

THINKING STYLE PREFERENCES IN COMMUNICATION PATHOLOGY

CARINA AVENANT

November 2000

In partial fulfillment for the degree M. Communication Pathology
in the Department of Communication Pathology, Faculty of Humanities

University of Pretoria
Pretoria

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Acknowledgement is given to the National Research Foundation, the University of Pretoria and Herrmann International, Lake Lure, Northern Carolina, United States of America for financial support. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived are those of the author and not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation, the University of Pretoria or Herrmann International.

ABSTRACT:

TITLE: Thinking style preferences in Communication Pathology.
NAME: Carina Avenant
PROMOTOR: Prof. S.R. Hugo
CO-PROMOTOR: Prof. A.L. de Boer
DEPARTMENT: Communication Pathology
DEGREE: M. Communication Pathology

In the present study, the thinking style preferences in Communication Pathology were describe since literature suggests that personality, mental preferences and the choice of profession should be congruent. A descriptive, exploratory study was done. A convenience, non-probability sample was used to identify 120 subjects to participate in the study. The subjects that participated in the study included first year students in Communication Pathology, final year students in Communication Pathology and professional, graduate Communication Pathologists. A cover letter, biographical questionnaire and the Herrmann Brain Dominance instrument were handed to the 120 identified subjects of the study. 91 of the 120 questionnaires were returned. The results indicate that the thinking style preference of the Communication Pathologist is quadrant C of the Four Quadrant Whole Brain Model. Quadrant C is followed by preferences for using quadrants B, D and A. When looking at the thinking style preferences of Speech-Language Pathologists, Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists, the preferred quadrant of all three groups still is quadrant C. It is interesting to note however that Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists' quadrant D obtained higher scores than individuals that considered themselves exclusively as Speech-Language Pathologists. Quadrant A is the least preferred quadrant for all the subjects that participated in the study. Learning- and teaching strategies relevant to the thinking style preferences of the student in Communication Pathology were developed. The results have important implications for the selection of future students to the course B. Communication Pathology, the development of new curricula and the training and education of students.

Key words: Thinking style preference, Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument, learning- and teaching strategies and communication pathology.

OPSOMMING:

TITEL:	Denkstylvoorkeure in Kommunikasiepatologie.
NAAM:	Carina Avenant
LEIER:	Prof. S.R. Hugo
MEDE-LEIER:	Prof. A.L. de Boer
DEPARTEMENT:	Kommunikasiepatologie
GRAAD:	M. Kommunikasiepatologie

In hierdie studie is daar ondersoek ingestel na die denkstylvoorkeure in Kommunikasiepatologie aan gesien literatuuraandui dat persoonlikheid, verstandprosesse en die keuse van beroep kongruent moet wees. 'n Beskrywende, ondersoekende studie is gedoen. 120 proefpersone (eerste jaar studente in Kommunikasiepatologie, finale jaar studente in Kommunikasiepatologie en gekwalifiseerde Kommunikasiepatoloë) is deur middel van 'n toevallige gerieflikheidssteekproef geselekteer. Hierdie proefpersone het 'n dekbrieff, 'n biografiese vraelys en die "Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument" ontvang. 91 van die 120 vraelyste is terug ontvang. Die resultate dui aan dat die Kommunikasiepatoloog se denkstylvoorkeur in kwadrant C van die "Four Quadrant Whole Brain Model" lê. Kwadrant C word gevolg deur kwadrant B, D en A. Wanneer daar gekyk word na die denkstylvoorkeure van die Spraak-Taalterapeut, die Oudioloog en die Spraak-Taalterapeut en Oudioloog, is kwadrant C steeds die voorkeur van al drie die groepe respondente. Oudioloë en Spraak-Taalterapeute en Oudioloë vertoon egter hoër waardes in kwadrant D as respondente wat hulself as sleg Spraak-Taalterapeute beskou het. Die minste denkstylvoorkeur bestaan deurgaans in kwadrant A. Leer- en onderrig strategieë wat relevant is vir die denkstylvoorkeur van die student in Kommunikasiepatologie is ontwikkel. Hierdie strategieë is daarop gemik om ook aspekte wat nie in die gemiddelde student as voorkeur ervaar word nie, te ontwikkel. Die resultate van hierdie studie het belangrike implikasies vir die keuring van toekomstige students tot die kursus, die ontwikkeling van nuwe kurrikuluminhoude en die opleiding van studente.

Sleutelwoorde: Denkstylvoorkeur, "Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument", leer- en onderrigstrategie en kommunikasiepatologie

CONTENTS:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	METHOD	17
2.1	Research aims	17
2.2	Research design	18
2.3	Subjects	19
2.4	Apparatus and Material	22
2.5	Data collection procedures	25
3.	RESULTS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION	27
3.1	Thinking style preferences of the communication pathologist using the Herrmann Brain Dominance Instrument	27
3.1.1	Thinking style preferences of first-year communication pathology students using the HBDI	27
3.1.2	Thinking style preferences of final year-students in communication pathology using the HBDI	33
3.1.3	Thinking style preferences of professional communication pathologists using the HBDI	39
3.1.4	The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of the communication pathologist using the HBDI	45
3.2	Differences in the thinking style preferences of the speech-language pathologist, the audiologist and the speech-language pathologist <i>and</i> audiologist	48

3.2.1	Thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists (First-years students, final-year students and professional communication pathologists)	48
3.2.2	Thinking style preferences of audiologists (First-year students, final-year students and professional communication pathologists)	51
3.2.3	Thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists <i>and</i> audiologists (First-year students, final-year students and professional communication pathologists)	53
3.2.4	The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists	57
3.2.5	The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of audiologists	58
3.2.6	The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists <i>and</i> audiologists	59
3.3	Learning- and teaching strategies relevant to thinking style preferences	61
4.	CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR CLINICAL PRACTISE AND FURTHER RESEARCH	64

LIST OF FIGURES:

FIGURE:

1. The relationship of the Four Quadrant Whole Brain Model with the theories of Sperry and MacLean	6
2. The Whole Brain Model	7
3. Whole Brain Learning and Design Considerations	10
4. The Whole Brain Teaching and Learning Model	12
5. The <i>average</i> thinking style profile (first-year students)	27
6. The <i>average</i> thinking style preference (first-year students)	28
7. Key descriptors (first-year students)	28
8. Work elements (first-year students)	30
9. The <i>average thinking</i> style profile (final-year students)	34
10. The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences (final-year students)	34
11. Key descriptors (final-year students)	35
12. Work elements (final-year students)	36
13. The <i>average</i> thinking style profile of professional communication pathologists	40
14. The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of the professional communication pathologists	40
15. Key descriptors (professional communication pathologists)	41
16. Work elements (professional communication pathologists)	42
17. The <i>average</i> thinking style preferences of the communication pathologist (students and professionals)	46
18. Thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists (first-year students and professional communication pathologists)	49
19. Thinking style preferences of audiologists (first-year students, final-year students and professional communication pathologists)	51

20. Thinking style preferences of speech-language pathologists and audiologists (first-year students, final-year students and professional communication pathologists)	53
21. The average thinking style preference of speech-language pathologists	57
22. The average thinking style of audiologists	58
23. The average thinking style preference of speech-language pathologists and audiologists	59

LIST OF TABLES:**TABLE**

1. Attributes and skills of the communication pathologist	13
2. Proposed thinking style preferences for the communication pathologists	15
3. Description of subjects and relevant characteristics	21
4. A comparison of proposed skills, less preferred key descriptors and work elements (first-year students)	31
5. A comparison of proposed skills, less preferred key descriptors and work elements (final-year students)	37
6. A comparison of proposed skills, less preferred key descriptors and work elements (professional communication pathologists)	43