optional and not required to complete the survey. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only. If you have any questions about completing this survey or any aspects of this research, please contact Edward De La Torre at delatorr@mail.brandman.edu.

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: By clicking the “agree” button and moving forward from this webpage you have indicated that you have read the informed consent form and the information in this document and that you voluntarily agree to participate. If you do not wish to participate in this electronic survey, you may move away from this webpage.

AGREE: I acknowledge of receiving this Informed Consent form. I have read the materials and give my consent to participate in the study.

APPENDIX C

Mok's Communication Styles Survey

What Communication Style Are You?

Instructions: *Click "yes" by each behavior that you feel describes you. Click "no" if you feel that the behavior does not describe you.*

1. I am an aggressive person.
2. I change my mind often. I zigzag through life rather than plodding down one monotonous path.
3. I don't worry about the past or the future. I live for today.
4. I am not very spontaneous or emotional. I believe the head should guide the heart.
5. I have been called impractical.
6. I don't like people who live for today without regard for the future. I look ahead and prepare for the rainy days.
7. My workspace looks very orderly and fairly stark.
8. I rather like to be different: to dress differently from other people, to go to strange and exciting places, to do the unusual.
9. I do no mind having people do sloppy work over as many times as necessary until they do it right.
10. I sometimes go to extremes. My "highs" are very high, and my "lows" are very low.
11. I am very sociable.
12. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through thorough, objective analysis.
13. I like being in charge.
14. I think that I would succeed as an accountant.
15. I am sensitive to the feelings of others.
16. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through freedom and individual motivation.
17. I value relationships. Getting along well with others is very important to me.
18. My workspace looks somewhat messy but it does have a "homey" charm.
19. It is important to me to feel that I "belong." I want very much to be accepted by the people with whom I work, my friends, and my family.
20. I like to compete.
21. I believe the majority is right. I usually go along with the group. Whatever they think and do usually suits me.
22. I am a dynamic, high-driven person.
23. When people begin to get upset, I try to calm them down. I don't like for people to be upset with each other.
24. I have a vivid imagination. I can see all sorts of possibilities that others can't see.
25. I love to be complimented and recognized.
26. I am neat. I'm bothered by messy people.
27. I play hard to win and I hate losing.
28. I enjoy meeting new people.

29. I am very practical. I believe in and value “what works.”
30. My workspace is a showcase for awards, plaques, and posters.
31. Sometimes I overlook details in implementing my big ideas and sometimes my ideas seem ahead of their time.
32. Sometimes people say I am a perfectionist. I guess I am because I believe that anything that is worth doing is worth doing well.
33. I like to learn by experience, by actually doing it rather than reading books about it.
34. I think that I could be a social worker.
35. I like people like Vince Lombardi, Clint Eastwood, and Oprah Winfrey.
36. I think through and try to do everything on a logical basis.
37. I have a “take charge” attitude.
38. I feel that I have a great destiny. I know I am going to amount to something.
39. I am very goal or task-oriented. I like to have specific goals or tasks to accomplish.
40. My favorite colors include black, white, and silver.
41. Sometimes people say that I am a visionary, a dreamer, and maybe I am.
42. I believe in myself, particularly my physical strength and ability.
43. I believe in doing things because of principles—hard work, efficiency, morality, justice. I believe the world would be a much better place if everyone would live by the great principles of religion and justice.
44. My favorite color is red.
45. I am very orderly. I believe “there is a place for everything, and everything belongs in its place.”
46. I am very excitable.
47. My workspace is precisely organized and displays diplomas and other signs of achievement.
48. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through deadlines and managed schedules.
49. My life is well-organized. There is an appropriate time and place for everything, which is important.
50. I like to deal with people and be dealt with in a very direct manner. I “tell it like it is,” and I expect others to do the same.
51. I love to go to parties.
52. I am very creative.
53. I have many friends.
54. I admire people like judges and religious leaders who put principle above everything else.
55. Sometimes I am extravagant.
56. I believe in rules—in the home, at work, and in society. I am for law and order.
57. I like to read about great explorers and inventors—people who accomplished great feats against seemingly insurmountable odds.
58. I like people like Tina Fey, Ellen DeGeneres, and Jay Leno—friendly, nice people who laugh a lot.
59. I think that I would enjoy being a creative designer.
60. My favorite colors are earth tone.
61. My favorite colors are vibrant/mixed combinations.

- 62. I am punctual. I get my work done on time. I am never late for appointments. I expect others to do the same.
- 63. In my work and social life, I try to be very cooperative. I like to get along.
- 64. I hate weakness in myself or others.
- 65. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through nonthreatening encouragement.
- 66. Things to me are right or wrong, “black or white,” never gray.
- 67. I never spend time thinking of the past. I think very little about the present. My thoughts are on the future—the great things that are going to happen to me!

Scoring: *One point is counted for each of the items associated with the different communication styles as listed below.*

- Driver (Items: 1, 3, 7, 13, 20, 22, 27, 29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 42, 44, 48, 50, 64)
- Amiable (Items: 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30, 34, 43, 51, 53, 58, 60, 63, 65)
- Analytical (Items: 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 26, 32, 36, 40, 43, 45, 47, 49, 54, 56, 62, 66)
- Expressive (Items: 2, 5, 8, 10, 16, 18, 24, 31, 38, 41, 46, 52, 55, 57, 59, 61, 67)

APPENDIX D

Interpersonal Communication Satisfaction Inventory

Communication Satisfaction Scale

Instructions: *The following statements concern communicating at work. In responding, think of the communication relationship you have with your immediate supervisor. Choose the number that best describes how you feel towards each statement.*

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neutral (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

When communicating with my immediate supervisor, I feel...

1. he or she lets me know that I am communicating effectively.
2. nothing is ever accomplished.
3. I would like to continue having conversations like ours.
4. he or she genuinely wants to get to know me.
5. very dissatisfied with our conversations.
6. like I have something else to do.
7. I am able to present myself as I want him or her to view me.
8. he or she shows me that he or she understands what I say.
9. very satisfied with our conversations.
10. he or she expressed a lot of interest in what I have to say.
11. I do NOT enjoy our conversation.
12. he or she does NOT provide support for what he or she says.
13. that I can talk about anything with my immediate supervisor.
14. that we each get to say what we want.
15. that we can laugh easily together.
16. conversations flow smoothly.
17. he or she changes the topic when his or her feelings are brought into the conversation.
18. he or she frequently said things that add little to the conversation.
19. we often talk about things that I am NOT interested in.

APPENDIX E

Communicator Competence Questionnaire

Communicator Competence Questionnaire

Instructions: In this series of questions, I would like you to describe how your supervisor communicates. Think about his or her behavior in general, rather than about a specific situation. Please indicate your response by choosing the number that best describes how you feel about the statement.

My immediate supervisor...

1. has a good command of language.
2. is sensitive to my needs of the moment.
3. typically gets right to the point.
4. pays attention to what I say to him or her.
5. deals with me effectively.
6. is a good listener.
7. is difficult to understand when communicating in written form.
8. expresses his or her ideas clearly.
9. is difficult to understand when he or she speaks to me.
10. generally says the right thing at the right time.
11. is easy to talk to.
12. usually responds to messages (memos, phone calls, reports, etc.) quickly.

APPENDIX F

Demographic Questions

Please answer the following questions pertaining to you, your supervisor, and the organization that you work for.

1. What is your gender: male or female?
2. Were you born between January 1, 1983 and December 31, 1997: yes or no?
3. What is the number of years that you have worked in your current organization?
4. What is the gender of your supervisor: male or female?
5. Is your supervisor a member of the Baby Boomer generation (those born between January 1, 1946 and December 31, 1964) or of Generation X (those born between January 1, 1965 and December 31, 1982): Baby Boomer or Generation X?
6. Which industry best describes the one in which you currently work: Construction, Technology, Manufacturing, Education, Financial, Health Care, Government or Other?

APPENDIX G

Online Survey

SECTION 1: Demographic Questions

Please answer the following questions pertaining to you, your supervisor, and the organization that you work for.

1. What is your gender: male or female?
2. Were you born between January 1, 1983 and December 31, 1997: yes or no?
3. What is the number of years that you have worked in your current organization?
4. What is the gender of your supervisor: male or female?
5. Is your supervisor a member of the Baby Boomer generation (those born between January 1, 1946 and December 31, 1964) or of Generation X (those born between January 1, 1965 and December 31, 1982): Baby Boomer or Generation X?
6. Which industry best describes the one in which you currently work: Construction, Technology, Manufacturing, Education, Financial, Health Care, Government or Other?

SECTION 2: What Communication Style Are You?

Instructions: *Click “yes” by each behavior that you feel describes you. Click “no” if you feel that the behavior does not describe you.*

1. I am an aggressive person.
2. I change my mind often. I zigzag through life rather than plodding down one monotonous path.
3. I don't worry about the past or the future. I live for today.
4. I am not very spontaneous or emotional. I believe the head should guide the heart.
5. I have been called impractical.
6. I don't like people who live for today without regard for the future. I look ahead and prepare for the rainy days.
7. My workspace looks very orderly and fairly stark.
8. I rather like to be different: to dress differently from other people, to go to strange and exciting places, to do the unusual.
9. I do no mind having people do sloppy work over as many times as necessary until they do it right.
10. I sometimes go to extremes. My “highs” are very high, and my “lows” are very low.
11. I am very sociable.
12. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through thorough, objective analysis.

13. I like being in charge.
14. I think that I would succeed as an accountant.
15. I am sensitive to the feelings of others.
16. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through freedom and individual motivation.
17. I value relationships. Getting along well with others is very important to me.
18. My workspace looks somewhat messy but it does have a “homey” charm.
19. It is important to me to feel that I “belong.” I want very much to be accepted by the people with whom I work, my friends, and my family.
20. I like to compete.
21. I believe the majority is right. I usually go along with the group. Whatever they think and do usually suits me.
22. I am a dynamic, high-driven person.
23. When people begin to get upset, I try to calm them down. I don’t like for people to be upset with each other.
24. I have a vivid imagination. I can see all sorts of possibilities that others can’t see.
25. I love to be complimented and recognized.
26. I am neat. I’m bothered by messy people.
27. I play hard to win and I hate losing.
28. I enjoy meeting new people.
29. I am very practical. I believe in and value “what works.”
30. My workspace is a showcase for awards, plaques, and posters.
31. Sometimes I overlook details in implementing my big ideas and sometimes my ideas seem ahead of their time.
32. Sometimes people say I am a perfectionist. I guess I am because I believe that anything that is worth doing is worth doing well.
33. I like to learn by experience, by actually doing it rather than reading books about it.
34. I think that I could be a social worker.
35. I like people like Vince Lombardi, Clint Eastwood, and Oprah Winfrey.
36. I think through and try to do everything on a logical basis.
37. I have a “take charge” attitude.
38. I feel that I have a great destiny. I know I am going to amount to something.
39. I am very goal or task-oriented. I like to have specific goals or tasks to accomplish.
40. My favorite colors include black, white, and silver.
41. Sometimes people say that I am a visionary, a dreamer, and maybe I am.
42. I believe in myself, particularly my physical strength and ability.
43. I believe in doing things because of principles—hard work, efficiency, morality, justice. I believe the world would be a much better place if everyone would live by the great principles of religion and justice.
44. My favorite color is red.
45. I am very orderly. I believe “there is a place for everything, and everything belongs in its place.”
46. I am very excitable.
47. My workspace is precisely organized and displays diplomas and other signs of achievement.

48. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through deadlines and managed schedules.
49. My life is well-organized. There is an appropriate time and place for everything, which is important.
50. I like to deal with people and be dealt with in a very direct manner. I “tell it like it is,” and I expect others to do the same.
51. I love to go to parties.
52. I am very creative.
53. I have many friends.
54. I admire people like judges and religious leaders who put principle above everything else.
55. Sometimes I am extravagant.
56. I believe in rules—in the home, at work, and in society. I am for law and order.
57. I like to read about great explorers and inventors—people who accomplished great feats against seemingly insurmountable odds.
58. I like people like Tina Fey, Ellen DeGeneres, and Jay Leno—friendly, nice people who laugh a lot.
59. I think that I would enjoy being a creative designer.
60. My favorite colors are earth tone.
61. My favorite colors are vibrant/mixed combinations.
62. I am punctual. I get my work done on time. I am never late for appointments. I expect others to do the same.
63. In my work and social life, I try to be very cooperative. I like to get along.
64. I hate weakness in myself or others.
65. I believe that the best technique for achieving results is through nonthreatening encouragement.
66. Things to me are right or wrong, “black or white,” never gray.
67. I never spend time thinking of the past. I think very little about the present. My thoughts are on the future—the great things that are going to happen to me!

SECTION 3: Communication Satisfaction Scale

Instructions: *The following statements concern communicating at work. In responding, think of the communication relationship you have with your immediate supervisor. Choose the number that best describes how you feel towards each statement.*

Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Neutral (3) Disagree (2) Strongly Disagree (1)

When communicating with my immediate supervisor, I feel...

1. he or she lets me know that I am communicating effectively.
2. nothing is ever accomplished.
3. I would like to continue having conversations like ours.
4. he or she genuinely wants to get to know me.
5. very dissatisfied with our conversations.
6. like I have something else to do.

7. I am able to present myself as I want him or her to view me.
8. he or she shows me that he or she understands what I say.
9. very satisfied with our conversations.
10. he or she expressed a lot of interest in what I have to say.
11. I do NOT enjoy our conversation.
12. he or she does NOT provide support for what he or she says.
13. that I can talk about anything with my immediate supervisor.
14. that we each get to say what we want.
15. that we can laugh easily together.
16. conversations flow smoothly.
17. he or she changes the topic when his or her feelings are brought into the conversation.
18. he or she frequently said things that add little to the conversation.
19. we often talk about things that I am NOT interested in.

SECTION 4: Communicator Competence Questionnaire

Instructions: In this series of questions, I would like you to describe how your supervisor communicates. Think about his or her behavior in general, rather than about a specific situation. Please indicate your response by choosing the number that best describes how you feel about the statement.

My immediate supervisor...

1. has a good command of language.
2. is sensitive to my needs of the moment.
3. typically gets right to the point.
4. pays attention to what I say to him or her.
5. deals with me effectively.
6. is a good listener.
7. is difficult to understand when communicating in written form.
8. expresses his or her ideas clearly.
9. is difficult to understand when he or she speaks to me.
10. generally says the right thing at the right time.
11. is easy to talk to.
12. usually responds to messages (memos, phone calls, reports, etc.) quickly.

SECTION 5: End Page

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you would like to receive results regarding your personal communication style, please provide it in the box below. Providing your email address is optional.

[Optional email address box]

Your email address will not be shared with any third party. Thank you again for your participation!

APPENDIX H

Information Flyer to Participants

Brandman University
Irvine, CA

Edward De La Torre, MBA, doctoral student in Organizational Leadership invites you to participate in a 10-12 minute online study hosted through SurveyMonkey.com. The study will support his dissertation. The dissertation focus is:

- Millennial workers
- Their communication styles
- Their relationships with supervisors

To participate in the survey, log into the following website [web address here]

For further information regarding the survey, please contact:

Edward De La Torre, MBA
delatorr@brandman.edu
T 949.341.9919