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RESEARCH OVERVIEW

This research aids in maximizing communications intelligence. In 2013 we surveyed 180 inside sales professionals across all title levels about their work-related communication patterns. By understanding these communication patterns and the mechanisms which explain them, we offer information which informs improved business success. In short: **Optimal intelligence in business communications is crucial to success.** Through data-informed analysis, this research informs communication practices that offer the most business success.

As an example we noticed the following trend within our research: 81% of the persons we surveyed receive a Twitter communication regarding a business topic at least once a week. Those same persons say they are less than 10% likely to respond to any Twitter business communication. From this example, we learn that if you expect a response, business communication by Twitter is not intelligent.

Fundamentally, communicating efficiently and effectively entails an understanding of the target audience, the tools, preferences and practices of that target audience, and modifying one’s communication patterns accordingly for optimal results. In the following sections we describe three kinds of data to inform optimal business communication:

1. **Usage.** The communication mechanism or platform workers used most frequently with other workers in business communications.

2. **Preference.** The communication mechanism workers prefer to use regarding business communications.

3. **Response.** The communication mechanisms that people report as most likely to elicit their response; i.e. the most efficient mechanism of business communication.

Motivation

Virtually every job requires communication among workers within a company and individuals across different companies. Given that business success is a function, in part, of efficient communication, understanding communication practices and preferences is not an important thing, it is indispensable. Buyers
and sellers, all the ‘occupants of the marketplace,’ must be maximally intelligent if they are to avoid failure.

Business practices today present a bewildering variety of new communication technologies. How to modify intelligently business communication to the preferences and practices of the target audience, is the main topic of this report, because **optimal intelligence in business communications is crucial to success.** This report focuses on the audience targeted by business communications, and asks the following questions:

- Which communication mechanism is most likely to elicit a response from the targeted audience?
- Are some communication mechanisms that elicit responses more preferred than others?
- What communication mechanism do different age groups prefer?
- To what communication mechanism are people at various title levels most likely to respond?
- What communication mechanism is most effective for each gender?
- Are the various social media mechanisms effective communication tools?

In answering these questions, this research provides businesses communication intelligence by informing current and future trends in communication as well as the information necessary to increase efficiency in communication.

**METHODOLOGY**

In 2013, we surveyed 180 respondents, across 26 separate industries. We asked a range of questions about work-related business communication which included the following: 1. the communication mechanism the respondents prefer others use to approach them; 2. whether their preferred mechanism varies depending on their location inside the workplace or outside the workplace; 3. which mechanism others used most frequently to communicate with them; 4. which mechanism most reliably and least reliably prompted a reply.

We asked for respondents to consider the aforementioned considered the following communication mechanisms:
• Face-to-Face meeting
• Email
• Voicemail
• Online Instant Messaging
• Text Messaging
• Video Chat
• Office Phone
• Cell Phone
• Fax
• Facebook
• LinkedIn
• Twitter

We assigned these mechanisms to one of three categories: traditional methods, non-traditional methods, and social media. The taxonomy:

**Traditional methods**
• Face-to-Face
• Email
• Text Messaging
• Office Phone
• Mobile Phone
• Voicemail

**Non-Traditional Methods**
• Online Instant Messaging
• Video Chat
• Fax

**Social Media**
• Facebook
• LinkedIn
• Twitter
DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

Age

Our respondents represent an even distribution across age groups. About half (53%) of respondents are under 45 years of age. Figure 1 represents the age groups of our survey respondents.

Figure 1.
Gender

We received a fairly even distribution of respondents according to gender, with 60% male and 40% female. Figure 2 represents these responses.

![Respondent Gender Chart](image)

Figure 2.
Title Level

We received responses across all title levels, which allowed for several useful analyses on optimal communication practices for each title level grouping. Figure 3 represents these responses.

![Respondent Title Level Chart]

- 30% Professional
- 22% Manager
- 22% Director
- 11% Vice President
- 11% Administrative/Support personnel
- 3% Not Currently Employed

Figure 3.
CONTACT MECHANISM: FREQUENCY OF USE

The first key finding we report is the frequency of contact mechanism usage. In Figure 4, we notice the patterns for each mechanism used at work compared with outside of work. The percentage of respondents for each mechanism corresponds to the number of respondents who reported usage about once a day or more.

A few key observations arise in this analysis. First, perhaps not surprisingly, email is the most frequently used mechanism either at work or outside of work. Email is above all other mechanisms in terms of what people report using.

Second, several non-traditional methods are quite infrequent in usage. Particularly, fax and video chat are seldom used. Social media is also infrequently used, with LinkedIn being most prominently used, with 14% of respondents reporting they use LinkedIn once a day or more while at work.

Third, a few communication mechanisms have very little difference in usage, whether at work or outside of work. Texting is most similar in usage patterns regardless of location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Mechanism Used Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.
**Communication at Work: Preference v. Response**

Although frequency of usage for each of the communication mechanisms reveals patterns of general prevalence, it is important to note that understanding communication patterns requires further investigation into *preference* and *response* to each mechanism—in addition to a report of usage.

Given that different preferences and response patterns occur by the context of workplace, i.e., whether one is at work or outside of work, the following figures display the reports of preference and likelihood of response for each of those two settings.

In Figure 5, we display the trends of preference overlaid with the likelihood of response for each communication mechanism. Through this overlaid visualization, we notice the mechanism most preferred by the target audience, and what mechanism is most successful or efficient at prompting a reply. Differences are noteworthy here because what people prefer is not identical to what they do.

![Communication Within the Workplace](chart)

**Figure 5.**

Several noteworthy items arise from these differences between preference and likelihood of response in Figure 5. First, email is the mechanism most preferred as well as most likely to get a response at work. In this case, preference
corresponds to responsiveness. Intelligent communicators understand that their contacts use email most often, and prefer to use email most often. Using the contacts’ preferred mechanism makes obvious sense, not only because the contact prefers it, but because it is also most likely to elicit a response.

In second place, using the office phone is reasonable because it has a high likelihood of response, where 86% of respondents claiming they would “Always” or “Usually” respond via office phone at work, and it is also closely aligned with preference at 83%.

Regarding communication mechanisms that do not align between preference and responsiveness, we notice that only 39% prefer text messaging at work, while 79% are likely to respond via texting at work, which is a wide gap between desire and actual behavioral tendencies.

Another mechanism that also has a responsiveness rate far above preference for usage is online instant messaging. Our analysis describes that 49% are likely to respond, though only 31% prefer.

Apart from email, which shows a slightly higher rate of preference over responsiveness, LinkedIn was the only other communication mechanism at work which showed a similar preference bias. We notice that 28% of respondents prefer using LinkedIn at work, while only 17% are likely to respond. This finding suggests that communication via LinkedIn is ineffective at receiving a response, despite people’s description that they prefer using it. These findings are important considerations for intelligence business communication.
Communication Outside of Work: Preference v. Response

Similar to the previous comparison regarding at work communication, Figure 6 compares preference and responsiveness for outside of work communication. As one would reasonably assume, effectiveness of all forms of communication diminishes when the contact is outside the workplace, but more important is noticing the differences between preference and responsiveness and gathering intelligent information to inform successful business practice.

Several noteworthy findings arise from this step of analysis. First, we notice that one communication mechanism actually increases in efficiency outside of work, compared to inside of work. While LinkedIn gets a preference rate of 28% and responsiveness rate of 17% regarding at work communication, these rates increase regarding outside communication, with a preference rate of 37% and responsiveness rate of 35%. This finding suggests that LinkedIn is much more efficient and preferred for work-related communication outside of work than it is for at work communication.

Second, we notice that responsiveness for email is at 65% for outside of work communication, which suggests email is still quite useful. However, cell phone and text messaging displace email as the most efficient mechanisms of communication outside the workplace. In sum, email is king for at work communication.
communication responsiveness, but cell phone and text messaging take the top spot for outside of work communication.

Third, and perhaps highly impactful to understanding the utility of text messaging, we notice that the gap between responsiveness and preference narrows considerably for outside of work communication. Texting is much more preferred for outside of work communication compared to at work, 60% to 39%. This finding suggests that it is more acceptable to text co-workers about work when you are outside the workplace, than it is when you are the workplace. A similar likelihood of response occurs via texting regardless of setting as well.

Intelligent communicators should by no means avoid cell-phone or text-messaging when contacting other workers outside the workplace. Both elicit responses 75% of the time, which is, again, extraordinarily productive.

Regarding other gaps in responsiveness and preference, we notice that online instant messaging has a sharp contrast. Only 16% of respondents prefer online instant messaging outside of work, but 31% are likely to respond to this method.

Lastly, the remaining methods of Facebook, Twitter, video chat, and fax have very little likelihood of response and are least preferred as well. Of all the non-traditional and social media methods, LinkedIn has the greatest utility for outside of work communication, both in preference and responsiveness. This finding is important because much work-related communication is driven through Facebook and other media—but LinkedIn, as highlighted in this research, is the best communication mechanism aside from the traditional methods.
Considerations by Gender

In addition to the aforementioned communication practices that maximize success, we also investigated communication patterns and preferences among men and women. Although the similarities between men and women overwhelmingly outweigh differences, there are some subtle differences in preferences and practices by gender, which this section describes.

Gender: At Work Communication

Figure 7 displays the differences in preference for each communication mechanism while at work, comparing the preference differences between men and women. The larger the percentage and bar size, the more preferred a communication mechanism is for one gender compared to another.

The communication mechanisms show a preference difference greater than 10%. Men prefer LinkedIn 17% more than women for at work communication. Women prefer online messaging 11% more than men, and men prefer cell phone usage 10% more than women.

Perhaps more interesting are the similarities that occur by gender. In considering the various communication mechanisms, we notice that with few exceptions, men and women have fairly similar preferences for at work communication.
Gender: Outside of Work Communication

Regarding communication outside of the workplace, several other trends emerge. Figure 8 below displays a similar comparison by gender for preferred communication mechanisms outside of the workplace.

The most striking item in this segment of analysis is that men prefer emailing 17% more than women for outside of the workplace communication. A number of factors could explain this finding, however, it is noteworthy that women prefer voicemail 8% more and cellphone usage 6% more than men.

Given that women are often underrepresented in managerial and executive roles in America (Hobbler, Lemmon, and Wayne 20111), it is a possibility that making themselves more available for voicemail and cellphone usage for women—which are more invasive mechanisms of communication—is one tool relied upon to compensate for other disadvantages faced in the workplace.

Regarding the finding of email preference for men, it is also a possibility that strong email preference—which is a less invasive mechanism of communication—only comes with the territory of more male presence across managerial roles on the aggregate.

---

Lastly, we notice that men prefer face-to-face communication 12% more than women for outside of work communication. This finding is perhaps due to lunch or golf course work engagements that tend to have more male presence.

As mentioned previously, several similarities for preferred communication mechanisms by gender are noteworthy. Texting is preferred closely for men and women alike, which is perhaps surprising to some. LinkedIn usage outside the workplace shows a close parity as well, whereas a strong male preference for LinkedIn occurred for at work communication.

Although focusing on gender difference might be provocative and interesting to some audiences—and some differences do occur—this research is most useful when applying the slight gender preferences toward useful and more efficient business communications. In so doing, this research offers maximal communication intelligence, which informs business success.
Considerations by Age

Just as some communication patterns show preferences by gender, similar comparisons occur across age groups. We investigated the communication mechanism preferences for four age groups and found several important trends which maximize efficient and successful business communication. The investigated the following four age groups: 24-35, 36-45, 46-55, and 56+.

Age: At Work Communication

Regarding communication at work, all age groups overwhelmingly prefer email communication, therefore emailing is omitted in Figure 9 below.

![Preferred Communication Mechanism by Age, At Work](image)

The first noteworthy item from these age group preferences is the sharp decline for cellphone usage among the 36-45 year olds. This group has a slight preference for texting and voice mail instead.

An important consideration when communicating with a younger target audience is that LinkedIn is preferred almost as much as texting, 61% to 65%, respectively. The preference of online instant messaging also declines with age.
**Age: Outside of Work Communication**

Additionally, several noteworthy trends emerged when considering outside of work communication. Figure 10 below displays these results.

Although not depicted in the interest of brevity, every age group prefers email above and beyond the other communication mechanisms. Other noteworthy trends show that cell phone is most preferred among the oldest groups.

The youngest age-group prefers voice mail less than every other age group—even online instant messaging and LinkedIn usage are preferred over voicemailing for 24-35 year olds. We also notice that texting grows in popularity with age.
Considerations by Title Level

From the outset of this study, we have sought to understand the best business communications based upon the preferences and practices of the target audience, both within and without the workplace. A key component to this understanding is finding optimal communication intelligence for each business title level, because workers' communication behaviors differ by level of advancement through title levels. In this section, we describe the best communication techniques for contacting executive level employees, because maximizing business success often entails communicating most intelligently with executives.

Executive Title Level: At Work Communication

In Figure 11 below, we describe executives' likelihood of responding at work through each of the communication mechanisms.

Consider the need for efficient communication with executives in the workplace, it is not surprising that executives respond most frequently to email. In this respect, they fit the general behavioral pattern and preference. Unexpectedly, executives are just as likely to respond to text messaging as they are to emailing while at work. This is an important consideration if one is in need of contacting executives. Other communication mechanisms such as cell phone, office phone, and voicemail are fairly likely to generate a response as well.
Executive Title Level: Outside of Work Communication

Similar to the above, but regarding outside of work communication, Figure 12 displays the likelihood of executive level employees responding through each of the communication mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Mechanism</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text Message</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Instant Messaging</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Phone</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Chat</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Somewhat surprisingly, executives are most likely to respond through text messaging for outside of work communication. This finding departs from the comparison between texting and email found for at work communication. Here, for outside of work communication, executives are 8% more likely to respond through text compared to email, and 12% more likely to respond through text compared to cell phones.

The executive response likelihood for LinkedIn was another noteworthy finding. Executives are likely to respond through LinkedIn 45% of the time, which is startlingly close to the 52% likelihood to respond through voice mail. Moreover, executives are more likely to respond through online instant messaging at 36%, compared to office phone at 30%.

These trends suggest that several of the more traditional communication mechanisms, such as office phone, email, and voice mail are being supplanted by other approaches for executives’ likelihood of responding.
Texting and Title Level

Given that texting has the highest likelihood of response among all communication mechanisms for executive level employees, a further examination into texting for each title level is appropriate. In Figure 13 below, we present the preferences for texting across each of the title levels and for outside of work and at work communication contexts.

Although texting is reported as the most likely communication method to receive a response for the top level executives, here we notice that it has a lower preference of usage—which reminds us that employee preference is often different from employee response likelihood.

Perhaps most striking from this segment of research is the reported preference of the manager title group. Managers, more than any other position, prefer text messaging both inside and outside the workplace. For getting in touch with management, texting is by far their method of choice, regardless of at work or outside of work communication.
Social Media Usage

The final topic we consider is the use of social media, displayed in Figures 14 and 15. Our research has shown that Social Media is generally not preferred, nor likely to elicit a response, relative to other traditional and non-traditional mechanisms of business-communications. However, if people do utilize social media communication, there are important response distinctions across the social media mechanisms themselves.

Social Media Usage At Work

LinkedIn is the overwhelmingly preferred mechanism of communication both within and without the workplace. The likelihood of response for LinkedIn is 40%, significantly higher than its level of recommendation. 40% is more than twice the response rate of Facebook or Twitter. Facebook is recommended less-often than Twitter. None of these mechanisms is desirable for effective communication. Social Media is the mechanism of last resort, and then, use LinkedIn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Usage At Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Usage At Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preference

Figure 14.
Social Media Usage Outside of Work

Perhaps the most important item to consider from the trends of social media usage outside of work is that LinkedIn is used about twice as much as Facebook, at 21% and 10% respectively. Additionally, LinkedIn is twice as likely as Facebook to get a response, and far more preferred than Facebook as well. These trends suggest that using Facebook for any business related communication is unwise.

One reason for this finding may be because people are preferring to partition their social media tools and use Facebook for more personal, non-work-related communication, and to use LinkedIn for their work-related communication. Facebook is popular for many reasons, but not for business communication. This research supports that LinkedIn is the social media mechanism of choice for optimal work-related communication.

![Social Media Comparison Outside of Work](image)
CONCLUSIONS

At the outset of this research, we sought to understand communication patterns in terms of frequency of usage, preference, likelihood of response, and how several groups vary across each of these categories for both at work and outside of work communication. By understanding these communication patterns and the mechanisms which explain the, we offer information which informs improved business success. In short: **Optimal intelligence in business communications is crucial to success.** Through data-informed practices, this research informs communication practices that offer the most business success.

Virtually every job requires communication among workers within a company and individuals across different companies. Today, a variety of communication mechanisms are available to use for such communication. How to intelligently modify business communication to the preferences and practices of the target audience is the main topic of this report. At the beginning of this report, we presented questions that would inform such modifications. Here, we summarize answers to those questions:

- **Which communication mechanism is most likely to elicit a response from the targeted audience?**

  *For communication at work, the top three mechanisms most likely to elicit a response are email, office phone, and cell phone, in that order. For communication outside of work, the top three are text messaging and cell phone—which are both tied for most likely—followed by email in third place.*

- **Are some communication mechanisms that elicit responses more preferred than others?**

  *Yes, and the differences between preference and likelihood of response are striking for several mechanisms. Regarding at work communication, we notice that cell phone, texting, voicemail, and office phone all have a similar response likelihood. Of these, office phone is most aligned with preference. Cell phone and voice mail are somewhat less preferred and texting is far less preferred, which means that although texting gets a good likelihood of response, using it is bothersome to the target*
audience. Online instant messaging also fits this category of high response with low preference.

Regarding outside of work communication, texting preference is much more aligned with response likelihood, which suggests it is more “okay” to text outside of work for business communication than to text at work.

Interestingly, our findings on outside of work communication show that response likelihood drops considerably for email, but the preference remains quite high—suggesting that people’s stated preferences for emailing outside of work are much higher than their likelihood of actually responding.

• What communication mechanism do different age groups prefer?

Several interesting findings emerge on this question. First, across all age groups, email is preferred the most. Second, regarding at work communication, the youngest (24-35 year olds) group prefers texting and LinkedIn more than voice mail. For outside of work communication the youngest group prefers online instant messaging and LinkedIn more than voicemail—and these three even more than texting—which shows how little the youngest group prefers texting outside of work.

Additionally, we find that texting gets better with age. The preference for texting outside of work steadily increases for the older age groups.

• To what communication mechanism are people at various title levels most likely to respond?

Assuming we are most interested in contacting the executive-level target audience, texting and email are best and are also equally likely to get a response while at work. Regarding outside of work communication, texting is more likely than even email for getting a response from executives.
• What communication mechanism is most effective for each gender?

Although most communication mechanisms are balanced where men and women prefer them similarly—we find that using LinkedIn at work is preferred by men 17% more than women and using online instant messaging at work is preferred by women 11% more than men. Using email outside of work is preferred by men 17% more than women as well. Texting, voice mail, and cell phone usage are also more preferred among women than men for outside of work communication.

The reasoning for these findings should carefully consider the gender imbalance within management positions in the United States. While noticing gender difference is interesting and often provocative, it is a possibility that strong email preference for men—which is a less invasive mechanism of communication—only comes with the territory of more male presence across managerial roles on the aggregate.

• Are the various social media mechanisms effective communication tools?

If used intelligently, they can be. Overall, we find that social media communication is less preferred, less used, and less likely to receive a response compared to more traditional methods. However, in comparing LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter to one another, we notice that LinkedIn is far superior, whether at work or outside of work, and superior in preference, usage, and response likelihood.

LinkedIn has the corner on business communication. People are more accepting of LinkedIn as a tool of business communication than they are for Facebook or Twitter, which are perhaps more accepted as social and recreational communication tools. LinkedIn even rivals several traditional communication mechanisms for the youngest age group, 24-35 year olds.

We conclude this research report with the pivotal motivation of this study: **Optimal intelligence in business communications is crucial to success.**

This research enhances communications intelligence. Those who understand communication mechanisms can inform and conform their practices to maximize business success. Intelligence is the key to surviving in an increasingly competitive marketplace.
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