

Human Communication. A Publication of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association. Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 121 – 135.

Family communication patterns and argumentativeness: An investigation of Chinese college students

Yang Lin
School of Communication
The University of Akron
Kolbe Hall, Rm 108
Akron, Ohio 44325-1003
(330) 972-7600
ylin1@uakron.edu

Andrew S. Rancer
School of Communication
The University of Akron
Kolbe Hall 108
Akron, OH 44325-1003
(330) 972-7600
arancer@uakron.edu

Qingshan Kong
Department of Diplomacy
School of Law
Guangdong University of Foreign Studies
#2 North Baiyun Road
Guangzhou, China 510420
kongqsh@sohu.com

Yang Lin (Ph.D., University of Oklahoma, 1997) is Associate Professor, and Andrew S. Rancer (Ph.D., Kent State University, 1979) is Professor in the School of Communication, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-1003. Qingshan Kong is Associate Professor in the School of Law, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Guangzhou, China.

Abstract

This study examines Chinese college students' trait of argumentativeness in relation to their family interpersonal communication patterns (Consensual, Pluralistic, Protective, and Laissez-faire). The results of a self-report survey of 141 students from two Chinese universities indicate that differences in family communication patterns are linked to the development of individuals' communication traits. Specifically, the findings show that Chinese students from consensual and pluralistic families tend to be more argumentative than those from protective families. There is no significant difference in argumentativeness among students from consensual, pluralistic, and laissez-faire families. Implications of these findings are discussed.

Family communication patterns and argumentativeness: An investigation of Chinese college students

Traits and predispositions indicate individuals' tendency to behave in certain ways, and they are "the fundamental building blocks of personality" (Santrock, 1991, p. 455). Communicators' traits and predispositions "represent major dimensions of interpersonal functioning" (Beatty, 1998, p. 318), and understanding the communication behavior of others can be enhanced by knowledge of the communication traits and predispositions that individuals possess (Beatty, 1998; Infante & Rancer, 1996). Indeed, research employing a trait perspective has occupied a central place in the development of communication theory.

According to social learning theory, individuals' environmental experiences influence the formation of their traits and predispositions (Santrock, 1991). The home is one of the most significant such social environments with which almost every one has had experiences. Child-development experts conclude that family dynamics play an important role on the type of person children will grow up into (Kantrowitz, 2004), and some individuals' personal problems at adult stage can be attributed to the type of family they grew up from (Conlin, 2004). Specifically, parent-child communication has been considered "one of the most pervasive forces" that can affect individuals' trait and personality development (Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, 1973, p. 349). Families develop different patterns of parent-child interpersonal communication, and these differences in family communication structure are "major and consistent" (p. 349).

Chaffee et al. (1973) first introduced the concept, family communication patterns (FCP), to study family communication structure. Since then, many studies have examined the relationships between family communication patterns and individuals' trait formation and personality development, for example, FCP and communication apprehension (Elwood & Schrader, 1998; Hsu, 1998), FCP and unwillingness-to-communicate (Avtgis, 1999), FCP and self-monitoring, social desirability, desirability of control, self-esteem, self-disclosure, and shyness (Huang, 1999), and FCP and communication competence (Koesten, 2004). Most of studies, however, focus mainly on families and individuals in the American society. Few, if any, explores how family communication patterns are related to individuals' trait development in other cultures.

Culture has been characterized by ways people engage in interpersonal communication. For instance, some cultures (e.g., American) are considered low-context and individualistic, in which people prefer explicit codes for communication, show a low tolerance for ambiguity, and perceive arguments in conversation as a positive way to deal with interpersonal conflict (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 1980; Gudykunst, 1991; Rancer, Kosberg, & Baukus, 1992). Meanwhile, some other cultures (e.g., Chinese and Japanese) are viewed as high-context and collectivistic, in which people tend to use implicit codes for communication, emphasize social harmony, and consider arguments potentially harmful to personal friendships and, therefore, should be avoided (Hall, 1976; Gudykunst, 1991; Prunty, Klopff, & Ishii, 1990a, 1990b). It has become a tradition of the communication discipline to study traits related to interpersonal interactions in intercultural contexts, such as argumentativeness (Avtgis & Rancer, 2002; Prunty, et al., 1990a, 1990b; Suzuki, 1998), verbal aggressiveness (Avtgis & Rancer, 2002; Harmon, Klopff, & Ishii, 1990; Suzuki, 1998), communication apprehension (Burroughs & Marie, 1990; Klopff, 1997), rhetorical sensitivity (Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiket, & Smith,

2003), and willingness-to-communicate (Burroughs & Marie, 1990; Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketu, & Smith, 2002), to name just a few. These studies have shown that individuals of different cultures vary significantly on those traits. Because of the differences in cultural characteristics, the relationships between family communication patterns and individuals' trait development may be different from one culture to another culture.

The present study focused on Chinese college students in Mainland China. Chinese college students of the late 1990s and the early 2000s is a unique social cohort that cannot be found anywhere in the world. First, the rapid development of Chinese economy has made their parents, as a whole, the richest generation in Chinese history. Materially, most of these parents didn't have an enjoyable childhood, but they can now afford a living standard that is hundred times higher than that of the past. As a result, many children of this richest generation have been living a family environment that has a tendency to focus more on material satisfaction of children than on other aspects of children, such as the development of a sense of social responsibility and personality.

Second, many of these college students are from one-child family. In order to control the fast growing population, the Chinese government in 1979 implemented a national policy allowing each family to have only one child. Undoubtedly, these children generally receive more intensive parental attention and engage in more direct interactions with their parents than the generations before them. It is also true that the parents of one-child families may act in an overprotective way with their only child, thus, hindering his or her normal development of personality. The influence of the family environment on the personal development of this new generation has become a common focus for research across disciplines, for it is an issue related to the future of Chinese people and culture. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between Chinese college students' trait argumentativeness and their family interpersonal communication patterns.

Family Communication Patterns (FCP)

Chaffee, McLeod, and Wackman (1973) define two relations to describe the characteristics of family communication environment: social-oriented and concept-oriented. In social-oriented families, children are encouraged to develop and maintain harmonious relationships and to avoid any confrontation with their parents and others. In concept-oriented families, children are expected to openly express and discuss their ideas with any individuals, including their parents. As a result, children would be able to explore alternative viewpoints of controversial issues and to even actively engage in debate with those individuals. These two dimensions measure the differences of family communication patterns.

The socio-oriented and concept-oriented dimensions of family communication patterns further help categorize families into four different types: *consensual*, *protective*, *pluralistic*, and *laissez-faire*. According to Chaffee et al. (1973), "consensual families stress both types of relations" (p. 351), and children are "constrained to develop concepts that are consonant with the existing socio-relations" (p. 351) although they may be exposed to controversial issues and have different takes on them. Protective families show communication patterns that "... stress socio-relations at the expense of concept-relations" (p. 351). Children in protective families are discouraged from expressing different opinions on issues. Pluralistic families assume communication norms that "...

emphasize the development of strong and varied concept-relations in an environment comparatively free of social restraints” (p. 351). Children from pluralistic families are encouraged to examine different ideas and to even reach a different conclusion from their parents on certain issues. Laissez-faire families “... emphasize neither type of relation” (p. 351). In other words, as shown in Figure 1, consensual families would be “high” for measures on both the socio- and concept-oriented dimensions; protective families would be “high” for measures on the socio-oriented dimension, but “low” on the concept-oriented dimension; pluralistic families would be “low” for measures on the socio-oriented dimension, but “high” on the concept-oriented dimension; *laissez-faire* families would be “low” for measures on both the dimensions.

Figure 1: A Two-dimensional Model of Family Communication Patterns*

Dimension	Concept-oriented Communication	
	(High)	(Low)
(High)	<u>Consensual</u> “... families stress both types of relations.”	<u>Protective</u> “... families stress social-relations at the expense of concept-relations.”
Social-oriented Communication		
(Low)	<u>Pluralistic</u> “...families emphasize the development of strong and varied concept-relations in an environment comparatively free of social restraints.”	<u>Laissez-Faire</u> “...families emphasize neither type of relation.”

*: see Chaffee, McLeod, & Wackman, 1973, p. 351.

Family communication patterns traditionally have been assessed through the McLeod, Atkin, and Chaffee (1972, cited in Rubin, Palmgreen, & Sypher, 1994) Family Communication Patterns Scale. This scale includes ten items, five measuring the social-oriented dimension of family communication patterns and the other five measuring the concept-oriented dimension. Four family communication types are then formed by splitting the sample at the median scores on both socio-oriented and concept-oriented measurements. This self-report instrument measures the respondent’s perceptions of, and beliefs about, the existing family interaction patterns, or, what the respondent perceives or believes regarding how he/she interacts with other family members at home. Obviously, although they live together within the same family, these perceptions and beliefs can be different among family members (Ritchie, 1991; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). These perceptions and beliefs help individual members of a family define and make sense of the family “reality” in which they live. Their attitudes towards and their interactions with other family members are influenced by these perceptions and beliefs.

From a researcher's viewpoint, it is almost impossible to know what exactly happens in each family day by day. What matters is what a member of the family perceives and believes regarding what it is going on. This perceived reality is the family environment that this member of the family believes he/she lives within. Each member of the family may have different descriptions of the family environment of the very same family. Specifically, for children in the family, it is the family environment as perceived by them that eventually can have an impact on the development of their personality traits. Therefore, the family communication patterns measured by children's self-report using the two dimensional scale are a meaningful representation of the characteristics of family environment.

Based on the two dimensions, a line of research on family communication patterns shows social- or concept-oriented families relate differently to the levels of children's interest in public affairs and political knowledge, and children in different family environments demonstrate different behaviors regarding their media usage, product brand selection, and career decisions (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). For example, regarding individuals' engagement of political communication such as discussion with friends and campaign activities, Chaffee et al. (1973) reported that adults and children from pluralistic families showed a higher level of political engagement than those from the other three types of families, and, specifically, those from protective families had the lowest level of such an engagement. Abel (1976) found that television viewing preferences of children in high socio-oriented families are similar to what they believe their parents want them to watch. He argued that this finding may be a result of communication restrictions imposed by parents on children in such a family environment in which children tend to have "less opportunity to encounter information at variance with parental views" (p. 332). Chan and McNeal (2003) also found that parents in protective Chinese families tend to exercise more control over children's television viewing than those in pluralistic Chinese families.

Regarding the relationship between family communication patterns and communication traits, Elwood and Schrader (1998) studied the levels of communication apprehension (CA) among college and middle school students in relation to both "conformity-oriented" (similar to socio-oriented) and "conversation-oriented" (similar to concept-oriented) dimensions. The findings of their study indicated that the levels of communication apprehension (CA) in the interpersonal and group contexts are negatively related to the measures of conversation-orientation of family. In other words, students, regardless of the level of their study (college or middle school), tend to have lower levels of communication apprehension in the two contexts if they come from a highly conversation-oriented or concept-oriented families. Hsu (1998) also reported that levels of communication apprehension were positively related to the conformity-oriented or socio-oriented families, and they were in a negative relation to the conversation-oriented or concept-oriented families. In addition, Hutchinson and Neuliep (1993) also found a moderate relationship between children's levels of CA and the scores of parental modeling (through which children imitate the communicative behavior of their parents to gradually develop their own). Thus, the studies summarized above suggest that family communication environment contributes to the development of children's communication personality traits.

Argumentativeness

Individuals engage in arguments in various social contexts for different reasons. The trait of argumentativeness has been found to be a significant predictor of actual argumentative behavior (see, Infante & Rancer, 1996, Rancer & Avtgis, 2006). Argumentativeness is a trait "... which predisposes the individual in communication situations to advocate positions on controversial issues and to attack verbally the positions which other people take on these issues" (Infante & Rancer, 1982, p. 72). Argumentativeness (ARGgt), according to Infante and Rancer (1982), consists of two motivational tendencies: the tendency to approach arguments (ARGap), and the tendency to avoid arguments (ARGav). The interaction of these two competing components defines individuals' level of argumentativeness. In other words, ARGgt = ARGap – ARGav. ARGgt is measured by a 20-item self-report scale, ten of the items measuring ARGap and another ten measuring ARGav. Therefore, a highly argumentative individual would have a high score on ARGap and a low score on ARGav. A low argumentative individual would register a low score on ARGap and a high score on ARGav. A moderate argumentative individual would have approximately equal scores on both ARGap and ARGav. Specifically, if an individual has low scores on both ARGap and ARGav, s/he is considered "apathetic moderate" (Infante, 1982, p. 142); if an individual has high scores on both ARGap and ARGav, s/he is considered "conflicting feelings moderate" (p. 142).

Argumentativeness as a communication trait has been a focus of many studies and its relation to other personality traits has been investigated in a large amount of research (Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 2003; Rancer & Avtgis, 2006). For example, Chen (1994) examined the relationship between argumentativeness and social desirability of college undergraduate students. He found that those individuals with high levels of social desirability would be less argumentative in social interaction. Nussbaum and Bendixen (2003) reported a significant relationship between individuals' extraverted personality traits and argumentativeness.

Individuals' trait argumentativeness has also been linked to the characteristics of family environment. Infante (1982) identified two of such characteristics: birth order and family size. He argued that firstborns in family tend to be "more motivated to achieve, competitive, and leadership oriented" (p. 143), and, therefore, they are more argumentative. Also, "the more children in a family the more potential for social conflict, [and,] thus, the more opportunity to develop an argumentativeness" (p. 149). However, the findings show that only the birth order is significantly associated with argumentativeness. In addition, Bayer and Cegala (1992) found that parents' trait of argumentativeness is related to the patterns of their parenting style. Parents high in trait argumentativeness are likely to have "autonomy-love" style with which parents show their support and express their affection for children, and, at the same time, encourage children to be independent. Parents with this style are considered an "authoritative parent" who themselves "tend to be good arguers" (p. 303), and they "are more likely to accept a child's reasonable argument" (p.303).

Argumentativeness has also been studied in different cultural contexts. Suzuki and Rancer (1994) examined the conceptual and measurement equivalence of the Argumentativeness Scale used in Japan. They reported that the translated ARG scale can be applied to Japanese sample. Prunty, Klopff, and Ishii (1990a, 1990b) and Suzuki

(1998) also found that American students show higher scores on argumentativeness (ARGgt) than Japanese students.

Taken together, this corpus of research suggests that family environment influences children's communication personality traits, and different family communication patterns promote different interaction styles among children when they engage in arguments. Specifically, children from highly concept-oriented families should develop different levels of argumentativeness than those from highly socio-oriented families. Based on these findings, the following hypotheses are forwarded:

H1: Individuals from consensual families have significantly higher scores on argumentativeness than those from protective families.

H2: Individuals from consensual families have significantly higher scores on argumentativeness than those from laissez-faire families.

H3: Individuals from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on argumentativeness than those from protective families.

H4: Individuals from pluralistic families have significantly higher scores on argumentativeness than those from laissez-faire families.

Method

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 165 undergraduate college students from two Chinese universities in the largest city located in Southern China. Although the questionnaires used in the study were distributed by the instructors in different classes, students in the classes participated voluntarily in the study. There were 141 completed questionnaires returned, and they were used for the data analysis. Among those who provided completed responses to the questionnaires, 96 were male, and 45 were female. The average age of these 141 participants was 21 ($SD = 1.15$). Their ages ranged from 18 to 24 (all of them born after 1979 when the "one-child" policy was implemented in China).

Instrumentation

Family communication patterns were assessed through a Chinese version of the McLeod, Atkin, and Chaffee (1972, cited in Rubin et al., 1994) Family Communication Patterns Scale. This scale includes ten items, and five each measure one dimension of family communication patterns. The items used 4-point responses (i.e., ranging from 1/"never happen" to 4/"often happen") to assess frequency of a form of family communication. For example, one item measuring the socio-oriented dimension states, "your parents say that their ideas are correct, and you shouldn't argue with them." One of the items concerning the concept-oriented dimension states, "your parents say that getting your ideas across is important, even if others don't like it."

Argumentativeness was measured by using a Chinese version of the Infante and Rancer (1982) Argumentativeness Scale. This scale has 20 items presented in a 5-point Likert-type format (i.e., ranging from 1/"almost never true" to 5/"almost always true"), ten each focusing on tendency to approach argument and tendency to avoid argument. The general tendency (ARGgt) to argue is computed by subtracting the total of the individuals' scores on the 10 ARGav items from that of the 10 ARGap items.

Translation Procedures for the Scales. The Family Communication Patterns Scale was first translated by the first author from English to Chinese, and two bilingual research assistants then back-translated it into English. Any discrepancies in the two-step translation process were discussed. Since each item of the Scale measures the frequency of one specific and common communication behavior in people's daily life, very few discrepancies were identified. All individuals involved in the translation found that the discrepancies were insignificant in terms of the meaning of the statements and the conceptual and measurement equivalence was well maintained.

The Argumentativeness Scale was first translated by a bilingual research assistant from English to Chinese. The translation was then compared to another Chinese version of the Scale provided by the second author of the current study. This Chinese version of the Scale was obtained from a published Chinese textbook on interpersonal communication (DeVito, 1998). Since the comparison showed no significant discrepancy between the former and the latter, the former version was used in the questionnaires.

Results

Measurement reliability

Family Communication Patterns. Reliability for the 5-item measure of socio-oriented family communication pattern ($M = 11.04$, $SD = 2.83$) was .64 (Cronbach's alpha). The higher the score, the stronger the socio-orientation a family tends to have. The 5-item measure of concept-oriented family communication pattern ($M = 13.24$, $SD = 3.34$) revealed a reliability of .74 (Cronbach's alpha). The higher the score, the stronger the concept-orientation a family tends to have. Following the method used in Chaffee et al. (1973), four family communication types were then formed by splitting the sample at the median scores on both socio-oriented and concept-oriented measurements (as shown in Figure 1), and the median scores were 11 and 14, respectively.

Argumentativeness. The ten ARGap items ($M = 34.62$, $SD = 6.31$) showed a reliability of .84 (Cronbach's alpha), while reliability for the ten ARGav items ($M = 24.96$, $SD = 5.23$) was .72 (Cronbach's alpha).

Analysis

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test the hypotheses. As shown in Table 1, this analysis revealed a significant difference on individuals' scores

Table 1: ANOVA Summary Table for Argumentativeness Among Four Types of Family

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>
Type of family	3	840.05	280.01	3.05*
Within group	137	12561.61	91.69	
Total	140	13401.66		

Note: $N = 141$.

* $p < .05$

on argumentativeness among four types of family environment, $F(3, 137) = 3.05$, $p < .05$. Specifically, further pairwise comparisons (as shown in Table 2) showed significant differences on individuals' scores on argumentativeness between consensual ($M = 12.45$, $SD = 1.51$) and protective families ($M = 6.32$, $SD = 6.57$), $p < .01$, and between pluralistic ($M = 11.22$, $SD = 1.72$) and protective families, $p < .05$.

Table 2: Pairwise Comparisons for Argumentativeness Among Four Types of Family

Family Type	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Consensual	40	12.45**	1.51
Pluralistic	31	11.23*	1.72
Protective	37	6.32	1.57
Laissez-faire	33	8.55	1.67

** $p < .01$ when compared to "Protective"; * $p < .05$ when compared to "Protective"

Discussion

The results indicate that both Hypothesis 1 and 3 are supported, and Hypothesis 2 and 4 are not supported. Therefore, students from either consensual or pluralistic families tend to be more argumentative than those from protective families. There were no significant differences in argumentativeness among students from consensual, pluralistic, and laissez-faire families. These findings provide a first glance at the relationships between family communication patterns and personality trait of argumentativeness for contemporary Chinese college students.

The differences on these patterns constitute different family environments that can have an impact on the development of children's personality traits. In pluralistic families, members are encouraged to participate in the family decision-making process, to explore controversial matters, and to convey their feelings and opinions with an open mind. Conversely in protective families, obedience, conformity, and social harmony are valued and protected, and members feel great pressure if they confront others with different viewpoints. Therefore, it is not surprising that students from pluralistic families would show a higher level of argumentativeness than those from protected families.

Consensual families stress both social harmony and openness on debating controversial issues. On the one hand, members of the consensual families are encouraged to actively engage in any discussion. On the other hand, in order to maintain the harmony, they also express desire to avoid any confrontation with others. Despite the fact that students from consensual families have to interact with others in such a complex manner, they are more argumentative than those from protected families. One possible explanation for this finding is that, for students from consensual families, sharing their own opinions on controversial issues and discussing or even debating them in an explicit

manner with others does not necessarily result in creating social disharmony. It is possible that how to argue is more influential than whether to argue in the process of developing the argumentative trait.

The relationships of family communication patterns and the trait of argumentativeness have several implications for Chinese children's overall development. Guided by Confucius' principles, in social contexts Chinese individuals are expected to respect authoritative figures, and, in family settings, children are expected to show obedience to parents and any arguments with their parents are discouraged. Chinese parents are inclined to create a family environment that is highly socio-oriented (Nisbett, 2006), and this type of family environment may dampen children's development of argumentativeness trait.

In the Western society, argumentativeness has been linked to several positive outcomes in the settings of social interaction, for example, highly argumentative individuals are perceived as more credible than less argumentative persons (Infante, 1985). Thus, argumentativeness is generally considered a socially desirable trait. Since 1979, China has gradually adopted the Western-style market economy and has seen a tremendous increase of cultural interactions between Chinese people and people from the rest of the world through various venues, such as mass media, the Internet, and business- and tourism-related interpersonal contacts. This new social environment presents many characteristics similar to those in the Western society. Thus, being argumentative could be very desirable for Chinese youths. Therefore, in order to help their children to develop a higher level of this trait of argumentativeness, those Chinese parents need to adopt new parenting styles—what they cannot learn from their own parents and what may sometimes deviate from the traditional cultural practice. These new styles need to emphasize the concept-orientation of family interaction. Moreover, research shows that members of highly concept-oriented families demonstrate less communication anxiety in interpersonal and group settings (Elwood & Schrader, 1998). Children can also benefit from the highly concept-oriented family structure that helps control the development of a socially undesirable trait—communication apprehension.

Some research suggests that communication between parents and their children is influenced by both the constructive trait of argumentativeness and the destructive trait of verbal aggressiveness. Bayer and Cegala (1992) investigated parenting style, and discovered that parents with an “authoritative” style (e.g., used reason with their children, encouraged give-and-take) were higher in argumentativeness and lower in verbal aggressiveness. Conversely, parents with a more “authoritarian” style (e.g., discouraged verbal communication from children, used more unilateral control-oriented communication) were lower in argumentativeness and higher in verbal aggressiveness. This is important in a child's development as Bayer and Cegala (1992) suggest that the development of positive self-concepts in children has been negatively associated with authoritarian-style reasoning.

There is one possible explanation on why there is no difference on argumentativeness among students of consensual, pluralistic, and laissez-faire families. In laissez-faire families, members do not follow any consistent communication patterns and there may be very little interaction between children and their parents (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). However, they are not prohibited from challenging others on any issue. Because of this practice, conceptually, these students from laissez-faire families

are not confined to certain norms like those in protective family environment, and, thus, they may become relatively high argumentative people.

One major limitation of the study is caused by the use of the conventional method to determine the four family communication patterns. Two of the four dimensions defined by Hofstede (1980) to describe the major characteristics of different cultures are individualism/collectivism and power distance. Chinese culture is highly collectivistic and with a large power distance. Therefore, conceptually, Chinese families are likely to be highly socio-oriented and less concept-oriented. Based on this analysis, we should expect to see a large number of families with one of the four communication patterns. However, in the current study the four family communication patterns were determined by simply splitting the sample at the median on both socio-oriented and concept-oriented measurements, and, in so doing, the numbers of four family patterns were very close to each other. In other words, the number of the families in one or two of the family types may be inflated, and that of the remaining family types may be fewer than it should be. Although it is the procedure most frequently employed to identify family communication patterns (Chaffee et al., 1973; Liebes & Ribak, 1992; Pingree, Hawkins, & Botta, 2000; Chan & McNeal, 2003), this procedure may lead to few inaccurate assignments of Chinese families into one of the four family communication patterns.

The current study provides only one snapshot of the relationships between family communication patterns and argumentativeness trait. In order to understand these relationships from a different vantage point, future research should examine the relationships between family communication patterns and other communication traits, such as verbal aggressiveness. From a developmental perspective, these relationships can change and they depend on the life stages on which parents and children are living. Therefore, future longitudinal studies may provide an on-going understanding of the dynamics of these relationships.

References

- Abel, J. D. (1976). The family and child television viewing. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 5, 331-335.
- Avtgis, T. A. (1999). The relationship between unwillingness to communicate and family communication patterns. *Communication Research Reports*, 16, 333-338.
- Avtgis, T. A., & Rancer, A. S. (2002). Aggressive communication across cultures: A comparison of aggressive communication among United States, New Zealand, and Australia. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 31, 191-200.
- Bayer, C. L., & Cegala, D. J. (1992). Trait verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness: Relations with parenting style. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 301-310.
- Beatty, M. J. (1998). Future directions in communication trait theory and research. In J. C. McCrosky, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), *Communication and Personality: Trait perspectives* (pp. 309-319). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Burroughs, N. F., & Marie, V. (1990). Communication orientations of Micronesian and American students. *Communication Research Reports*, 7, 139-146.
- Chaffee, S. H., McLeod, J. M., & Wackman, D. B. (1973). Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. In J. Dennis (Ed.), *Socialization to politics*, (pp. 349-364). NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Chan, K., & McNeal, J. U. (2003). Parent-child communications about consumption and advertising in China. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20, 317-334.
- Chen, G. M. (1994). Social desirability as a predictor of argumentativeness and communication apprehension. *The Journal of Psychology*, 128, 433-438.
- Conlin, M. (2004, May 10). I'm a bad boss? Blame my Dad. *BusinessWeek*, 3882, 60-61.
- DeVito, J. A. (1998). *The interpersonal communication book* (7th ed.). Taipei, Taiwan: Yang-Chih Book Co.
- Elwood, T. D., & Schrader, D. C. (1998). Family communication patterns and communication apprehension. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 13, 493-502.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. NY: Doubleday.
- Harman, C. M., Klopf, D. W., & Ishii, S. (1990). Verbal aggression among Japanese and American students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 70, 1130.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hsu, C. F. (1998). Relationships between family characteristics and communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports*, 15, 91-98.
- Huang, L. N. (1999). Family communication patterns and personality characteristics. *Communication Quarterly*, 47, 230-243.
- Hutchinson, K. L., & Neuliep, J. W. (1993). The influence of parent and peer modeling on the development of communication apprehension in elementary school children. *Communication Quarterly*, 41, 16-25.
- Infante, D. A. (1985). Inducing women to be more argumentativeness: source credibility effects. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 13, 33-44.

- Infante, D. A. (1982). The argumentative student in the speech communication classroom: An investigation and implications. *Communication Education, 31*, 141-148.
- Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46*, 72-80.
- Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1996). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness: A review of recent theory and research. In B. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook 19* (pp. 319-351). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Infante, D. A., Rancer, A. S., & Womack, D. F. (2003). *Building communication theory* (4th ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Kantrowitz, B. (2004, May 3). Parenting for dummies. *Newsweek, 143*, 52.
- Koesten, J. (2004). Family communication patterns, sex of subject, and communication competence. *Communication Monographs, 71*, 226-244.
- Klopf, D. W. (1997). Cross-cultural apprehension research: Procedures and comparisons. In J. A. Daly, J. C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D. M. Ayres (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension* (pp. 269-284). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Knutson, T. J., Komolsevin, R., Chatiket, P. & Smith, V. R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of Thai and US American rhetorical sensitivity: Implications for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 63-78.
- Knutson, T. J., Komolsevin, R., Chatiket, P. & Smith, V. R. (2002). A comparison of Thai and U.S. American willingness to communicate. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 31*, 3-12.
- Liebes, T., & Ribak, R. (1992). The contribution of family culture to political participation, political outlook, and its reproduction. *Communication Research, 19*, 618-641.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2006). Living together vs. going it alone. In L. A. Samover, R. E. Porter, & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A reader* (pp. 103-113). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Nussbaum, E. M., & Bendixen, L. D. (2003). Approaching and avoiding arguments: The role of epistemological beliefs, need for cognition, and extraverted personality traits. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 28*, 573-595.
- Pingree, S., Hawkins, R. P., & Botta, R. A. (2000). The effect of family communication patterns on young people's science literacy. *Science Communication, 22*, 115-132.
- Prunty, A. M., Klopf, D. W., & Ishii, S. (1990a). Argumentativeness: Japanese and American tendencies to approach and avoid conflict. *Communication Research Reports, 7*, 75-79.
- Prunty, A. M., Klopf, D. W., & Ishii, S. (1990b). Japanese and American tendencies to argue. *Psychological Reports, 66*, 802.
- Rancer, A. S., & Avtgis, T. A. (2006). *Argumentative and aggressive communication: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Rancer, A. S., Kosberg, R. L., & Baukus, R. A. (1992). Beliefs about arguing as predictors of trait argumentativeness: Implications for training in argument and conflict management. *Communication Education, 41*, 375-387.

- Ritchie, L. D. (1991). Family communication patterns: An epistemic analysis and conceptual reinterpretation. *Communication Research, 18*, 548-565.
- Ritchie, L. D. & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research, 17*, 523-544.
- Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication research measures: A sourcebook*. NY: Guilford Press.
- Santrock, J. W. (1991). *Psychology: The science of mind and behavior* (3rd). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Suzuki, S. (1998, November). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness: Effects of gender and low- and high-context communication. Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, New York, NY.
- Suzuki, S., & Rancer, A. S. (1994). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness: testing for conceptual and measurement equivalence across cultures. *Communication Monographs, 61*, 256-279.