

Obstacles in Business Communication

Maria-Cristina GHEORGHE

Abstract

Communication is the most mentioned feature of our society, with increasingly easier technological ways of interacting. Still, we continue to face significant difficulties in establishing and maintaining good/efficient relationships, including in the business/organizational context. This happens because the communication (either verbal or nonverbal) process remains affected by the incidence of some factors. To overcome or minimize the effect of such obstacles, the business/organizational literature (referring to organizational behaviour or approaching the intercultural communication) provides an array of complex and heterogeneous approaches of the topic. This paper provides evidence that the theoretical solutions (identified by the consulted authors) apply with positive results to a situation in an organizational environment (by presenting a case study). Also, it offers a holistic and systemized view on the main reasons that lead to communication barriers and possible ways to prevent or overcome them.

Keywords: face-to-face communication, business communication, obstacles in communication

Introduction

In a time when communication is the aspect that defines our society the most, and the electronic means of interaction are in the spotlight, a question should emerge: is our communication effective? Is it more efficient now, with all these devices that are capable to abolish physical distances?

My opinion is that it is easier to communicate now *as a possibility*, but with not necessarily better results. This is a fact we can all check around us: from the misunderstanding in everyday life to major conflicts between groups or populations. In many situations there are even persons interested to enhance that miscommunication and manipulate other people, in order to achieve their own interests.

If asked, I think most people would agree that better communication equals a more pleasant and easier life. But when asked what can be done or what *they* can/should do to improve the interactions with other people, few of them would know what to answer. Even fewer would actually make an effort to know and to act accordingly.

In this paper I wanted to do exactly that: see how the key concepts and theories regarding communication apply to an everyday situation in a workplace, so as to learn from them.

Given the fact that most active people are spending most of their time at work, it is very important not only for the company/institution, but also for them as individuals to engage in productive and harmonious relationships with each other. This is why the spotlight is on the obstacles that emerge in the process of communication in a business environment.

Research methodology

The *research questions* were: Why does the communication process (with a focus on the business environment) fail to reach its purpose and what can be done about it? Can the theoretical aspects be successfully applied to a usual confrontational situation in an organizational environment?

I approached the topic by looking at the theoretical explanations, then applying them to my own work environment. The *data collection* was made by looking for various sources of information: books, articles and websites (as available in the Bibliography section). Then *secondary analysis* was used to study the contrasting or similar approaches.

It was somewhat difficult to have a coherent picture of the most significant views of the topic. This happened not because they were so very different at their core (in contrast to the very diverse taxonomies and names of the concepts), but because the approaches were made from various angles.

The applicability of theoretical views was considered through the lenses of *practical situations* encountered. Hence the inevitable limitations of the paper, since the real-life situations were only those I witnessed or heard about from a limited amount of people (my friends or acquaintances).

As I will also present in the section dedicated to conclusions, the failures and dead-end situations encountered in my practice are a proof of the theoretical views in the literature. What is more important is that the solution from the literature for improving human interactions inside the organization is not only applicable, but it is also working in real-life situations.

In the end, I hope this paper will offer a compact and clear view regarding the reasons for communication failures and some of the most important measures we can all take to ensure a more efficient interaction in the business environment.

Case study

In this chapter I intend to illustrate the problems arising when some of the obstacles to perception and communication manifest themselves. I will also try to identify possible solutions to solve them.

a) Factual situation

The CEO of a large and well-known company decides to implement a major change in the way the firm is organized. He had observed that people - let us call them the A employees - having the role to manifest critical thinking and assess the opportunity and consistency of data collected by other workers (the B employees) and suggest remedies accordingly, were not impartial. He realized that this is happening because they were all working in the same office, having the same manager.

So, whenever A said that the data brought by B were not enough to reach a conclusion or were contradicted by previous information, not only B took it personally, as a criticism of their work, but their managers reprimanded A. They were saying that being a team member means that the role of A should not be to express an unbiased point of view, but to “play” with words in their reports and reach a conclusion that favored the department and her/his management. Since the manager of the department was the one to assess each year the activity of A and to propose the bonuses, A resignedly accepted to do what their manager and B colleagues expected from them. Another cause for their submission was the fact that they shared the same office with B workers, and wanted to work in a pleasant atmosphere and not to be isolated by the others.

Obviously, this situation led to the fact that A workers were not doing the job intended for them. Thus, the company was devoid of an important filter, which should have provided a different and objective look on the efficiency of the activity carried out. This situation lasted for the past 8 years; in fact, since the establishment of A type of work in the company.

Consequently, the CEO decided to solve the problem by extracting the A workers from each department of the company and creating divisions of their own (A structures), led by A managers. These managers were selected following a competition between the most experienced A workers.

John Doe was one of these managers. He realized that his mission was particularly difficult: he had to create a team from people he had not the possibility to choose, to identify the best work processes, to learn how to be a manager and find a way to be acknowledged as such. Also, he had to smooth the relationships with B workers and the very reluctant B managers (now deprived of an important resource) – a highly important aspect, since their activities were closely inter-related-, and change the mentality of the A workers.

The last task was crucial: after so many years of providing the solutions and evaluations that supported the view of B managers, they had now to acknowledge the fact that they not only had the opportunity to openly speak their mind, but they *must* do it. Moreover, many of them never had an opinion of their own, because from the first days in the company they were told their role is to support the viewpoint of the B manager (pretty much like a lawyer who has to defend his/her client no matter what she/he had done). In fact, their critical thinking was missing completely.

In their turn, the A workers not only had to deal with a new manager (a stressful situation for anyone), but this new boss wanted for them to change their way of thinking. To make things even more difficult, both for John Doe and his subordinates, the CEO decided that A should remain in the same office as before, so as to stay in touch with the B employees and be real-time updated with their activities and the collected data. Therefore A employees had to find a middle way between being objectively critical when they had to be, and preserve an amicable work environment.

At the same time, the A manager had to create a new team from people each staying in different offices of the company and already accustomed to see themselves as members of the B units.

In short time, John Doe was overwhelmed by the many tasks he had to deal with as a manager. He was working from 9 A.M. until 9 P.M., many times also in the weekends. He tried to identify some tools for better organizing the activities, which proved to be a challenge, since many tasks were urgent and planning was somewhat vain.

He organized at least one work meeting with his subordinates, not only to discuss about their activities and to solve together the problems encountered, but also to make them feel like belonging to another team now. He talked with every A employee so as to highlight the importance of having an independent view and affirm his support if pressure were to arise from B workers and managers. He very often had to mediate between his subordinates and the B boss. Of course, he also had to supervise their work, make sure it was quality work, and discuss with them new possible approaches. He let them know that he was very open to dialog and suggestions, appreciated initiatives and mutual feed-back. In short, he tried to get things done at a professional level, and to establish trustful interpersonal connections with his subordinates.

After a few months, it became evident that he had a tough relationship with two of them, Richard Dean and Emma Stone. Richard was his assistant manager and they even shared the same office, so it was important that they get along well. Emma was an employee with many years of experience, specialized

in one of the main fields of activity.

Richard had previously been assistant manager in another line of work. He really enjoyed his past activity and his former manager (Y) and colleagues. He was into sports, and he was pleased to see that the amount of things to be done was not so large, so he was not forced to work overtime and miss his trainings. He had been moved in this new department against his will. He thought that the new field of activity was less interesting than the past one and that he was somehow “punished”. Moreover, now he had to learn new and difficult things, and to accomplish new tasks.

After finding out that John was to be his new manager, he spoke to Y, which had only bad things to say about John’s personal characteristics, from what he had also heard from others. Y and John rarely interacted at work, but Richard trusted Y, so he believed him. He already disliked John when they had to start working together. The errors the latter made as a manager (mainly losing his temper and jumping to conclusions about someone’s fault) established his belief that John was a poor substitute for Y as his boss.

Richard has never openly expressed dissatisfaction or the cause of his annoyance, but when he interacted with John it was obvious from the tone of voice, body language (clench teeth, tight muscles) and sharp answers that he was upset about something. He would do what John said it needed to be done, but muttering in a low voice. He was often saying “I will do this or that, but ...” and reasons followed why he thought it was too difficult or useless to make something, although he was aware that the task had to be done, as ordered by the CEO. He would then make a bad job of it, leaving it to John to make the appropriate corrections.

Although Richard knew he could not openly oppose John (because not only he was his manager, but also he had experience in a field of activity that was new for him), he was aware that it was something to be done to defy this unwanted boss. So he began to undermine his authority in front of their team members (he spent a lot of time in the offices where A employees were located, cleverly invoking work issues that had to be discussed) and outside of it (especially in front of Y). He felt better every time he told stories about how John made a mistake or lost his temper, proving that he was unfit to be a manager. Moreover, he felt that *he* was the real manager of those subordinates, *they* were a team when they had such a good time together speaking about John. Also the compassion received from Y for having such an inappropriate manager made him surer of himself, and blurred his fear about not being able to execute those new activities as requested. Yes, John knew more things than him, but it was obvious that he was not meant to be a manager, as he was.

Furthermore, during the weekly meetings he would continue to write on his computer, apparently ignoring his boss, with a view to showing others that he did not care about what this manager had to say.

John guessed that this behavior was a way to show the others that he did not recognize his authority, and implicitly encouraging them to do the same. During the third meeting, he decided to directly ask Richard to stop working at the computer and take part in the discussions, which he did, adding that he was paying attention. Although he said nothing more, he believed John did that to undermine his authority in front of his subordinates and his grudge against his boss amplified.

After a while, John found out that Richard was speaking ill of him (referring both to personal and professional characteristics) not only in front of the other members of the team, but also in front of B workers and managers, during his visits to their offices. Twice during those months, John had asked Richard if he was upset about something. Avoiding John's eyes, he said there was nothing to talk about and refused to admit there was a problem. After finding out what Richard was saying about him in front of his subordinates and of the other company employees, he decided that something had to be done, although he was usually reluctant in engaging in open confrontations.

John was particularly sensitive about the work atmosphere, so usually he preferred to accumulate frustrations against what he thought to be unfair remarks or doings of others, than to break that fragile peace in the office.

Richard had an excellent relationship with Emma. Although they hadn't worked together before the A department was created, they seemed to get along very well. Moreover, they were often spending time together on the hallway, speaking in low voices.

Emma had been an A employee since she first arrived in the company, changing two B departments. She had the capacity of making her own judgments and even the courage of speaking up her mind, but she was quickly renouncing when the B managers contradicted her. She was very proud of her professional skills. In the new A department, she had to learn some new things, in order to also carry out different assignments, which made her somewhat nervous.

Emma had a difficult relationship with John. She made harsh comments on the task she had to accomplish, she was most of the time snappy, and she made many mistakes in her paperwork and reacted strongly when John pointed them out. She had that sort of discontented attitude also during the meetings. She arrived late every day, saying that she did not hear the phone alarm.

John asked her once if there was some issue she wanted to discuss about. While keeping her arms crossed on her chest, she said she was always ready to

talk, but the problem was not with her. She said that John did not understand what she was saying and that she was only doing what she had been encouraged to do, speak up her opinions. It was nothing personal, she claimed. Just that they were not on the same page.

Emma was passing through a rough time: she was considering a divorce, but spoke with no one at work about this, except for Richard. She had trouble sleeping and she was suffering a lot. At the same time, she had to deal with all those changes at work – a new manager and new requirements. She also had to bear the change in attitude from the B colleagues and manager in her office, who now saw her as being “on the other side”.

She was fed up with them and the constant reprimands from her new manager. Frustrations accumulated and Emma did not like him at all, and thought that John had something against her personally. She felt her only ally against John was Richard, and she felt protected by him. She was already not happy with the new boss, and from what Richard was telling her, John was completely unfit to be a manager.

As for John, these interpersonal difficulties were a high, supplementary stress factor. He thought that it was important for everybody to do their best in order to make things work in this new department, because they were sailing in the same boat and their activities were highly interconnected. He was feeling anxious at the thought that other members of the team might develop the same conduct, “inspired” by Richard and Emma. He was frustrated also, because he felt that he was doing everything in his power to make things work and that the refractory attitude was unjust.

He began to be resentful of them and to point out their mistakes. Not so much Richard’s, because they were sharing the office and he was reluctant to have tense atmosphere in there, but especially Emma’s. She was, in fact, making those errors, and she made even more of them, after John started reprimanding her. The more mistakes Emma made, the more his tone became sharper. They were so absurd and so many, that at one point he even began to suspect that she was doing them on purpose; also, that she was late every day as a form of rebellion against him. He was already speculating that she was so irritable, so hard to get along with because she had been influenced by her friend Richard. It also crossed his mind that maybe Richard was upset because he wanted to be a manager instead of him.

He realized he needed to do something to solve the problem. He knew that somewhere along the line mistakes were made, by himself included, but how and when?

b) Identifying the causes of the situation

Taking into consideration the theoretical research for this paper, I would say that this situation is a consequence of perceptual filters, objective difficulties determined by context and flaws in communication.

- Let me start with **the context**: the big changes in the organizational structure had a significant impact both on the A and B workers and managers. Especially for the A employees it implied a lot of stress due to the initial confusion and need to adjust not only to a new hierarchy line and a new manager, but also with a shift in the way they perceived their role in the organization. It was equally difficult for the managers of the new A departments. They had to learn how to be managers, assume new responsibilities and affirm their authority in front of their subordinates, and also gain their credibility as managers both in front of the CEO and the very reluctant B managers.

Thus, a very stressful situation and a lot of pressure for the A employees and their new manager appeared.

- **Physiological factors** followed: all the “actors” were, in some degree into an emotional state. John and Emma looked always tired and obviously needed more sleep. All these usually translate into a poor quality of work and leads to an affected judgment, an incapacity to think clearly, and taking bad decisions.
- Then there were the **personal characteristics** of each of them and the differences between their personalities, which accounts for their perceptual filter and communication style:

John: well-intended and hard-working; anxious about his managerial skills and other’s point of view; willing to pass over the borders of his comfort zone, but doing so only when absolutely necessary; lack of courage in settling the problems through open confrontations; frustrated when making efforts with no results; willingness for all the people to act in a “correct” way; impulsive; using harsh tone when angry; often making a hasty judgment before considering all the facts; he tends to see and talk about people and situations depicting them in extremes;

Richard: often frustrated when things don’t work as he wanted; easily influenced by people he trusts, he rarely changes his mind once an opinion is formed; prone to gossiping, and to making and believing in inferences; lack of audacity in speaking up and confronting people; passive - aggressive way of dealing with unwanted situation and disliked people; very unsure about his work skills; loathing change; usually calm under pressure; refers to persons and circumstances as being very good or bad; often generalizes using everybody, all, never etc;

Emma: intelligent; self-centered; self-image very much depending on her professional performance; reluctant to new experiences; willingness to be liked by everyone; impulsive; defiant and aggressive when she feels attacked; lack of self-control; operates a lot with inferences.

▪ **The occurrence of obstacles in perception:**

• **The attribution factor** is very much present this situation:

- *John* thinks the causes of Emma's behavior and errors are her animosity against him, and her wish to make things difficult for him. As for Richard, the motives would be his desire to undermine his authority and competence, and maybe, even to take his place;

- *Richard* believes that John has problems because he is an unfit manager, that John tries to discredit him in front of their team-members, and that his transfer in this new department is a form of unjustifiably penalty;

- *Emma* considers that John has something personal against her, this being the reason her work is not appreciated anymore. Yes, she made some errors, but this is just because of her inevitable divorce, and her manager should see that she is distracted and she has a personal problem. She also considers that Richard's interest in her is due to her professional qualities that John deliberately refuses to see.

As such, we can observe the tendency to:

- attribute the missteps of others to features of their personality, rather than the situation in which they find themselves (the fundamental attribution error);
 - blame their own failures on circumstances beyond their control (self-serving bias);
 - explain their own positive outcomes by pointing out internal factors (self-serving bias);
 - make hasty judgments before collecting enough data.
- **The Halo Effect** is also there. When Richard, hearing negative opinions about John, is not trying to convince himself of the truth, beginning this work relationship with a bias (a form of **prejudice** even) against his manager. Moreover, he expands this negative view to other characteristics of John, quickly forming the opinion that he cannot be a good manager and that his intentions towards himself are malicious.

Also, I would say that the good relationship between Emma and Richard is an expression of the observation made by Huczynski and Buchanan¹, namely the fact that we tend to judge favorably people who have features similar to ours. The common point in this situation would be the shared antagonism to their manager.

All these happened because of the tendency of:

- selecting information that matches what we want to see;
 - ignoring later and conflicting information;
 - allowing our own characteristics to influence how we see others.
- **The Pygmalion effect** manifests itself when Emma begins to make more and more errors as John points them out. She is doing what John expects her to do, she behaves as she thinks she is perceived by her manager.
 - **The contradiction between the verbal and non-verbal communication**

When Richard said he was taking notice on what John said in that meeting, although he continued to work on his computer, it might have been true. But, as proof of non-verbal having a superior importance in decoding the message, John continued to think that Richard was ignoring him. Also, although Richard never accepted the fact that he was having a grudge against John, his tight muscles, clenched teeth, tone of voice, and caustic replies said the contrary.

As for Emma, John believed her availability for having a frank conversation was contradicted by the crossed arms and her aggressive tone.

c) Solving the problem

John asked for help from the psychologist of the company, Ellen May. After discussing with him, she also talked with Richard and Emma. Ellen identified some steps to be taken, and she communicated

them to each of them.

To all of them, she said that they needed to:

- be more willing to have an efficient communication to each other;
- be aware of their own biases;
- try to understand the other's point of view;
- pay more attention to what the other is doing and saying;
- practice active listening: listen in a way that demonstrates interest and encourages continued speaking;
- be careful in choosing the right time and place to convey a message;
- use explicit language;
- ask questions to make sure that they understood correctly;
- give feed-back and also analyze how the message has been interpreted, in order to correct any mistake;
- be sure to have all data before jumping to conclusions;
- make assessments according with facts, not inferences;
- be ready to change an opinion if further facts contradict it.

Also, she advised:

- *John*: to honestly speak to Richard and Emma (separately), recognize his mistakes, apologize, and make them see his reason, namely how he perceived things to be; she also emphasized on the fact that he should be less impulsive in reacting and also more careful in forming an opinion about a situation or a person;
- *Richard*: to stop gossiping about John, to express regret about his conduct, to try to understand his efforts and mistakes as a beginner at being a manager, and to express support for him in front of their team members; she emphasized that it was not necessary for him to *like* John, he only had to do his best to work with him. Also, since Richard's contract was due to end next year, she let him know that it was possible that the CEO made his job available for other interested people, if John would make such a suggestion. Thus, it was in his best interest to make things go along.
- *Emma*: to be more open about her personal problems, if they had consequences on her professional activity, and ask for the manager's support; to be moderate in expressing judgments about people or situations; to be herself more open and willing to communicate, before asking the same thing from the others; to improve her attitude towards her manager.

At first, Ellen's recommendations were received with reserve. She had been speaking with Richard while John was taking a vacation, and when he got back he didn't expect much. But he had a big surprise: Richard's attitude had very much changed. He even seemed a different man: he was amiable and supportive. He still had something to comment from time to time, when he had something against working on certain tasks, but the work atmosphere was a lot better.

In his turn, John began to be less anxious, more relaxed, and consequently less impulsive in judging and speaking to his subordinates. He was smart enough to know that Richard's new attitude did not mean they were now friends, but he was relieved that finally they seemed to work together, and not one against the other. John's new way of approaching people, more calm and moderate, made his subordinates be (in their turn) open to suggestions, less afraid of making mistakes and more productive.

John also approached Emma, apologized for his previous harsh tone towards her, and asked if she had some personal problems that could be accountable for her mistakes. It was then when Emma told him about her divorce. John expressed his regrets, and told her that he will try to support her during this difficult time. He offered to devise together a plan in order to better organize her work, which would lead to a more relaxed way of approaching the daily tasks. Also, he assured her that he will do everything in his power to "smooth" her relationship with her B colleagues. Moreover, he explained to her what his own difficulties were as a new manager, and asked for her help in having a better rapport, so as to make the new structure successful.

Emma also recognized that she had an improper attitude towards John, and that the quality of her work was very poor lately. She explained how much the personal problems affected her mood, health, and her efficiency at work. She said that indeed she needed John's help for a little time more, until her divorce would be final. After that, she will recover and her work will improve.

Following this discussion, *John* tried to be more patient and understanding. He continued to make

Emma aware of her errors, but his tone was different, not to mention that he was looking now for the motive: what was behind that situation (wrong reasoning, hasty conclusions, lack of attention, fatigue), in order to correct the cause, not just the effect. He quickly understood that it was the best way to approach problems with all his subordinates. John thought now that the difficult situation with Richard and Emma proved to be a good thing, since it forced him to pay more attention to people, improved his communication skills, and made him a better manager.

Emma also was more relaxed and open towards John. She realized that he had good intentions, and that she could learn something from his observations. Even to her surprise, things were easier to handle now at work. After her divorce was final, she focused on her professional tasks, and rediscovered the joy of learning new things. Her mistakes were significantly reduced. After 7 months she even got a bonus.

Looking back, she wondered how she could have been so naïve in expecting things to go better without making the smallest effort to actually communicate with John. This situation also taught her to be more prudent in making judgments about people: behind their behavior might be a personal problem, their wrong perception, or even her own biased view. She even began to read psychology books, and soon discovered more and more fascinating subjects about the reasons behind people's sentiments and reactions.

Richard was also pleased with how things had worked out. At first, his change in attitude was determined by the possibility to lose his current position. After being more open with John, though, he was surprised to find out that he was not such a bad person and manager after all. John had good intentions and now, being less stressed, was losing his temper only occasionally. He knew many of the new things Richard had to learn, and he was happy to share. He also seemed to appreciate now what Richard, in his turn, had to bring to the team. He began to initiate more conversations with John, and he soon discovered they had some common points of interest. He would not have John as a fiend, but it seemed that the psychologist was right: they could just work together and make things easier for everybody.

It was somehow surprising for him how his willingness to cooperate, fake at first, led in the end to something so real: an enhanced communication and a better understanding between all team members and management.

Conclusions

Effective communication helps establishing, maintaining and improving interpersonal connections. Consequently it has a crucial role in boosting cooperation in a team, making the right decision and increasing the profit of a company.

Since the errors in coding and decoding a message are inevitable, what we can do is to prevent or exceed them. This can be done, both in a private or organizational context, by:

- being aware of ourselves, our distortions in perception and errors in communication;
- paying attention to how we convey a message (offer the conditions for our message to be correctly deciphered), with a view to being received and understood by the others in exactly the way we intended;
- cultivate the capability to understand and use non-verbal communication;
 - listen attentively to others, try to understand them, in order to:
 - have feedback, find out if our message was correctly decoded;
 - if not, identify the possible causes (our flaws in conveying the message, or the other's biases in perceiving or inadequate communication);
 - make them feel heard and respected, which can build a stronger connection;
- challenge our convictions and maybe even change our personality.

Many of us find it difficult to invest so much energy in taking all the above actions, even if some people are actually aware that the effort will be rewarded with improved interpersonal relationships and increased quality of life. It is even more difficult to perform these actions in an organizational environment, where things are complicated by the architecture of the communication process (horizontally and vertically) and the top-management's vision about it.

For instance, there are major differences in how an employee relates to her/his manager in a private company, and a military institution. Obviously in the latter the authority of a manager is bigger and the subordinate feels less free to express herself/himself openly. Also, the manager is more tempted to impose her/his view just by calling it an "order" (since the organizational structure permits her/him to just do so), instead of making an effort to explain, change herself/himself or understand the others.

Another specific feature of the organizational context is that, if we want to act as a team and accomplish the professional tasks in a multicultural environment, we do not have a choice, we have to struggle to comprehend and adjust to the differences determined by the disparate ways of perceiving things and communicating.

By applying the theoretical solutions (identified by the consulted authors) to a practical confrontational situation that appeared in my workplace, I found out that they can really help in surmounting a challenging situation.

As emerged from the case study, the first important step is to recognize the existence of a problem and the role we most probably had in creating it. Also, to openly admit it, not only for ourselves, but in front of others, and ask for help, if necessary. Moreover, a person has to accept her/his mistakes and make the effort to correct them. It is also essential not to stop here, but to make the necessary adjustments in one's way of thinking and acting towards others. This is actually the most difficult stage of the process of improving the way we communicate.

Another aspect revealed by the case study was the fact that, once the first act of being more open and agreeable is made by someone (no matter what the real reason is), a complex mechanism is set into motion. This time, a positive one, since one changed attitude leads to another, and so on. It is as if the spiral of errors and misunderstandings that produced the crisis was replaced by one of goodwill, positive results, more effort invested, more good outcomes etc. It all ends up with better human and professional relationships, and increased efficiency of the company's activity.

Besides, one should not ignore the effect that solving a communication problem in this manner has on other similar work situation, not only for those implied, but also for their colleagues. Once a solution has been found to be valid, it is expected that it will be applied again, generating a downstream effect that can lead to big scale positive outcomes.

The conclusions mentioned above have some limitations determined by the practical situations encountered at my workplace. I believe that an extended study might be conducted on the various

problematic relationships, in the context of specific work environments. If the strategies and solutions extracted from the literature are applicable or not to every context, either we speak of a medical, military, educational or business field of activity, it is yet to be discovered.

A larger, comparative approach could identify the similarities and differences between these (and other) work environments, from the point of view of specific hierarchical relationships, distorted perceptions, most common mistakes in communication and their impact. More important, it could propose solutions adjusted to the individuality of each area of activity.

Likewise, an extended research could be conducted on each of the particular field of activity, resulting in an in depth view of the specific communication problems, and in identifying the most appropriate methods to exceed them. If the study is conducted at the request of the management, this could further lead to the implementation of new rules or policies regarding the way people interrelate with each other, a more agreeable work environment, and better results in reaching the institution's/company's goals.

Bibliography

Books

1. Beebe, Steven A.; Mottet, Timothy P. (2013). *Business and Professional Communication*, Second Edition. Boston, Pearson Education.
2. Chaney, Lilian H.; Martin, Jeanette S. (2007). *Intercultural Business Communication*, 4th ed. Upper Saddle River (N.J.), Pearson.
3. Cîndea, Rodica M.; Cîndea, Dan (1996). *Comunicarea managerială*. Editura Expert, București.
4. Constantinescu-Ștefănel, Ruxandra (2014). *Theories and techniques of face-to-face communication*. București, Editura ASE.
5. Greenberg, Jerald (2005). *Managing Behavior in Organizations*. Harlow, Pearson Education.
6. Guirdham, Maureen (2011). *Communicating across Cultures at Work*. Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Harris, Thomas E.; Nelson, Mark D. (2008). *Applied Organizational Communication: Theory and Practice in a Global Environment*. New York, Routledge.
8. Hartley, Peter (1999). *Interpersonal Communication*. New York, Routledge.
9. Huczynski, Andrzej A.; Buchanan, David A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. Harlow, Pearson Education.
10. Luthans, Fred (1992). *Organizational Behavior*. New York, McGraw-Hill, Inc.
11. McLean, Scott (2010). *Business Communication for Success*. Boston, Flat World Knowledge, L.L.C.
12. Pease, Allan; Pease, Barbara (2009). *De ce bărbații se uită la meci și femeile în oglindă*. București, Curtea Veche Publishing.
13. Randolph, Alan W.; Blackburn, Richard S. (1989). *Managing*

- Organizational Behavior*. Homewood, Irwin.
14. Reece, B.L.; Brandt, R. (2005). *Effective human relations: personal and organizational applications*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.
 15. Robbins, Stephen P.; Judge, Timothy A. (2014). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston, Pearson.
 16. Singer, M. R. (1998). *Perception and identity in intercultural communication*. Maine, Intercultural Press, Inc.
 17. Stanton, Nicky (2004). *Mastering Communication*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.
 18. Tannen, Deborah (2014). *Ce spun eu și ce înțelegi tu*. București, Litera.

Articles

19. Allan, L. (s.a.). *Why Communication Practices Are Important*. [online] Available from
20. <http://www.businessperform.com/workplace-communication/poor-communication-costs.html> [Accessed 10th March 2017]
21. Benna, S. (2015, July). *The 3 communication skills every leader needs to master*. [online] Available from <http://www.businessinsider.com/communication-skills-every-leader-needs-to-master-2015-7> [Accessed 16th March 2017]
22. Carnes, D. (2015, May). *Do Men & Women Use Nonverbal Communication Differently?* [online] Available from <http://www.livestrong.com/article/172581-do-men-women-use-nonverbal-communication-differently/> [Accessed 10th March 2017]
23. Miller, R. (2016, June). *5 Strategies to Improve Communication in the Workplace*. [online] Available from <https://www.sandler.com/blog/5-strategies-improve-communication-workplace> [Accessed 16th March 2017]
24. Mishra, S (s.a). *Non-verbal Communication in Different Cultures*. [online] Available from <https://www.businesstopia.net/communication/non-verbal-communication-different-cultures> [Accessed 10th March 2017]
25. Robinson, L.; Segal, J; Smith, M (2016, December). *Effective Communication. Improving Communication Skills in Your Work and Personal Relationships*. [online] Available from <https://www.helpguide.org/articles/relationships/effective-communication.htm> [Accessed 17th March 2017]
26. Washburn, S. (2008, February). *The Miscommunication Gap*. *ESI Horizons*, 9 (2). [online] Available from <http://www.esi-intl.ae/horizons/>

publication/2008/200802_themiscommunicationgap.asp [Accessed 14th January 2017]

27. Figure 1.1 “*Importance of communication in an organization*” [online] Available from <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/organization-communication-importance-forms-and-improving-effectiveness-in-communication-process-in-an-organization/8726> [Accessed 17th March 2017]
28. Figure 4.2 “*Interrelation between self-fulfilling prophecy and the Pygmalion effect*” [online] Available from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/psychology-writers/201210/using-self-fulfilling-prophecies-your-advantage> [Accessed 10th March 2017]
29. Figure 5.2 “*Elements of personal communication, according to Albert Mehrabian*” [online] Available from <http://www.rightattitudes.com/2008/10/04/7-38-55-rule-personal-communication> [Accessed 10th March 2017]

Notes

[← 1]
Op.cit.