

Correlation between Communication Styles of Detectives and their Cooperation with Representatives of other Organizations

Irena Gorenak

Ministry of Internal Affairs, Štefanova 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia, irena.gorenak@gov.si

In this paper two important challenges regarding the market orientation of the service companies are addressed through literature review. Firstly, an overview of conceptual development regarding this construct is made. The challenge that results from this overview is based on finding, that initial conceptualizations largely neglect managerial and organizational issues related with implementation and enhancement of market orientation. Secondly, implications for conceptualizing and assessing the market orientation construct in a services companies are presented. As service context normally requires an adjusted managerial approach to marketing, key organizational areas requiring adjustments are pointed out and implications for market orientation conceptualization and measurement are discussed. On this basis, an alternative conceptual model separating strategic direction from the key organizational leverages of market orientation is proposed, which better suits the addressed challenges.

Keywords: Market orientation, Marketing concept, Services marketing, Strategic management

V teoretičnem delu avtorica govori o komuniciranju in sodelovanju organizacij. Podrobneje predstavlja komunikacijske stile in sodelovanje policijskih organizacij z okoljem. Teoretični del zaključuje s predstavitevjo dosedanjih raziskav s področja sodelovanja med policijo in drugimi organizacijami. V empiričnem delu avtorica proučuje sodelovanje in odnose med kriminalisti in predstavniki zunanjih organizacij ter oceno uporabe komunikacijskih stilov kriminalistov, ki so jo podali predstavniki centrov za socialno delo, tožilstev, preiskovalnih oddelkov sodišč, odvetnikov, inšpekcijskih služb, davčne uprave, oddelkov za notranje zadeve upravnih enot in nevladnih organizacij. Empirični del prispevka temelji na raziskavi, ki je bila opravljena na vzorcu 337 predstavnikov organizacij s katerimi kriminalisti sodelujejo.

Avtorica je z oceno komunikacijskih stilov kriminalistov pojasnila 49,7 % sodelovanja in odnosov med kriminalisti in predstavniki organizacij. Konkretnije je pojasnila, da na sodelovanje in odnose med kriminalisti in predstavniki organizacij vpliva iskreni stil komuniciranja (43 %), dodatno sledi vpliv pritrjevalnega stila komuniciranja (1,8 %), dodatno sledi vpliv indiferentnega stila komuniciranja (2,2 %), nato dodatno sledi vpliv odklonilnega stila komuniciranja (2,6 %) in nato še dodatno vpliv racionalnega stila komuniciranja (0,1 %).

Ključne besede: komunikacijski stili, sodelovanje in odnosi, policija, kriminalisti, predstavniki organizacij

1 Introduction

In everyday life of an individual as well as organization cooperation with others is very important. In all types of cooperation certain relationships between everyone involved emerge. Cooperation and relationships between individuals and organizations in everyday life are of the vital importance for their existence and success. Success is an ultimate goal of individuals as well as organizations. Cooperation and relationships are basing among other things on communication. Možina, Tavčar and Knežević (1995:85) have stated that: "Every communication has more obvious content point of view, that focuses on content of communicated information and less obvious relationship point of view, which focuses on relationships between all the parties in the communication."

Every individual has its own style of communicating, that he or she uses in personal as well as professional life. If two people use different styles of communicating there can be some misunderstanding.

Communicating is important for understanding among people. Communicating inside organization as well as communication with others is important for success of organization. Communication inside organization is important for gaining support of employees towards the goals of organization. Communicating with others is important for organization since it helps recognize certain factors that can have direct or indirect impact on the work of organization and the success of organization. Many organizations have found their selves dependent on communicating with others since they need the support and cooperation of community for their work. This is

especially true for police and other organizations that cooperate with police like social centers, prosecutor's office, courts investigatory departments, attorneys-at-law, various inspections, tax authorities, departments of internal affairs at administrative units and non-government organizations.

In this paper we talk about cooperation and relationships between detectives and representatives of other organizations. Especial attention is dedicated to evaluation of communication styles of detectives at communication with representatives of other organizations and to the influence of these factors on cooperation and relationship between detectives and these representatives of other organizations.

2 Communication

Communication as a notion coming from a Latin word "communicare" and stands for to consult, to discuss, or to ask for advice, as mentioned by Možina, Tavčar, and Knežević (1998:22-23). There are many definitions of communication to be found in various texts therefore we will look into some a bit more in depth.

"Communication is an interaction – exchange of information and not a one way flow of information" claim Ule and Kline (1996:53). Schramm (1963; in Ule and Kline, 1996:54) claims, that communication can be defined in various ways as: "conveying information, conveying ideas, or as shaping of common thinking between sender and receiver of information." Mumel (1998:60) states that: "communication can be generally described as a process of exchanging information." Rosengern (2000) claims that communication is a process of creating meaning of words. It is very important who creates meaning and what does it mean. Burleson (1995:576) describes communication as a "central tool that people use to pursue and perform various functions that have a significant influence on preserving relationships between people. Relationships are reflecting mutual, behavioral actions of everyone involve." Verčič and Ruler (2002:743) say that: "Early communication theories have seen communication as a one way process in which sender dictates what to do to receiver." Some theories see this as an attempt of sender to make a change in opinion/standpoint of receiver. "Modern communication theories see communication as a two way process that base on cooperation" (Verčič and Ruler, 2002:744). Foltz (1981:5) describes communication as: "Exchange of information, ideas, and feelings on vertical and horizontal level inside organization." Laswell (1960) describes communication as a process of transmitting of content in a message. Same author breaks communication down into: communicators, content, channel, medium, receiver, and effect. Trček (1998:109) talks about communication and describes it as: »A complex process of flow of information, that does not only carry a message in a dictionary meaning, but also facts about relations between people involve." Schramm (1963) determines that communication sciences deals with studying of human behaviour, this is somewhat understandable, since communication is an essential social process. Without communication people and society could not exist. It would be an extremely difficult task to set up

a theory or a framework for research on whichever field that incorporates human behaviour without taking into consideration communication.

2.1 Communication styles

Communication is always performed on non-verbal as well as verbal level. People involve in communication always use various communication styles adapted to situation, goals, and other people in communication process and environment in which communication process is taking place. Various authors (Satir, 1972; Miller and others, 1988; Wetzel, 1988; Shultz von Thun, 1989; Brajša, 1993; Howden, 1994; Turk and Skalar, 2001; Broderick, 2004) have studied styles of communication and gave them various names. Commonality among all of the authors is the fact that they have all linked names of styles of communication to contextual and relational aspect of communication among people involved in communication process. We will now take a look at how did some authors name communication styles.

Satir (1972) has devised five styles of communication and has presented the following differences:

- Conciliatory style – this style is characterized by effort in taking care of others, putting you down and not regarding facts. When we use this style we try to please everyone else, by agreeing with everything the other side has to say, and agreeing in everything others offer. Often used words with this style are: it would be very good if, ...
- Accusation style – this style is characterized by only taking care of you, not having any respecting others, and disregarding the facts. When we use this style we are looking for mistakes in other people's performance, and excluding everything we get. Often used words with this style are: why haven't you, ...
- Rational style – this style is characterized by taking the position that neither we or the other side are important, the only thing that matters are the facts. Often used words with this style are: if we analyze this truly, yes I can see it now (avoiding emotions), ...
- Indifferent style – this style is characterized by the fact that we are indifferent, we tend to talk a lot but have very little of actual conversation, communication is very superficial and targeted only to avoid getting to actual dialog.
- Congruent style – this style is characterized by sincerity. We are striving to understand others, express ourselves, understand the facts, balance emotions and thoughts, speech and behaviour, ... we tend to talk and act as we thing and feel.

Miller and others (1988; in Brajša 1993) talk about six styles of communication named: conventional style, mildly controlling style, actively sharply controlling style, passive sharply controlling style, investigatory style, and open style.

Schulz von Thun (1989; in Brajša, 1993) divided eight different styles of communication named: plea for help, offering of help, underestimating yourself, aggressiveness and underestimation of opponent, self conformation, controlling of opponent, self distancing, playing a comedian.

Brajša (1993) distinguishes six different styles of communication: communication, which is dependent on others – conciliatory communication, self underestimating and noncreative; communication directed against others – accusation style, strictly controlling, aggressive and underestimating towards others; communication for others – more profaned, mildly controlling and protective; superficial communication – everyday communication, conventional communication that is keeping its distance to others; strictly rational communication – analytical, investigatory, linked only to content, very impersonal; communication with others – open, democratic, quality, creative, and successful.

Broderick (2004) sees the following styles of communication: coincidental, random conversational style, careful conversational style, informal written style and formal written style.

Turk and Skalar (2001) say: "When communicating with our partners we often do not distinguish our private identity from our professional identity therefore using our most typical ways of feedback perception – styles of communication." Same authors divide styles of communication into: evaluating style, interpretation style, supporting style, fact-finding research style, immediate solution style, comprehensive style.

3 Cooperation of organizations

Cooperation among individuals and organizations is important for successfully performed work and solving problems that occur. Ury (1998) talks about cooperation of organizations and determines, that cooperation between organizations became a necessity on all levels and fields among organizations and individuals employed for organizations. Many authors (Laufer, 1984; Trunk-Širca and Tavčar, 1998; Shockley – Zalabakova, 1999) talk about cooperation between organizations and community. All of them came to a conclusion that organizations have to respond to various changes and influences from community, that organizations and community have to cooperate to reach the goals of community and organization, and that cooperation helps co-create events inside community and organization.

There are various factors influencing cooperation and relationship between organizations and community. Mosley, Pietri, and Megginsson (1996) have categorized these factors as: political, economical, social, technological, and international factors. As they see it political factors are measured as an influence of politics on success of organization, economical factors are dependent on the fact whether organization is in a rise, decline or stall, social factors are a question of size, age, and gender of population or a question of changes in relationship towards needs, environments, security, and other things. Regarding technological factors we are looking into how developed is the technology, automations of work, other processes and integration of computers into work environment. Very important are also international factors since they have a general influence on economy of a nation.

Considering the topic of this paper we will focus our

attention towards cooperation and relationship between police organizations and community from here on.

3.1 Cooperation and relations between police organizations and community

Cooperation between police and various organizations in the community is based on legal bases, community support and mutual understanding of each others roles in problem solving. Cooperation with other public authorities is more or less a consequence of already occurred actions. It is a common occurrence that we see individual partial problems grow into wider social problems that, sometimes under influence of media, force public authorities to react. Lobnikar and Pagon (1995) claim that the cases in which public authorities act proactive are rare; therefore solving the problems before they grow is not a common occurrence. Same authors have found out that police officers use 80% of their working time providing protective services, and further on they are asking themselves whether police officers are adequately prepared for cooperation with other institutions. Their claim is that this is a matter of orientation of safety politics and strategic goals of police as a whole organization.

Cooperation between police and some public authorities is strictly regulated by the law. This is particularly true for cooperation with judicial bodies and somewhat true for cooperation with attorneys-in-law and communities. Cooperation with other public authorities such as social centers, and non-government organizations is not regulated strictly by law. Considering the fact that police is in fundament a repressive body, with a main task of chasing perpetrators of criminal actions this seems somewhat understandable. Sadly we can say that cooperation with local communities and social centers is more or less left to internal guidelines given to by management of police and is affected by the level of affection that these managers feel towards this two types of organization.

Community in which police organizations operate has an influence on police organizations themselves. Certain communities are dealing with higher criminality rates than others; therefore police organizations as well as police officers have more chance in some communities to prove themselves then in others.

Corsianos (2000) has determined that good relations between police and community impact the success of police officers and police organizations. Van Reenen (1981) discusses the same topics and concludes that in order for police to be successful, it needs support from the community. Gorenakova (2004) has also dealt with the problem of cooperation and relationship between police officers and communities. Gorenakova (2004) has determined that police officers that more frequently positively evaluate their communication with representatives of various organizations also more positively evaluate all the segments that she used to evaluate their job satisfaction. Lobnikar and Pagon (1995) also stress the importance of cooperation between individual systems, in this context they stress that it is very important for police to exchange information's efficiently with various organizations and that police

acknowledges once and for all that its first and foremost task is of the non criminal nature.

Police role is beside preventive actions also repressive actions and in this context police has to cooperate with other public authorities, therefore we will focus on cooperation between police and other public authorities from here on.

Lettieri (1999) talks about cooperation between prosecutors and police in Italy, he points out that prosecutors are always the ones that lead the investigation and direct the work of police. This is why the same author thinks that cooperation between police and prosecutors is very important. Morré (1999) talks about relationship between police, prosecutors, and judicial system in Germany; he stresses that the leading role in investigation belongs to prosecutors, police is just helping out. Same author also stresses the importance of cooperation between police and prosecutors. Kečanovič (1999) is talking about the importance of cooperation between police, prosecutors, and judicial system that enables a successful conviction of criminal offenders. Kečanovič also stresses the importance of training in practical procedures in this field. Dvošek (2001) also talks about cooperation between national prosecutors and police, he emphasizes that permanent and efficient relationship must be built on legal bases, independently of current political interests of individual prosecutors office and police representatives.

When Penko (2005) talks about cooperation between police and national prosecutors, he says that one of the key problems of inefficiency or low efficiency of law-enforcement agencies lies precisely in cooperation between police and prosecutors. Same author claims that cooperation between police and prosecutors office is only occasional, inadequate or in some cases inexistent Penko sees the reason in his opinion above all on personal level of competent creators, and much less on regulatory level, since competent creators obstruct the flow of information in many cases. Same author says that we can sometimes see disharmony and disfunctionality between police and national prosecutors, sometimes it is unclear who is running the show and power relations are sometimes absurd. Furthermore author emphasizes the lacking of harmonized police-prosecutors investigations with on-time realization of seizure of property in matters of serious economic crime. Penko suggests an establishment of an organization that would oversee the establishment of permanent and solid communication channels between police and national prosecutors.

Mazi (2005) talks about cooperation between police and prosecutors on light of Regulations about cooperation between national prosecutor's office and police at detecting and chasing criminal offenders (2004), when he stresses that very frequent mutual notifying brought additional useless administrative work, especially with less important criminal offences. Same author stresses the importance of immediate establishment of inter-institutional connection between law-enforcement agencies. Mazi thinks that cooperation has to become a part of a system that works reliably and flawlessly.

Leskovškova (2000) has researched the importance of cooperation between various institutions when dealing with child sexual abuse. In this research she found out that the institutions that are in mutual dependence while

the investigation is going on are forced to adapt their ways of work in order to work together. Research that she has done showed that mutual cooperation of intervention institutions is improving; however the improvement within non intervention institutions cooperation is lagging behind. Research also showed that there is a lack of information flow among some institutions, especially there is a general lack of feedback information, and that is what makes work for some institutions even more difficult.

4 Description of a sample and the method

For the needs of this paper we will use the data gathered in a wider research conducted among representatives of other organizations that detectives cooperate with in the line of work. Aforementioned research was conducted for the needs of the dissertation. In this paper we will focus on the data gathered among representatives of other organizations and analyze them for the needs of this paper.

Subject of our research was cooperation and relationship between detectives and representatives of other organizations. We also researched the evaluation of communication styles of detectives, which were given to us by representatives of other organizations. Goal of this research was to establish whether there is a correlation between evaluation of communication styles of Slovene detectives and their cooperation and relationship with representatives of other organizations.

Sample contained 337 representatives of other organizations that detectives work with in the line of work. Among 337 interviewees there were 117 or 34,8% of interviewees from social centers, 17 or 5,1% of interviewees from prosecutors office, 16 or 4,8% of interviewees from court investigatory departments, 73 or 21,7% of interviewees from departments of internal affairs at administrative units, 27 or 8% of interviewees from attorneys-at-law, 29 or 8,6% of interviewees from tax authorities, 22 or 6,5% of interviewees from non government organizations, and 53 or 10,4% of interviewees from various inspections. One of the interviewees has not stated for which institution he or she works.

We have given interviewees 28 claims with which we have measured the relationship, cooperation, and evaluation of communication styles. Interviewees have evaluated the claims on a five marks chart inside which mark 1 meant never, mark 2 meant rarely, mark 3 meant sometimes, mark 4 meant often, and mark 5 meant always. Aforementioned 28 claims were distributed in the following five sections; "**Formal cooperation**", "**Informal cooperation**", "**Relationship with detectives**", "**Cooperation plans**", and "**Shared opinions**". These five categories were then combined to form a dependent variable that we have named "**Cooperation and relationships**". Another 24 claims were posed to evaluate the frequency of various communication styles used. These 24 claims were divided in another five sections with the help of factor analysis as followed: "**Declinatory style**", "**Affirmatory style**", "**Rational style**", "**Sincere style**", and "**Indifferent style**". All five sections were combined into an

independent variable called **“Evaluation of uses of communication styles”**.

Among 334 interviewees that state their gender there was 101 or 30,2% of men and 233 or 69,8% of women. Among 330 interviewees, which were between 25 and 65 years of age, the average age was 43,4 years. There were 333 interviewees that stated their level of education, 18 or 5,4% had only a high school diploma, 146 or 43,8% had a college diploma, and 169 or 50,8% had an university diploma or even higher education. Interviewees had on average 20,4 years of working experience and 13,7 years on average of working for present institution.

We have also wanted to know how often they communicate with detectives. We have found out that 73,7% of all the interviewees only communicate with detectives' couple of time a year, 23,1% of interviewees communicates with detectives couple of time a month and only 3,3% of interviewees has stated that they communicate with detectives on the weakly bases.

5 Results

5.1 Determining connection

We wanted to know whether the age of interviewees, their education, years of work, and years of work for this institution have any correlation with evaluation of cooperation, relationship, and their evaluation of communication styles used by detectives. Results can be seen in Table 1.

Our findings indicate that older interviewees more frequently positively evaluate, that detectives use **“Rational style”** of communication than younger interviewees. We

have also found out that interviewees with higher level of education less frequently positively evaluate **“Informal cooperation”**, but at the same time they more frequently positively evaluate **“Cooperation plans”** with detectives and the use of **“Affirmatory style”** of communication with detectives than interviewees with lower level of education. We have also established that interviewees with longer length of service more frequently positively evaluate, that detectives use **“Rational style”** of communication, then interviewees with shorter length of service. Another thing we have found out is that interviewees, that have a longer length of service with current institution more frequently positively evaluate that detectives use **“Rational style”** of communication, then the interviewees that have shorter length of service for current institution.

We have also made a correlation analysis between independent and dependent variable. Findings show that there is a strong positive correlation (0,407; $p=0,01$) between **“Evaluation of uses of communication style”** and **“Cooperation and relationship”**.

5.2 Finding the statistically significant differences

With the help of t-test we have found out that there are statistically significant differences between male interviewees and female interviewees with the following four variables; **“Formal cooperation”**, ($t=4,687$; $p=0,000$), with men evaluating lower (average of 3,14) **“Formal cooperation”** then women (average of 3,60), **“Declinatory style”** of communication ($t=3,015$; $p=0,002$) with men evaluating higher (average of 2,22), that detectives use **“Declinatory style”** of communication than women (average of 1,99), **“Affirmatory style”** of communication ($t=2,189$;

Table 1: Correlation between age of interviewees, their education, years of work, and years of work for present institution on one hand and variables on the other.

	Age	Education	Years of work	Years of work at present institution
"Informal cooperation"		-,136*		
"Planning of cooperation"		,190**		
"Affirmatory style"		,110*		
"Rational style"	,164**		,159**	,113*

** $p < 0,01$; * $p < 0,05$

Table 2: Results of statistically important differences between variables and institutions for which interviewees are working for.

VARIABLE	F	p
"Formal cooperation"	35,462	0,000
"Informal cooperation"	3,931	0,000
"Relationship with detectives"	3,170	0,003
"Cooperation plans"	11,882	0,000
"Shared opinions"	11,468	0,000
"Declinatory style"	3,650	0,001
"Affirmatory style"	3,589	0,001
"Rational style"	3,940	0,000
"Sincere style"	6,367	0,000
"Indifferent style"	3,988	0,000

$p=0.030$), with men evaluating higher (average of 2,33), that detectives use **"Affirmatory style"** of communication than women (average of 2,15), and **"Indifferent style"** of communication ($t=2,244$; $p=0,026$) with men evaluating higher (average of 2,59), that detectives use **"Indifferent style"** of communication than women (average of 2,42).

With the help of variance analysis we have found out that there are statistically significant differences between variables and institutions for which interviewees work. Results of statistically significant differences are shown in Table 2.

"Formal cooperation" is evaluated above average by interviewees that work for social centers, prosecutors' offices, and non government organizations, while interviewees from tax authorities, and court investigatory departments evaluate it as average, below average is **"Formal cooperation"** in the eyes of interviewees from various inspections, attorneys-at-law, and departments of internal affairs at administrative units. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in social centers, and lowest by attorneys-at-law.

"Informal cooperation" is evaluated above average by interviewees that work for social centers, prosecutors' offices, court investigatory departments, and departments of internal affairs at administrative units, while interviewees from non government organizations evaluate it as average, below average is **"Informal cooperation"** in the eyes of interviewees from various inspections, attorneys-at-law, and tax authorities. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in prosecutors' offices, and lowest by attorneys-at-law.

Variable **"Relationship with detectives"** is evaluated above average by interviewees that work for social centers. Interviewees from prosecutors' offices, departments of internal affairs at administrative units, tax authorities, and various inspections evaluate it as average, below average is **"Relationship with detectives"** in the eyes of interviewees from court investigatory departments, and non government organizations. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in tax authorities, and lowest by attorneys-at-law.

"Cooperation plans" is evaluated above average by interviewees that work for social centers, prosecutors' offices, court investigatory departments, tax authorities, non government organizations, and various inspections. Below average is **"Cooperation plans"** in the eyes of interviewees from attorneys-at-law, and departments of internal affairs at administrative units. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in various inspections, and lowest by departments of internal affairs at administrative units.

Variable **"Shared opinions"** is evaluated above average by interviewees that work for social centers, and tax authorities. Interviewees from prosecutors' offices, departments of internal affairs at administrative units, and various inspections evaluate it as average, below average is **"Relationship with detectives"** in the eyes of interviewees from court investigatory departments, attorneys-at-law, and non government organizations. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in tax authorities, and lowest by attorneys-at-law.

That detectives use **"Declinatory style"** of communication was above average evaluated by interviewees that

work for non government organizations, and attorneys-at-law, as average this was evaluated by interviewees that work for social centers, court investigatory departments, and departments of internal affairs at administrative units, below average is **"Declinatory style"** in the eyes of interviewees from prosecutors offices, tax authorities, and various inspections. Highest average score was in this case given by attorneys-at-law, and lowest by various inspections.

That detectives use **"Affirmatory style"** of communication was above average evaluated by interviewees that work for prosecutors offices, and court investigatory departments, everyone else has evaluated the use of **"Affirmatory style"** as below average. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in prosecutors' office, and lowest by workers in tax authorities.

That detectives use **"Rational style"** of communication was above average evaluated by interviewees that work for prosecutors offices, court investigatory departments, and departments of internal affairs at administrative units, attorneys-at-law, tax authorities, and various inspections, below average is **"Rational style"** of communication in the eyes of interviewees from non government organization, and social centers. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in court investigatory departments, and lowest by social centers.

That detectives use **"Sincere style"** of communication was above average evaluated by interviewees that work for social centers, prosecutors offices, court investigatory departments, and tax authorities. As average this was evaluated by workers in departments of internal affairs at administrative units, below average is **"Sincere style"** of communication in the eyes of interviewees from non government organization, various inspections, and attorneys-at-law. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in prosecutors' offices, and lowest by attorneys-at-law.

That detectives use **"Indifferent style"** of communication was above average evaluated by interviewees that work for, prosecutors' offices, departments of internal affairs at administrative units, attorneys-at-law, non government organization, and various inspections. As average this was evaluated by workers in court investigatory departments, below average is **"Indifferent style"** of communication in the eyes of interviewees from social centers, and tax authorities. Highest average score was in this case given by workers in attorneys-at-law, and lowest by social centers.

5.3 Regression analysis

We have conducted a hierarchical regression for dependent variable **"Cooperation and relationship"**. We have put the independent variable **"Declinatory style"** in the first block, in second block we have put independent variable **"Affirmative style"**, in third block independent variable **"Rational style"**, in fourth block independent variable **"Sincere style"**, and in the fifth block **"Indifferent style"**. Results of hierarchical analysis for dependent variable **"Cooperation and relationship"** are shown in Table 3.

Results of regression analysis show, that we were able to explain 49,7% of variability of **"Cooperation and**

Table 3: Hierarchical regression analysis for dependent variable "Cooperation and relationship"

VARIABLES	R ²	R ²	df	F	P
Sincere style	,430	,430	1	194,835	,000
Affirmative style	,448	,018	1	105,145	,000
Indifferent style	,470	,022	1	76,837	,000
Declinatory style	,496	,026	1	62,255	,000
Rational style	,497	,001	1	49,736	,000

relationship". With "Sincere style" we have explained 43% of variability of "Cooperation and relationship", further we have explained another 1,8% of variability of "Cooperation and relationship" with "Affirmative style", further more we have explained another 2,2% of variability of "Cooperation and relationship" with "Indifferent style", with "Declinatory style" we have managed to add another 2,6% of variability of "Cooperation and relationship", and lastly we have managed to add the final 0,1% of variability of "Cooperation and relationship" with "Rational style".

6 Discussion

Cooperation between individuals and organizations is important for successful performance at work and for solving problems. There are various factors that influence cooperation and relationship between individuals and organizations such as political, economical, social, technological and international. In this paper we have been dealing with connection between evaluation of usage of communication styles of detectives and their relationship with representatives of other organizations.

We have found a strong positive and statistically significant correlation between evaluation of communication styles of detectives, which was given to us by representatives of other organizations, and cooperation and relationship. This in other words means that evaluation of usage of individual communication style of detectives and evaluation of cooperation and relations correlated. This finding is important for police management, especially for management of detectives, since it indicates that the style of communication between detectives and representatives of other organization actually presents the element that influences the cooperation and relationship among them.

With variance analysis we have tried to determine statistically important differences among representatives of various organizations. We have established that representatives of social centers evaluate all means of cooperation and relationship with detectives above average; this means that they are pleased with cooperation and relations. This finding is somewhat expected, since it is a mutual area of work for both organizations on the field of taking care of victims, especially children and minors. They also work closely with one and other in the area of family violence. They both have a common interest in chasing perpetrators of violent criminal actions.

Further we have determined that representatives of prosecutors' offices evaluate formal and informal cooperation, and cooperation plans as above average, as average they have evaluated relationship with detectives, and

shared opinion. This finding is also expected to some extent since the area of work between detectives and prosecutors is connected via the interest in chasing perpetrators of criminal acts. Also with analysis regarding the frequency of cooperation we have found out that cooperation among detectives and prosecutors is relatively frequent and fairly direct.

Regarding the court investigatory departments we have determined that they evaluate above average informal cooperation and cooperation plans, their evaluation of formal cooperation was average, with below average grade they have evaluated relationship with detectives and shared opinions. These last two ones are somewhat expected since court investigatory departments are in the position where they orders to detectives what to do, and this orders are more reasonable to some than to others. In communication we can face certain distractions and misunderstanding or misinterpretations of the message.

Very interesting finding came with representatives of various inspections that have evaluated below average formal and informal cooperation on one hand, and on another with above average they have evaluated cooperation plans. We must look at this in a context of occasional cooperation between detectives and inspectors that is in most cases related only to a specific case. The communication among them is fairly rare, only couple of times a year. They both have the interest in chasing the perpetrators of criminal acts.

It is somewhat interesting that representatives of non government organizations evaluate formal cooperation and cooperation planning as above average on one hand and their relations with detectives and shared opinions on the other hand as below average. This can be understood in the context of declarative cooperation between non government organizations and detectives on national level, since we have found out that nearly half of all detectives does not communicate with representatives of non government organizations directly. It is obvious that detectives see non government organizations as something useless as a critic to detectives work, the goal should be to establish exactly the opposite way of thinking among detectives.

Attorneys-at-law have, as expected, evaluated all the segments of their cooperation and relationship below average. This finding must be viewed in the context of opposing interests, since attorneys represent advocates to perpetrators of criminal acts that have interest in finding any small error they can find in the process. Their presence represents some sort of a control over legitimate work of detectives and care for the interests of the person in investigation.

When studying communication styles we have found out that representatives of attorneys-at-law and

non government organizations evaluate above average that detectives, when communicating with them, use declinatory style of communication. We have also found out that representatives of court investigatory departments and prosecutors have evaluated above average that detectives when communicating with them use affirmative style of communication. Further we have found out that representatives of social centers and non government organizations have evaluated below average that detectives use rational style of communication when communicating with them. That detectives when they communicate with them use sincere style of communication was evaluated above average by representatives of social centers, prosecutors' offices, court investigatory departments, and tax authorities. Finally we have also established that representatives of social centers and tax authorities evaluate below average that detectives use indifferent style of communication when communicating with them.

These findings were expected. Attorneys-at-law, and partially also representatives' non government organizations detectives see as something unimportant, in some cases even something that is obstructing their work, and that is why they use declinatory style of communication when communicating with them. It is virtually a reverse situation when we are dealing with detectives communicating with court investigatory departments and prosecutors and this is why detectives use affirmative style of communication when they are communicating with them. This is somewhat also a consequence of higher average education among prosecutors comparing to detectives. Success at work for detectives is also dependent from cooperation with court investigatory departments and that is why detectives usually use affirmative style of communication. Common interests in solving tasks successful can explain why evaluations of sincere style of communication are evaluated above average from representatives of social centers, prosecutors, courts investigatory departments, and tax authorities

Finding that representatives of other organizations evaluate, that on cooperation and relationships among them communication styles do have an influence is even more striking, since we have been able to explain 49,7% of this influence.

To managerial and executive workers inside police management and management of police detective departments we suggest that they dedicate more attention towards educating detectives in the field of communication skills, because improvements in this field will improve the cooperation and relationship among detectives and representatives of other organizations and this will have for the consequence higher police effectiveness.

7 References

- Brajša, P. (1993). *Pedagoška komunikologija*. Ljubljana: GLOTTA Nova.
- Broderick, J.P. (2004). *Linguistics, Language Structure, Language Variation, and Plain Language*. Internet: <http://web.odu.edu/al/jpbroder/lingangvarplainlang.ppt>, accessed on: 02. 09. 2004.
- Burleson, B.R. (1995). Personal relationships as a skilled accomplishment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12: 575-581.
- Corsianos, M. (2000). *Detectives Decision Making within a Police Organizational Structure and Occupational Culture: Examining the Social Construction of "High Profile" Cases*. Dissertation-Abstract-International, A: The-Humanities and Social Sciences, 60,10, 3801-A.
- Dvoršek, A. (2001). Sodelovanje med policijo in tožilstvom; ali zadostuje le dobra volja šefov?, In: Pagon, M. (Ed.). *Drugi slovenski Dnevi varstvoslovja*. Ljubljana: Visoka policijsko-varnostna šola.
- Foltz, R.G. (1981). Communication in Contemporary Organizations. In: Reus, K. in Silvis D. (ed.). *Inside Organizational Communication*. New York: Longman, pp. 5-16.
- Gorenak, I. (2004). Vpliv organizacijskega komuniciranja na zadovoljstvo policistov pri delu. *Master Thesis*, University of Maribor, Faculty of Organisational Sci.
- Howden, J.C. (1994). Competitive and Collaborative Communicative Style: American Men and Women, American Men and Japanese Men. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 4:1-10.
- Kečanovič, B. (1999). Sodelovanje med sodstvom, državnim tožilstvom in policijo na področju praktičnega usposabljanja. In: *Odnosi med policijo, državnim tožilstvom in sodstvom pri odkrivanju in preiskovanju kriminalitete*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve – Izobraževalni center, pp. 29-31.
- Lasswell, H. (1960). *The Structure and Function of Communication In Society*. In: Schramm, W. Mass Communication Urbana. University of Illinois, pp.117-130.
- Lauffer, A. (1984). *Strategic Marketing For Not-for-profit Organizations – Program and Resource Development*. New York: The Free Press – Macmillan.
- Leskošek, V. (2000). Pomembnost medinstitucionalnega sodelovanja pri obravnavi spolnih zlorab. *Socialno delo*. 39 (3): 191-205.
- Lettieri, N. (1999). Italijanska zakonodaja o odnosih med tožilstvom in policijo na različnih stopnjah kriminalističnih preiskav: težave, prednosti in obeti. In: *Odnosi med policijo, državnim tožilstvom in sodstvom pri odkrivanju in preiskovanju kriminalitete*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve – Izobraževalni center, pp. 10-14.
- Lobnikar, B. & Pagon, M. (1995). Elementi socialnega dela pri opravljanju policijske dejavnosti. *Zbornik strokovno znanstvenih razprav*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve, 8 (6), 165-177.
- Mazi, F. (2005). Medinstitucionalni vidiki pregona storilcev kaznivih dejanj (sodelovanje s policijo in drugimi organi). In: *Gospodarsko kazensko pravo – za večjo učinkovitost države pri oblikovanju gospodarskega kriminala in korupcije*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za primerjalno pravo pri Pravni fakulteti; Pravna fakulteta in Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve – Policija, pp. 2-6.
- Miller, S. (1988). *Gespräche selbstsicher und ebenbürtig führen*. Landensberg: MVG.
- Morré, P. (1999). Nemške izkušnje. In: *Odnosi med policijo, državnim tožilstvom in sodstvom pri odkrivanju in preiskovanju kriminalitete*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve – Izobraževalni center, pp.15 - 28.
- Mosley C. D., Pietri H. P. & Megginson C. L. (1996). *Management – leadership in Action 5th Ed.* New York USA: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Možina, S., Tavčar, M. & Kneževič, A. (1995). *Poslovno komuniciranje*. Maribor: Založba obzorja.
- Možina, S., Tavčar, M. & Kneževič, A. (1998). *Poslovno komuniciranje*. Maribor: Založba obzorja.
- Mumel, D. (1998). Tržno komuniciranje v konkurenčnem okolju – nujnost integriranega pristopa. In: Lukšič, I. (ed.). Ljubljana: *Teorija in praksa*, 4: 660-670.

- Penko, B. (2005). Nekateri problemi kazenskega pregona hujših oblik gospodarskega (finančnega) kriminala. V: Dvoršek, A., Selišnik, L. (ur.) *Problematika finančnega kriminala v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za policijsko varnostne vede in Pravna Fakulteta, pp.154-158.
- Rosengren, K.E. (2000). *Communication: An introduction*. London, Sage.
- Satir, V. (1972). *Selbstwert und Kommunikation*. München: Pfeiffer.
- Schramm, W. (1963). Raziskovanje sporočanja v Združenih državah Amerike. (Translated by Erjavec, K.) *Komunikološka hrestomatija 2*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Schulz von Thun, F. (1989). *Miteinander reden II Rowohlt*. Reinbek.
- Sholckley-Zalabak, P. (1999). *Fundamentals of organizational communication 4th ed.* New York: Longman
- Trček, J. (1998). *Medosebno komuniciranje - kontaktna kultura*. Ljubljana: Korona Plus.
- Trunk Širca, N. & Tavčar, M.I. (1998). *Management nepridobitnih organizacij*. Koper: Visoka šola za management.
- Turk, S., Skalar, T. (2001). Komuniciranje in obvladovanje konfliktov za policiste. *Seminarsko gradivo*. Ljubljana: Policijska akademija.
- Ule, M. & Kline, M. (1996). *Psihologija tržnega komuniciranja*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Uredba o sodelovanju državnega tožilstva in policije pri odkrivanju in pregonu storilcev kaznivih dejanj. (2004). Ljubljana: *Uradni list RS, šte. 52*.
- Ury, W. (1998). *Od nasprotovanja do sodelovanja: kako preseči zavrnitev*. Ljubljana: gospodarski vestnik.
- Van Reenen, P. (1981). Urban Crisis Management and the Police Force: The Case of Amsterdam. Netherlands, *Journal of Sociology*, 17 (2): 51-78.
- Verčič, D., Ruler, B. (2002). Refleksni komunikacijski management. In: Lukšič, I. (ur.). Ljubljana: *Teorija in praksa 2002* (5): 739-754.
- Wetzel, P.J. (1988). Are 'powerless' communication strategies the Japanese norm? *Journal of Language in Society* (17).

Irena Gorenak has got her doctorate at Faculty of Organizational Science at University of Maribor. She is currently working at Ministry of Internal Affairs as a senior adviser in sector for complains. In her work she is focusing her energy on communication within organization as well as communication of police organization with other organizations with which they cooperate in the line of work.
