SOCIO-PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION STYLES AND ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE

HANZA L.

Hanza Laura - PhD(c), lecturer, Universitatea Libera Internațională Moldova, Chisinau, Moldova
E-mail: laura.hinza@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5528-3741

Abstract. This research aims to analyze the statistically significant differences between the socio-professional communication styles used by employees with executive and managerial functions in an organization. The study explores four communication styles: non-assertive, aggressive, manipulative and assertive, and the main goal is to identify how the organizational role influences the communication patterns of employees.

To test the hypothesis, the scores obtained by the participants based on these styles were analyzed, applying advanced statistical tests to evaluate their distributions and verify the normality of the data. The results showed that the score distributions are not symmetrical, being leptokurtic, which required the use of non-parametric tests, such as the Mann-Whitney U test, to compare the communication styles between the two groups of employees. Analyzing the differences between executive and managerial personnel, the research highlighted significant differences in the adoption of communication styles. Thus, employees in executive roles tend to adopt a more pronounced non-assertive style, while those in leadership positions frequently use a manipulative style. Executive personnel also showed a lower use of the aggressive style, compared to management.

An important aspect of the study is that no significant differences were observed for the assertive style between the two groups, suggesting a relatively uniform use of this style in both functions.

The results of the research provide an in-depth understanding of how organizational functions influence communication styles and have important implications for the development of management strategies and the improvement of internal relations in organizations.

Key words: communication, leadership, execution, assertive style, non-assertive style, aggressive style, manipulative style, organizational psychology.

Introduction

Communication within organizations constitutes a fundamental component in shaping interpersonal relationships, group dynamics, and overall organizational effectiveness [11]. In contemporary professional environments, socio-professional communication styles represent key instruments that orient the ways in which employees interact and cooperate, being strongly conditioned by the position and responsibilities they assume.

From the perspective of pedagogical and psychopedagogical sciences, these styles can be regarded as mechanisms of social learning and professional modeling, through which individuals acquire and consolidate adaptive behaviors in organizational contexts [6].

The literature on organizational communication has evolved along several axes, ranging from the study of interactional styles to analyses of their impact on performance, motivation, and interpersonal cohesion [5, 12].

Socio-professional communication is frequently classified into four major styles: non-assertive, aggressive, manipulative, and assertive. Each of these categories influences employees' capacities to manage conflict, collaborate with peers, and articulate professional standpoints. From a pedagogical perspective, the assertive style resembles the facilitative communication promoted in student-centered instruction, supporting openness, constructive feedback, and co-construction of meaning—competences encouraged within psychopedagogical training for educators and managers alike [9].

Empirical studies have highlighted systematic associations between communication style and organizational role. Individuals in managerial or supervisory positions often display manipulative or strategically persuasive patterns, whereas those in executive or operational roles may lean toward non-assertive or compliant forms of interaction [14]. Understanding these tendencies is relevant not only to

organizational psychology but also to educational management, where leaders' communicative behaviors shape institutional climate, participatory decision-making, and the development of professional communities.

The present research aims to investigate significant differences between the socio-professional communication styles of employees in executive and managerial positions and to assess the implications of these differences for the quality of internal relationships within organizations. By employing advanced statistical techniques, such as the Mann-Whitney U test, the study seeks to capture nuanced variations in style and to elucidate the correlations between communicative approaches and occupational status. Such analyses also resonate with psychopedagogical paradigms emphasizing the formative function of communication in professional development and in fostering climates conducive to collaborative learning.

Ultimately, interpreting these findings through both organizational and pedagogical lenses contributes to a deeper understanding of the complexity of socio-professional communication in modern institutions, offering theoretical insights and practical recommendations for enhancing dialogue, cooperation, and reflective practice among employees.

Materials and methods of research

The purpose of the research that will be described below is to analyze the statistically significant differences between the socio-professional communication styles used by employees with executive and management functions in organizations. The objective that guided the investigation approach was to identify the differences between the socio-professional communication styles used by employees with executive functions and those used by employees with non-executive functions (leadership.) The research hypothesis is that it is assumed that there are statistically significant differences in terms of socio-professional communication style and role in the organization Participants. The research group is composed of 326 participants from urban and rural areas, employed in various fields including the banking field, aged between 21 and 72 years old, respectively, who were administered a multiaxial questionnaire, in electronic format, using the Google Forms platform, with items that targeted aspects of communication styles. Methods and tools for data collection. The individuals in the sample used in the research, both executive and managerial positions, women and men, completed the Communication Styles Questionnaire, which includes 60 statements to which the subjects had the opportunity to express their personal opinion by selecting one of the two response options: true or false. Communication style refers to the set of manifestation particularities characteristic of a person in the communicative act.

The results and its discussion

To verify the hypothesis, the following results were analyzed. Frequency distribution of the Dominance variable, derived from Communication Styles, allocated between the two attributes of the Role in the organization variable. Number of subjects associated with each communication style, distribution made, on the one hand, between 185 participants occupying the execution function and, on the other, 141 subjects with management functions.

Table 1 – Starting indices

Statistics		Non-Assertive Style	Aggressive style	Manipulative style	Assertive style
N	Valid	326	326	326	326
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		6.40	7.00	7.06	9.21
Median		6.00	6.00	6.00	10.00

Mode	6	2	5	14
Std. Deviation	3.578	4.010	4.043	4.566
Skewness	.358	.330	.436	-.294
Std. Error of Skewness	.135	.135	.135	.135
Kurtosis	-.870	-1.016	-.947	-1.387
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.269	.269	.269	.269
Range	14	14	14	14
Minimum	1	1	1	1
Maximum	15	15	15	15

Analyzing the starting indices on the two samples, it appears that for the non-assertive style there is a mean score of 6.40, median 6.00, mode is 6 and standard deviation has the value 3.57; the skewness coefficient is 0.35, with a standard error value of 0.13.

The coefficient of 0.35 does not fall within the first interval of a standard error (-0.03 ... +0.13), for 99%, but neither in the one associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.26 ... +0.26) thus stating that the distribution of scores is not symmetrical. The Kurtosis coefficient is -0.87 and does not fall within the first interval of a standard error (-0.26 ... +0.26), for 99%, but not within the one associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.52 ... +0.52), the distribution being, as expressed by the normality curve, a leptokurtic one.

For the aggressive style there is a mean of the scores of 7.00, the median is 6.00, the mode is 2 and the standard deviation has the value 4.01. The skewness coefficient is 0.33, with the value of a standard error of 0.13. The value of 0.33 does not fall within the first range of a standard error (-0.13 … +0.13), for 99%, but not within the range associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.26 … +0.26) thus stating that the distribution of scores is not symmetrical. The Kurtosis coefficient is -1.01 and does not fall within the first range of a standard error (-0.26 … +0.26), for 99%, but not within the range associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.52 … +0.52), the distribution being, as expressed by the normality curve, a leptokurtic one.

For the manipulative style there is a mean of scores of 7.06, median 6.00, mode is 5 and the standard deviation has the value 4.04. The skewness coefficient is 0.43 with a standard error of 0.13. The value of 0.43 does not fall within the first range of a standard error (-0.13 … +0.13), for 99%, but not within the range associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.26 … +0.26), thus stating that the distribution of scores is not symmetrical. The Kurtosis coefficient is -0.94, which does not fall within the first range of a standard error (-0.26 … +0.26), for 99%, but not within the range associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.52 … +0.52), the distribution being, as expressed by the normality curve, a leptokurtic one.

For the assertive style there is a mean score of 9.21, median 10.00, mode is 14 and standard deviation has the value 4.56, the skewness coefficient is -0.29, with a standard error value of 0.13. The coefficient 0.29 does not fall within the first interval of a standard error (-0.13 ... +0.13), for 99%, but neither in that associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.26 ... +0.26), thus stating that the distribution of scores is not symmetrical. The Kurtosis coefficient is -1.13, which does not fall within the first range of a standard error (-0.26 ... +0.26), for 99%, but not within the range associated with the second standard error, for 95%, (-0.52 ... +0.52) - the distribution being, as expressed by the normality curve, a leptokurtic one.

From the analysis of the normality test in table 2.14, we observe that the significance threshold of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is less than 0.05, which means that the scores of the four communication styles do not comply with the normality criteria associated with the distribution, and the non-parametric

Mann-Whitney U test will be used to verify the working hypothesis.

The hypothesis testing regarding the identification of statistically significant differences in terms of the socio-professional communication style used and the role in the organization will be done by analyzing the tables below.

Table 2 – Average ranks

	Ranks			
	Function in the organization	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Non-Assertive Style	Execution	185	179.82	33266.50
	Leadership	141	142.09	20034.50
	Total	326		
Aggressive Style	Execution	185	153.74	28442.50
	Leadership	141	176.30	24858.50
	Total	326		
Manipulative Style	Execution	185	131.18	24268.00
	Leadership	141	205.91	29033.00
	Total	326		
Asertive Style	Execution	185	171.36	31701.00
	Leadership	141	153.19	21600.00
	Total	326		

The table shows differences between the average ranks for subjects with an executive role and those with a management role, on communication styles as follows: non-assertive style for executive functions is 37.73 higher than for personnel with management roles, aggressive style for personnel with an executive role is 22.56 lower than for personnel with a management role, manipulative style for personnel with executive functions is 74.73 lower than for personnel with a management role, and assertive style for executive personnel is 18.17 higher than for personnel with a management role.

Table 3 – Statistical tests

	Test Statistics[a]			
	Non-Assertive Style	Aggressive Style	Manipulative Style	Asertive Style
Mann-Whitney U	10023.500	11237.500	7063.000	11589.000
Wilcoxon W	20034.500	28442.500	24268.000	21600.000
Z	-3.595	-2.148	-7.117	-1.732
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.032	.000	.083
a. Grouping Variable: Function in the organization				

According to the Mann-Whitney U test revealed in table 2.21, there is a significance level of 99% for the non-assertive and manipulative style (p = 0.00; 0.00 < 0.01 < 0.05), which denotes that the personnel in executive positions adopt a non-assertive communication style, unlike the personnel in management positions who adopt a manipulative communication style. A significance level of 95% for aggressive (p = 0.03 < 0.05) indicates that the personnel in executive positions adopt the aggressive communication style less than the personnel in management positions.

At the same time, the analysis of the table shows that there are no statistically significant differences for the assertive communication style in terms of the role in the organization (p = 0.08 >0.05), the test not being statistically significant.

Table 4 – Median values

Report					
Function in the organization		Non-Assertive Style	Aggressive Style	Manipulative Style	Asertive Style
Execution	N	185	185	185	185
	Median	7.00	6.00	5.00	12.00
Leadership	N	141	141	141	141
	Median	5.00	7.00	8.00	8.00
Total	N	326	326	326	326
	Median	6.00	6.00	6.00	10.00

The table above shows the median values associated with the 4 communication styles broken down by the two types of roles in the organization. For executive functions, the median for the non-assertive style is 7, for the aggressive style it is 6, for the manipulative style it is 5 and for the assertive style the median is 12. For leadership functions the median values are: 5 for the non-assertive style, 7 for the aggressive style, 8 for the manipulative style and 8 for the assertive style.

The Mann-Whitney U test revealed significant differences between executive and managerial staff. Executives adopted more non-assertive styles (p < 0.01), while managers adopted manipulative styles more frequently (p < 0.01). Aggressive styles were less used by executives compared to managers (p < 0.05). No significant differences were found for the assertive style. These findings resonate with recent evidence showing that leadership style is strongly associated with employee adaptability and organizational change processes [13]. Moreover, leaders' tendency to use persuasive or manipulative tactics is consistent with the full-range leadership model, where transformational leadership fosters satisfaction, while transactional or manipulative approaches drive efficiency but may lower motivation [4].

Leaders' access to resources and responsibilities may explain the prevalence of manipulative strategies, while executive staff show more compliance. This aligns with research indicating that leaders' emotional intelligence and communication behaviors significantly shape employee trust and job performance [8, 10]. Transparent communication, particularly during crises, was found to mitigate anxiety and strengthen organizational trust [10].

Conclusion

Within organizational contexts, leaders may sometimes be perceived as more manipulative than employees in executive positions, a perception that is rooted in the interplay between responsibilities, access to resources, and power dynamics. This interpretation does not imply that manipulation is an intrinsic attribute of leadership, but rather that certain structural and situational conditions may foster behaviors perceived as manipulative at the managerial level more frequently than at the operational level [7, 3]. From a pedagogical and psychopedagogical standpoint, such patterns underscore the formative role of ethical communication in professional development, as well as the importance of modeling transparent and participatory interaction within organizations [9].

One explanatory factor concerns access to power and strategic information. Leaders generally have privileged access to organizational knowledge and resources, which offers them significant leverage in shaping decision-making processes. Informational power enables them to select, frame, or even withhold data to advance organizational or personal objectives, in contrast to executive staff, who typically possess less information and thus limited capacity to influence outcomes. Pedagogical

research emphasizes that the responsible use of information is central to cultivating professional integrity and fostering climates of mutual trust, values that should be embedded in training programs for leaders and educators alike [6].

A second dimension relates to **accountability for results and performance pressures.** Leadership roles entail heightened responsibility for achieving strategic objectives, which can generate substantial psychological pressure. Under such circumstances, leaders may resort to persuasive or manipulative tactics to mobilize teams or influence colleagues, particularly when alternative solutions appear constrained. Psychopedagogical frameworks suggest that developing stress management, ethical reasoning, and collaborative problem-solving skills within leadership preparation curricula may mitigate the risk of adopting counterproductive strategies [12].

Influence and control over organizational resources also shape communicative practices. The ability to allocate financial, material, or human resources can become a form of leverage, sometimes used to steer subordinates' behavior or secure desired outcomes. For instance, promises of promotion or bonuses may be employed to sway decisions. Within educational leadership, similar risks are recognized, prompting recommendations for transparent decision-making and participatory governance to avoid perceptions of favoritism or undue pressure [14].

Furthermore, leaders' advanced influencing and persuasion skills, often honed through professional experience and training, can inadvertently blur the line between ethical persuasion and manipulation. The negotiation and conflict management competencies required in leadership are akin to the facilitative communication approaches promoted in student-centered pedagogy, which prioritize empathy, reciprocity, and reflective dialogue [5]. Integrating ethical communication modules in psychopedagogical programs for managers may reinforce responsible use of these skills.

As individuals ascend organizational hierarchies, the tendency toward consolidating power and maintaining control may emerge. Strategies such as forming alliances, withholding information, or marginalizing potential competitors can be interpreted as manipulative efforts to safeguard positional security. Pedagogical perspectives highlight that leadership education should cultivate democratic values and cooperative learning strategies to counteract such defensive behaviors.

The perception of leaders' roles also contributes to this phenomenon. Because managers are often tasked with implementing difficult decisions or organizational changes, their actions can be interpreted as manipulative even when they reflect legitimate managerial duties. Psychopedagogical theories of social perception underscore that attribution biases can shape how authority figures are evaluated, emphasizing the value of meta-communication and transparent reasoning in organizational training.

Finally, structural opportunities and psychological distance from consequences may reinforce this dynamic. Leaders, by virtue of their broader remit, engage in negotiations, internal politics, and high-level strategies, affording more occasions to employ influence tactics. At the same time, their distance from operational realities can reduce their sensitivity to the immediate repercussions of their choices. This finding resonates with research on professional ethics, which advocates experiential learning and reflective supervision as means of fostering awareness of the impact of leadership communication.

In sum, the convergence of power, performance demands, and resource control can amplify the perception that individuals in leadership roles are more manipulative than those in executive positions. Nevertheless, this tendency is neither inevitable nor universal; it is contingent upon personal ethics, organizational culture, and the quality of professional training. Pedagogical and psychopedagogical disciplines contribute by proposing educational frameworks that integrate ethical reasoning, participatory communication, and reflective practice, thereby supporting the cultivation of leadership behaviors grounded in transparency and social responsibility.

The study confirms that organizational roles influence socio-professional communication styles. Executives tend to be more non-assertive, while managers show a greater inclination toward manipulative communication. These insights are consistent with findings that transformational

leadership remains the most effective style for motivating and inspiring employees [2], while poor communication or overreliance on manipulative strategies can reduce trust and performance [1]. Furthermore, acknowledging employees' active roles in organizational communication may support the development of healthier workplace climates [15].

References

1. Ahmed A., & Rahman S. The influence of organizational communication on employee performance: A case study of XYZ company. Journal of Organizational Studies, 15(2), 55–68, 2025. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390180148

2. Deng C. Transformational leadership effectiveness: an evidence-based primer. Human Resource Development International, 26(1), 1–15, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2135938

3. Galinsky A. D., Gruenfeld D. H., & Magee J. C. Power and perspectives not taken. Psychological Science, 17(12), 1068–1074, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01824.x

4. Garzón-Lasso F. Full-range leadership style and its effect on employees' effort, efficiency, and satisfaction. Behavioral Sciences, 14(5), 213, 2024. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14050213

5. Hackman M. Z., & Johnson C. E. Leadership: A communication perspective (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, p.74-81, 2013.

6. Iucu R. B. Management and pedagogy in educational organizations. Bucharest: University of Bucharest Publishing House, p.101-112, 2018.

7. Keltner D., Gruenfeld D. H., & Anderson C. Power, approach, and inhibition. Psychological Review, 110(2), 265–284, 2003. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

8. Lee C.-C., Huang S.-C., & Zhao C.-Y. The effects of leader emotional intelligence, leadership styles, organizational commitment, and trust on job performance. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 881725, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.881725

9. Marin E., & Cristea S. Communication competences in psychopedagogical training: Implications for professional practice. Journal of Educational Sciences, *22*(1), 45–58, 2020. https://doi.org/10.35923/jes.2020.22.1.45

10. Men L. R., Yue C. A., & Liu Y. Fostering employee trust via effective supervisory communication during the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Business Communication, 59(5), 645–668, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884211024424

11. Miller K. Organizational communication: Approaches and processes (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, p.47-53, 2014.

12. Runcan P. L., & Ionescu A. Interpersonal communication and organizational climate. Timișoara: West University Press, p.66-78, 2019.

13. Saleem A., Khan A. W., & Qureshi M. A. Leadership styles and the process of organizational change. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 920495, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920495

14. Salavastru D. Educational psychology: Concepts and applications. Iași: Polirom, p.91-98, 2019.

15. Verhoeven J. W. M. Active employee communication roles in organizations. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 50(2), 123–142, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2021.2014503

Әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Ahmed A., & Rahman S. The influence of organizational communication on employee performance: A case study of XYZ company. Journal of Organizational Studies, 15(2), 55–68, 2025. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390180148

2. Deng C. Transformational leadership effectiveness: an evidence-based primer. Human Resource Development International, 26(1), 1–15, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2135938

3. Galinsky A. D., Gruenfeld D. H., & Magee J. C. Power and perspectives not taken. Psychological Science, 17(12), 1068–1074, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01824.x

4. Garzón-Lasso F. Full-range leadership style and its effect on employees' effort, efficiency, and satisfaction. Behavioral Sciences, 14(5), 213, 2024. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14050213

5. Hackman M. Z., & Johnson C. E. Leadership: A communication perspective (6th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, p.74-81, 2013.

6. Iucu R. B. Management and pedagogy in educational organizations. Bucharest: University of Bucharest Publishing House, p.101-112, 2018.

7. Keltner D., Gruenfeld D. H., & Anderson C. Power, approach, and inhibition. Psychological Review, 110(2), 265–284, 2003. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

8. Lee C.-C., Huang S.-C., & Zhao C.-Y. The effects of leader emotional intelligence, leadership styles, organizational commitment, and trust on job performance. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 881725, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.881725

9. Marin E., & Cristea S. Communication competences in psychopedagogical training: Implications for professional practice. Journal of Educational Sciences, *22*(1), 45–58, 2020. https://doi.org/10.35923/jes.2020.22.1.45

10. Men L. R., Yue C. A., & Liu Y. Fostering employee trust via effective supervisory communication during the COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Business Communication, 59(5), 645–668, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884211024424

11. Miller K. Organizational communication: Approaches and processes (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, p.47-53, 2014.

12. Runcan P. L., & Ionescu A. Interpersonal communication and organizational climate. Timişoara: West University Press, p.66-78, 2019.

13. Saleem A., Khan A. W., & Qureshi M. A. Leadership styles and the process of organizational change. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 920495, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920495

14. Salavastru D. Educational psychology: Concepts and applications. Iaşi: Polirom, p.91-98, 2019.

15. Verhoeven J. W. M. Active employee communication roles in organizations. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 50(2), 123–142, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2021.2014503

ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК-КӘСІБИ БАЙЛАНЫС СТИЛДЕРІ ЖӘНЕ ҰЙЫМДАСТЫРУ РӨЛІ

ХИНЗА Л. 🆔

Хинза Лаура - Магистр, оқытушы, Молдованың еркін халықаралық университеті, Кишинев қ., Молдавия
E-mail: laura.hinza@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5528-3741

Аңдатпа. Бұл зерттеу ұйымдағы атқарушы және басқару функциялары бар қызметкерлер пайдаланатын әлеуметтік-кәсіби қарым-қатынас стильдері арасындағы статистикалық маңызды айырмашылықтарды талдауға бағытталған. Зерттеу төрт қарым-қатынас стилін зерттейді: талапсыз, агрессивті, манипуляциялық және сенімді сонымен қатар негізгі мақсат ұйымдық рөл қызметкерлердің қарым-қатынас үлгілеріне қалай әсер ететінін анықтау.

Гипотезаны тексеру үшін қатысушылардың осы стильдер негізінде алған ұпайлары талданды, олардың таралуын бағалау және деректердің қалыптылығын тексеру үшін кеңейтілген статистикалық сынақтар қолданылды. Нәтижелер қызметкерлердің екі тобы арасындағы қарым-қатынас мәнерлерін салыстыру үшін Манн-Уитни U сынағы сияқты параметрлік емес сынақтарды қолдануды қажет ететін лептокуртикалық болып табылатын ұпайларды бөлу симметриялы емес екенін көрсетті. Атқарушы және басқарушы персонал арасындағы айырмашылықтарды талдай отырып, зерттеу қарым-қатынас стилін қабылдаудағы елеулі айырмашылықтарды көрсетті. Осылайша, басшы рөлдердегі қызметкерлер айқынырақ талап етілмейтін стильді қабылдауға бейім, ал басшылық лауазымдардағылар манипуляциялық стильді жиі пайдаланады. Басшы қызметкерлер де басқарумен салыстырғанда агрессивті стильді азырақ пайдаланғанын көрсетті.

Зерттеудің маңызды аспектісі - бұл екі топтың арасында сертивті стиль үшін айтарлықтай айырмашылықтар байқалмады. Бұл екі функцияда осы стильді салыстырмалы түрде біркелкі қолдануды ұсынады.

Зерттеу нәтижелері ұйымдық функциялардың қарым-қатынас стиліне қалай әсер ететінін терең түсінуге мүмкіндік береді және басқару стратегияларын әзірлеуге және ұйымдардағы ішкі қатынастарды жақсартуға маңызды әсер етеді.

Түйін сөздер: коммуникация, көшбасшылық, орындаушылық, ассертивті стиль, сертсіз стиль, агрессивті стиль, манипуляциялық стиль.

СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫЕ СТИЛИ ОБЩЕНИЯ И ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННЫЕ РОЛИ

ХИНЗА Л.

Хинза Лаура – Магистр, преподаватель, Свободный международный университет Молдовы, г. Кишинев, Молдавия
E-mail: laura.hinza@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5528-3741

Аннотация. Целью данного исследования является анализ статистически значимых различий между социально-профессиональными стилями общения, используемыми сотрудниками с исполнительными и управленческими функциями в организации. В исследовании рассматриваются четыре стиля общения: неуверенный, агрессивный, манипулятивный и напористый, и главная цель — определить, как организационная роль влияет на модели общения сотрудников.

Для проверки гипотезы были проанализированы баллы, полученные участниками на основе этих стилей с применением расширенных статистических тестов для оценки их распределений и проверки нормальности данных. Результаты показали, что распределения баллов не являются симметричными, являясь лептокуртическими, что потребовало использования непараметрических тестов, таких как U-тест Манна-Уитни, для сравнения стилей общения между двумя группами сотрудников. Анализируя различия между исполнительным и управленческим персоналом, исследование выявило существенные различия в принятии стилей общения. Таким образом, сотрудники на руководящих должностях, как правило, принимают более выраженный неуверенный стиль, в то время как те, кто занимает руководящие должности, часто используют манипулятивный стиль. Руководящий персонал также показал более низкое использование агрессивного стиля по сравнению с менеджментом.

Важным аспектом исследования является то, что не было обнаружено существенных различий в отношении напористого стиля между двумя группами, что предполагает относительно единообразное использование этого стиля в обеих функциях.

Результаты исследования обеспечивают глубокое понимание того, как организационные функции влияют на стили общения и имеют важные последствия для разработки стратегий управления и улучшения внутренних отношений в организациях.

Ключевые слова: общение, лидерство, исполнение, напористый стиль, не напористый стиль, агрессивный стиль, манипулятивный стиль.