

COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT: A STUDY IN THREE GUATEMALAN ORGANIZATIONS

by

Federico Varona

B.A. Universidad de Salamanca, Spain, 1976

M.A., University of Kansas, 1988

Submitted to the Department of  
Communication Studies and the Faculty  
of the Graduate School of the University  
of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy.

**Redacted Signature**

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
Professor in Charge

**Redacted Signature**

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

**Redacted Signature**

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
Committee Members

Date Defended: June 27, 1991

OCT 14 1991

## ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational communication and organizational commitment in Guatemala. To investigate these areas, three different organizations were studied: 1) a private educational institution, 2) a private children hospital, and 3) a private food factory. Data were collected using questionnaires and an open question survey. The questionnaires used were: 1) Cal W. Downs' (1990) Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ), the Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), the Cook and Wall (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI), and the Downs and Varona (1991) Commitment Questionnaire. The qualitative data were content analyzed according to the most recent standards of content analytic procedures, and the quantitative data were statistically analyzed using the SPSS, version 4.1.

Results indicted that there was an explicit positive relationship between communication factors and employees' organizational commitment. The school teachers were significantly more satisfied with the communication practices and more committed to their organization than were the employees of the hospital and the food factory.

The quality of the relationship that took place in the communication process was the most important dimension in the conceptualization of communication satisfaction. The supervisors were significantly more satisfied than were the subordinates with overall communication and similar in their levels of overall organizational commitment to their organizations. Both supervisors and subordinates acknowledged that issues related to Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Communication with Top Managers were the critical ones in fostering, inhibiting or improving communication satisfaction. Work ethic, mission commitment, and a desire of self actualization were perceived as the most important motivators of organizational commitment. However, relational factors such as lack of communication, appreciation, and trust were perceived as the most important inhibitors of organizational commitment. Identification with the organization's mission, to give one's best in order to do a good job, and to perform some obligations in exchange for getting some economic and social benefits were the three most important dimensions in the conceptualization of organizational commitment. Motivational strategies, economic incentives, the improvement of communication and

interpersonal relationships, and changes in some organization features were recognized as the best strategies to manage organizational commitment by the Guatemalan employees. There was a positive and significant relationship between tenure and organizational commitment; employees with more tenure were significantly more committed to their organizations. Tenure, however, did not correlate significantly with communication satisfaction. The Downs's CAQ, the Mowday, Porter, and Steers OCQ, and the Downs and Varona commitment scale were measures that displayed a satisfactory internal reliability with the Guatemalan sample. The Cook and Wall composite and theorized factors, however, did not achieve a satisfactory internal reliability in this study. The correlations between the commitment composites and factors used in this study were all significant but moderate. They interacted, however, differently with the communication satisfaction factors. The three factor solution for the Cook and Wall OCI did not emerge, as it had been theorized by its authors, from this sample. However, a three factor solution did surface but with a different structure of factors. For the Mowday, Porter, and Steers OCQ a two factor solution emerged as appropriate for the Guatemalan sample.

To:

Lucía, my wife, and Ana and Mario, my children

Angel and Jenara, my parents

Barry and Loty, my parents in law

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Many people deserve recognition and thanks for their support. First of all, I want to thank with all my heart my wife Lucia, and Ana and Mario my children, for their love, understanding, and help through the whole process of this study. I am especially grateful to Dr. Cal W. Downs, first for letting me use his Communication Audit Questionnaire in this study, and second for his understanding, professional advice, and friendship. To work with him was a enjoyable experience. My gratitude also goes to all my committee members, Dr. Jon A. Blubaugh, Dr. Howard Sypher, Dr. Charles Stansifer and Dr. Ellen R. Gold, and to all the professors I had, and to the secretaries and graduate students who helped me during these years of academic work.

My deepest gratitude goes to Mr. James Rives, Sister Mary Savoie, Sister Margaret Nacke, and John Gribas for their help in refining the writing style of this study.

I want to thank finally to all the people in Guatemala who helped me to collect the data for this study, most especially, Licda. Yulma Bojorques.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Communication Satisfaction.....	1
Organizational Commitment.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	8
Operational Definitions.....	10
Methodology.....	13
Instruments.....	14
Translation of the Instruments into Spanish..	17
Self-administered Open Question Survey.....	19
Sample.....	19
Analytic Procedures.....	20
Organization of this Dissertation.....	26
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	27
Organizational Communication.....	27
The Communication Satisfaction Construct.....	28
Communication Satisfaction Research.....	30
Organizational Commitment.....	43
Conceptualizations of Commitment.....	44
Theoretical Frameworks of Commitment.....	50
Summary and Conclusions.....	60
Commitment Research.....	65
Organizational Communication and Commitment.....	66
An Overview of the Social, Economic and Political Situation of Guatemala.....	71
Summary.....	75
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	77
The Research Instruments.....	77
The Downs CAQ.....	77
The Mowday, Porter, and Steers (OCQ).....	86
The Cook and Wall (OCI).....	87
The Downs and Varona (CQ).....	88
Translation of the Instruments.....	89
Validation of the Instruments.....	89
Administration of the Questionnaires.....	90
Participating Organizations.....	91
Organization 1 ( A School).....	92
Organization 2 (A Hospital).....	93
Organization 3 (A Food Factory).....	94

Data Analysis.....	97
Quantitative Analysis.....	97
Qualitative Analysis.....	102
Summary.....	107
CHAPTER FOUR: QUALITATIVE RESULTS.....	108
The Self-administered Open Question Survey.....	108
The Sample.....	109
The Coding System.....	110
Communication Satisfaction.....	110
Levels of Communication Satisfaction.....	110
Factors that Foster Communication.....	112
Factors that Inhibit Communication.....	117
Communication Satisfaction Impact on Commitment.....	120
Communication Satisfaction Defined.....	125
Improving Communication Satisfaction.....	128
Organizational Commitment.....	130
Levels of Commitment.....	130
Factors that Foster Commitment.....	132
Factors that Inhibit Commitment.....	139
Organizational Commitment Defined.....	144
Improving Commitment.....	148
Managing Organizational Commitment.....	151
Important Things for Commitment.....	151
How Supervisors Communicate What Is Important.....	154
Typical Behaviors of Low Committed Employees.....	156
Managing Low Committed Employees.....	158
Typical Behaviors of Highly Committed Employees.....	160
Managing Permanent Commitment.....	163
Summary.....	165
CHAPTER FIVE: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS.....	169
An Evaluation of the Research Instruments.....	169
Factor Analysis.....	171
Communications Audit Questionnaire (CAQ)....	172
Commitment Questionnaires.....	175
Comparison of Organizations.....	186
Communication Satisfaction.....	186
Organizational Commitment.....	196
Relationship Between Communication and Commitment.....	204
Correlation Analyses.....	204
Regression Analyses.....	213
Comparison of Position.....	216
Communication Satisfaction.....	216
Organizational Commitment.....	220

Comparison of Tenure.....	225
Communication Satisfaction.....	225
Organizational Commitment.....	226
Summary.....	234
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION.....	236
Conclusions on Communication Satisfaction.....	238
Conclusions on Organizational Commitment.....	248
Conclusion on the Relationships Between Communication Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment.....	264
Conclusion on Tenure.....	270
Conclusions on the Research Instruments.....	272
Conclusions on the Limitations of this Study and some Suggestions for Future Research.....	280
REFERENCES.....	285
APPENDIX A - CAQ Frequency Distribution of Responses..	294
APPENDIX B - Commitment Questionnaires Frequency Distribution of Responses.....	300
APPENDIX C - Open Question Survey Forms.....	305
APPENDIX D - Spanish Version of Research Instruments..	310

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE 2.1:</u> Communication Satisfaction Research.....	31
<u>Table 3.1:</u> Organization 1 (School) Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions.....	93
<u>Table 3.2:</u> Organization 2 (Hospital) Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions.....	94
<u>Table 3.3:</u> Organization 3: Factory. Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions.....	96
<u>Table 3.4:</u> Entire Sample by Organizations and Positions.....	96
<u>Table 4.1:</u> Sample of the Self-administered Open Question Survey by Organizations and by Positions.....	109
<u>Table 4.2:</u> Levels of Communication Satisfaction for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as Perceived by Supervisors. By Organizations Separately and by all of the Organizations Combined.....	111
<u>Table 4.3:</u> Factors that foster Communication Satisfaction for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors.....	115
<u>Table 4.4:</u> Factors that Inhibit Satisfaction with the Organizational Communication Practices for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors.....	118
<u>Table 4.5:</u> Communication Satisfaction impact on Organizational Commitment for Subordinates and Supervisors for the Organizations Separately and Together.....	121
<u>Table 4.6:</u> How Communication Satisfaction Impacts Organizational Commitment for Subordinates and Supervisors.....	124
<u>Table 4.7:</u> Communication Satisfaction Definition of Subordinates and Supervisors.....	125
<u>Table 4.8:</u> Suggestions for Improving Communication Satisfaction given by Subordinates and Supervisors....	128

<u>Table 4.9:</u> Levels of Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors. Presented Separately by Organizations and Combined.....	131
<u>Table 4.10:</u> Factors that Foster Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, and for Supervisors; and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors.....	136
<u>Table 4.11:</u> Factors that Foster Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, and for Supervisors; and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors.....	138
<u>Table 4.12:</u> Factors that Inhibit Organizational Commitment for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors.....	141
<u>Table 4.13:</u> Factors that Inhibit Organizational Commitment for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors.....	142
<u>Table 4.14:</u> Organizational Commitment Definitions of Subordinates and Supervisors.....	146
<u>Table 4.15:</u> Suggestions for Improving Organizational Commitment as Given by Subordinates and Supervisors...	150
<u>Table 4.16:</u> Important things in this Organization for Subordinates and for Supervisors to be Committed to...	152
<u>Table 4.17:</u> How Supervisors Communicate What Is Important. Subordinates and Supervisors Perceptions...	155
<u>Table 4.18:</u> Typical Behaviors of Low Committed Employees. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses.....	157
<u>Table 4.19:</u> What Supervisors Do With Low Committed Employees. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses.....	159
<u>Table 4.20:</u> Typical Behaviors of Highly Committed Employees. Subordinates' and Supervisors' Responses...	162
<u>Table 4.21:</u> What Does Top Management Do To Foster Permanent Commitment. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses.....	164
<u>TABLE 5.1:</u> Cronbach Alphas for Research Instruments...	170

<u>Table 5.2:</u> Principal Components Factor Analysis for the CAQ for the entire sample.....	172
<u>Table 5.3:</u> Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Commitment Composite Questionnaire.....	175
<u>Table 5.4:</u> Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Mowday, Porter, and Steers' (OCQ).....	178
<u>Table 5.5:</u> Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Cook and Wall (OCI).....	181
<u>Table 5.6:</u> Principal Components Factor Analysis for Downs and Varona Commitment Questionnaire.....	183
<u>Table 5.7:</u> Job Satisfaction: Frequency Distributions and Means for the Entire Sample and for each Organizations.....	186
<u>TABLE 5.8:</u> Means and Rank Orders of the Five Most Satisfied CAQ Items for Entire Sample and for Each Organization.....	188
<u>TABLE 5.9:</u> Means and Rank Orders of the Five Least Satisfied CAQ items for Entire Sample and for each Organization.....	189
<u>Table 5.10:</u> Paired T-Tests between Most and Least Satisfied CAQ Items for Entire Sample.....	191
<u>TABLE 5.11:</u> Entire Sample and Each Organization: Means for the Ten Communication Satisfaction Factors in Rank Order.....	192
<u>Table 5.12:</u> Comparison of Organizations on Communication Satisfaction Factors: Entire Sample.....	194
<u>TABLE 5.13:</u> Means of Five Strong Agreement Commitment Items for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization.....	197
<u>TABLE 5.14:</u> Means and Standard Deviations for Five Strong Disagreement Commitment Items for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization.....	198
<u>Table 5.15:</u> Paired T-Tests between Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree CCQ Items for the Entire Sample.....	200

TABLE 5.16: Entire Sample and by Organizations:  
Means for the Commitment Factors in Rank Order.....201

Table 5.17: Comparison of Organizations on Commitment  
Composites and Factors: Entire Sample.....202

Table 5.18: Correlation between CAQ Factors and  
Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the Entire Sample  
and for Each Organization.....204

Table 5.19: Correlation between CAQ Factors and  
Organizational Commitment Composites and Factors  
for Organization 3.....206

Table 5.20: Correlation Among Commitment Factors.  
Entire Sample.....208

Table 5.21: Comparison of Less Satisfied Versus More  
Satisfied Employees on Commitment Composites and  
Factors for Organization 3 (Factory).....210

Table 5.22: Comparison of Less Committed Versus More  
Committed Employees on Communication Satisfaction  
Factors. Entire Sample.....211

Table 5.23: Paired T-Tests between Comsat Composite  
and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for Entire Sample  
and for Each Organization.....212

Table 5.24: Stepwise Multiple Regression (Using  
Organization 3 Sample and Entire Sample): All CAQ  
Factors, Excluding Subordinate Communication on  
Commitment Composites, Factors, and Global  
Commitment (CAQ.40).....214

TABLE 5.25: Means and Rank Orders for the Five Most  
Satisfied CAQ Items by Position.....216

TABLE 5.26: Means and Standard Deviations for the  
Five Least Satisfied CAQ items by Position.....217

TABLE 5.27: Positions for Entire Sample: Means for  
the Ten Communication Satisfaction Factors  
in Rank Order.....218

Table 5.28: Paired T-Tests between Supervisors and  
Subordinates on Communication Factors for  
Entire Sample.....219

<u>TABLE 5.29:</u> Means for the Five Strong Agreement Items by Position.....	220
<u>TABLE 5.30:</u> Means for the Five Strong Disagreement Commitment Items by Position.....	221
<u>TABLE 5.31:</u> Position: Means for the Commitment Factors in Rank Order by Position.....	223
<u>Table 5.32:</u> Paired T-Tests between the Comsat Composite and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) by Position for the Entire Sample and between Comsat Composite and Commitment Composite by position for Organization 3.....	224
<u>Table 5.33:</u> Correlation between CAQ Factors and Tenure for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization.....	226
<u>Table 5.34:</u> Correlation between Tenure and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization.....	227
<u>Table 5.35:</u> Correlation between Tenure and Organizational Commitment Composites and Factors for Organization 3.....	227
<u>Table 5.36:</u> Comparison of Tenure on the CAQ factors. Entire Sample.....	228
<u>Table 5.37:</u> Comparison of Tenure on CAQ Factors by Organizations. Organization 1 (School).....	230
<u>Table 5.38:</u> Comparison of Tenure on the CAQ Factors. Organization 3 (Factory).....	231
<u>Table 5.39:</u> Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Composites and Factors: Entire Sample.....	232
<u>Table 5.40:</u> Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Factors: Organization 1 (School).....	232
<u>Table 5.41:</u> Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Factors: Organization 2 (Hospital).....	233
<u>Table 5.42:</u> Comparison of Tenure on Global Commitment (CAQ Q. 40) Organization 3 (Factory).....	234

## Chapter One

### INTRODUCTION

The importance of communication in the functioning of any organization is well established. Barnard (1938) refers to communication as the "nerve system" of the organization. Organizational communication has been studied from different perspectives with relative success in producing theoretical models that can help us to have a better understanding of its nature and functions. Over the past two decades, the constructs of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment have been important variables of interest to organizational communication researchers (Clampitt & Downs, 1987; Putti, Aryee, & Phua, 1990), and yet few studies have focused directly on the relationship between these two organizational variables.

### COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION

The term "communication satisfaction" was first introduced by Level (1959) in his analysis of human communication in an urban bank. Redding (1978) reported that the term communication satisfaction has been used "to refer to the over-all degree of satisfaction an employee perceives in his total communication

environment." A relatively new and successful research stream in organizational communication (Crino & White 1981) has attempted to conceptualize and operationalize a construct labeled communication satisfaction by Downs and Hazen (1973, pp. 63-64). The construct of communication satisfaction has become an accepted part of the organizational communication literature over the last 20 years (Clampitt & Downs, 1987). Many studies have been built on the Downs-Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire and those have resulted in the creation of a new and successful research stream. The findings of the various studies revealed that: 1) the construct of communication satisfaction is multi-dimensional; 2) the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has proven to be a useful tool for organizational diagnosis in a wide range of organizations; 3) communication satisfaction links to the end-product variables of job satisfaction and productivity; and 4) the communication satisfaction construct is effective in explaining job satisfaction and productivity (Clampitt & Downs, 1987).

## **ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Organizational commitment has been of more recent interest to organizational communication researchers over

the past two decades (Putti, Aryee, & Phua, 1990). This interest in commitment stemmed from its demonstrated linkage with variables that had an influence on organizational effectiveness. Some of these variables were absenteeism (Steers, 1977; Larson & Fukami, 1984), turnover (Kom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Angle and Perry, 1983) and job performance (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1974; Steers, 1977).

According to Putti, Aryee, and Phua, (1990) most of these studies about the antecedents and consequences of commitment have focused primarily on structural, individual, and role-related variables (Dornstein & Matalon, 1989; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). As a consequence, the organizational processes have been ignored as potential determinants of commitment. One such organizational process is communication and the members' satisfaction with communication relationships (Putti, Aryee, & Phua, 1990). Other research has empirically found positive relationships between commitment and: 1) network involvement (Eisenberg, Monge, & Miller, 1983), 2) leadership (Morris & Sherman, 1981), 3) participation in decision making (Hall, 1977), 4) amount of feedback received on the job, and 5) socialization strategies of new employees (Buchanan, 1974).

Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) explored the impact of communication relationship satisfaction on organizational commitment in an engineering company in Singapore. They demonstrated a relationship between communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. The two factors that showed the strongest relationship to organizational commitment were relationship with top management and supervisor, of these the relationship with top management had the highest correlation. In this study, communication satisfaction was conceived of as an antecedent condition of commitment. These findings indicated that the satisfaction of organizational members with the amount of information available to them could enhance their commitment.

#### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Since communication practices and organizational commitment attitudes are important processes in organizations, there is a need for the study of these two dimensions within organizations. Moreover, there is a need to study the relationship between these two variables. A review of the literature reveals that in fact there is a lack of research on the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational

commitment. Therefore, the relationship that is believed to exist between these two variables is more implied than demonstrated. On the other hand, the study of the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment is particularly important since it is believed that the implications of the findings of such research may have a significant impact on managerial activities and organizational effectiveness. Until now three studies Putti, Aryee, and Phua, 1990; Potvin, 1991; and Downs, A., 1991 have supported a relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

In order to fulfill this need for studying the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment, a major thrust of research has been recently initiated by Cal W. Downs (1989). The purpose of this new research trend in organizational communication is to examine the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in various cultures. The Potvin (1991) study in the United States and the Downs A. (1991) study in Australia were two of the first reported studies of research in this area. The present research project, which has studied the nature of the relationship between

communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in Guatemala, was a part of this research thrust.

The need for these kinds of studies in Latin American countries is particularly important since organizational communication research in these nations is just beginning. Therefore, this study represents a significant contribution to the development of research on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment and expands it into another country, namely, Guatemala.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To accomplish the main purpose of this study, which is to examine the relationship between organizational communication and organizational commitment in Guatemalan culture, the following research questions have been formulated:

1. What are the differences and similarities in employees' responses for the communication satisfaction factors and for the organizational commitment composites and factors among the three Guatemalan organizations?

2. What are the relationships among the communication satisfaction factors and: a) the Mowday, Porter, and Steers organizational commitment composite,

b) the Cook and Wall commitment composite and factors, c) the Downs and Varona commitment composite, and d) the participant Global Commitment for the employees of the Guatemalan organizations?

3. What are the relationships among the Mowday, Porter, and Steers organizational commitment composite and: a) the Cook and Wall commitment composite and factors, b) the Global Commitment composite, c) the Downs and Varona commitment composite? And what are the relationships among the Cook and Wall commitment factors for the employees of the Guatemalan organizations?

4. What impact does employment tenure have on the communication satisfaction dimensions and on the organizational commitment dimensions for the employees of the Guatemalan organizations?

5. What are the differences between supervisors and subordinates for the ten communication satisfaction factors and for the organizational commitment composites and factors for the Guatemalan organizations?

6. What are the differences and similarities between managers/supervisors and subordinates on: a) factors that foster and inhibit communication satisfaction, b) conceptualizations of communication satisfaction, and c) suggestions for improving communication satisfaction?

7. What are the differences and similarities between managers/supervisors and subordinates on: a) factors that foster and inhibit organizational commitment, b) conceptualizations of organizational commitment, and c) suggestions for improving organizational commitment?

8. What do Guatemalan top managers and supervisors do to manage their employees' organizational commitment?

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study, which is descriptive and exploratory in its nature, has some specific features that make it unique:

1. It represents the first endeavor to investigate how Guatemalan employees conceptualize the two organizational constructs of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2. It illustrates the first attempt to investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in Guatemala.

3. It is the first effort to investigate the actions of managers to control employees' commitment to the organization.

4. It is the first examination of a new measure of organizational commitment, the Downs and Varona

commitment questionnaire. This measure assesses new commitment dimensions such as commitment to results, commitment to gain work experience, and commitment to career. Moreover, it evaluates the impact of some communication dimensions (top management communication, horizontal communication, and relation with supervisor) on commitment.

5. This study is also unique because it assesses for the first time differences and similarities between managers and employees on their conceptualizations of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in Guatemala. Moreover, it investigates differences and similarities regarding their perceptions of the factors that foster and inhibit communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

6. Another significant and unique feature of this study is the contribution that it makes to the organizational studies in Spanish speaking countries. As a result, research instruments on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment will be available in Spanish to be used for organizational development or research purposes.

## OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

It was necessary to define the terms communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in order to proceed with this study.

### Communication Satisfaction

Several definitions of the term "communication satisfaction" have been provided by researchers since it was first introduced by Level (1959). The first definitions of communication satisfaction emphasized the unidimensionality of the construct. Thayer (1969, p. 144) defined the term as the personal satisfaction a person experiences when communicating successfully. Redding (1978) in an analysis of several studies, reported that the term communication satisfaction was used "to refer to the over-all degree of satisfaction an employee perceives in the total communication environment." More recently Downs and Hazen (1977) attempted to study whether or not communication satisfaction was a multidimensional rather than a unidimensional construct. The results of their research indicated that "communication satisfaction" was a multidimensional construct. Based on these findings, the Downs and Hazen study (1977) define the term as "an

individual's satisfaction with various aspects of communication in his organization."

"Communication satisfaction," for the purpose of this study, is defined as individual satisfaction with various aspects of communication in an organization as measured by the Communication Audit Questionnaire (Downs 1977, 1989). Such various aspects of the Communication Satisfaction construct are: 1) Organizational Perspective, 2) Personal Feedback, 3) Organizational Integration, 4) Supervisor Communication, 5) Communication Climate, 6) Horizontal Communication, 7) Media Quality, 8) Subordinate Communication, 9) Top Management Communication, and 10) Interdepartmental communication.

### Organizational Commitment

A review of literature about organizational commitment revealed that three different conceptualizations of organizational commitment have been proposed. First is the side-bets (exchange) perspective which sees commitment as an outcome of inducement/contribution transactions between the organization and member. In this conceptualization, the individual perceives associated benefits such as pension

plans as positive elements in an exchange that produces a willingness to remain attached to the organization. Under this perspective, commitment is defined as a function of the rewards and costs associated with organizational membership (Becker, 1960; Sheldon, 1971; Alutto, Hrebiniak, & Alonso, 1973; and Farrell & Rusbult, 1981).

Second is the psychological perspective which views organizational commitment as a three-component orientation consisting of (1) identification with the goals and values of the organization, (2) a willingness to focus strong effort toward helping the organization achieve its goals, and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Sheldon, 1971; Buchanan 1974; and Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). Under this perspective commitment is defined "as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46). And third is the attributions perspective which defines commitment as a binding of individuals to behavioral acts that results when individuals attribute an attitude of commitment to themselves after engaging in behaviors that are volitional, explicit, and irrevocable (Reichers, 1985).

"Organizational commitment," for the purpose of this study, is defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with the goals and values of the organization, his/her willingness to help the organization achieve its goals, and his/her strong desire to maintain membership in the organization, specifically it is measured by composite scores on the Mowday, Porter, & Steers (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), the Cook and Wall (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI), and the Downs and Varona (1990) Commitment Questionnaire (CQ).

#### METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in the following steps. (1) The communication satisfaction and organizational commitment instruments were selected for collecting the data. (2) The instruments were translated into Spanish. (3) The instruments were pre-tested. (4) Data were collected from three Guatemalan organizations. (5) Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, regression, analysis of variance, factor analysis, and content analysis.

## Instruments

The instruments used for this study were: 1) Downs' (1990) Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ); 2) Mowday, Porter and Steers's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); 3) Cook and Wall's (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI); and 4) Downs and Varona's (1990) Commitment Questionnaire (CQ).

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. The Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) is an instrument that was developed by Cal W. Downs and Michael D. Hazen (1977), and revised by Cal W. Downs (1990). The questionnaire was constructed to indicate level of satisfaction of respondents with fifty-two items using a one-to-seven point scale which ranged between "very satisfied" and "very dissatisfied". Two additional questions referred to changes experienced in job satisfaction and productivity. Two open-ended questions asked for suggestions to improve communication satisfaction and productivity. The Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) is reviewed in detail in Chapter Three of this study.

One more question (Q #40) was added to the questionnaire in this study to measure the employees'

level of global commitment to the organization. Three demographic questions were included to investigate employees' 1) tenure, 2) position, and 3) work unit.

A transcript of the CAQ, along with a frequency distribution of responses obtained for the present study, is included in Appendix A.

Commitment Questionnaires. The Mowday, Porter, and Steers Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was developed in 1980 and, it is the most frequently used instrument for the measurement of organizational commitment. The OCQ is characterized by three factors: "(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Mowday, Porter, and Steers 1979, p. 226). The OCQ measures a combination of employee attitudes and behavioral intentions that reflect the moral involvement of the employee with an organization (Barge & Schlueter, 1988). Responses to the 15-item OCQ are measured on a 7-point Likert-like scale and the respondents indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the items.

The Cook and Wall Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI) was also developed in 1980. Three theoretical components of commitment characterized this measure: identification, involvement, and loyalty (Barge & Schlueter, 1988). The instrument consists of nine items, with three items representing each theoretical component. The responses are based upon a 7-point Likert-like format. Respondents indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the items.

The two instruments discussed above have achieved acceptable levels of reliability and face validity. Convergent and predictive validity are also high for all the instruments with the exception of Cook and Wall's OCI (Barge & Schlueter, 1988).

The Downs and Varona Commitment Questionnaire consist of 20 statements aimed to measure dimensions of commitment that were not included in the Mowday, Porter and Steers Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) or the Cook and Wall Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI). The first ten items assess commitment to results, organization, and career; and the last ten evaluate the impact of some communication dimensions on commitment. The responses for this instrument use a 7 point Likert-like format in which the respondents are asked to

indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the items.

The three commitment questionnaires, along with frequency distributions of the responses obtained for the present study, are presented in Appendix B.

### Translation of the Instruments into Spanish

One important problem concerning the instruments used in this research study was to establish the reliability of each of the instruments. An instrument proving reliable in one cultural setting may or may not be reliable in another culture. Johnson and Tuttle (1989, 474) suggest at least two strategies for dealing with problems of intercultural research: 1) conduct a pretest to determine if a study's instrumentation is reliable for the people of new a culture, and 2) be willing to modify the original instrumentation to make its scales reliable and valid for both cultures.

The translations of the questionnaires used in this study from English into Spanish were conducted following the procedures used in intercultural research (Hofstede, 1980, pp. 34-35). First, the questionnaires were carefully translated from their original English versions into Spanish by the researcher (a native Spanish

speaker), with concern being given to remaining faithful to the original format and content. Second, this translation was reviewed by other professional persons who were fluent in both the English and Spanish languages. Third, a back-translation of the instruments by a second bilingual person was performed. Finally, a third researcher compared the back-translation text with the original, and differences between these two texts were resolved through discussion between him and the researcher. For the Spanish version of the Communication Audit Questionnaire, two previous translations of its original form by Alum (1982) and Varona (1988) were reviewed and the necessary adjustments were made to comply with the revision of the questionnaire done by Downs in 1990. For the ten new items that were added in the recent revision of the questionnaire, the complete three step translation procedure described above was followed.

The Spanish version of the research instruments are presented in Appendix D.

The Spanish version of the research instruments used in this study are presented in Appendix D.

## Self-administered Open Question Survey

The self-administered open question survey with supervisors and subordinates were conducted to investigate the employees' direct perception of some specific issues related to the areas of 1) communication satisfaction, 2) organizational commitment, and 3) managing organizational commitment.

A survey guide with the open questions to be asked to the respondents was prepared and tested using a sample from the Latin American population present on the university campus.

The open question survey guide in its English version is presented in Appendix C, and its Spanish version in Appendix D.

### Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from three different organizations located in Guatemala City, Guatemala. In order to make organizational comparisons, the sampled organizations were designated as an educational institution, a hospital, and a large factory.

A sample of 307 subjects was selected from the three organizations. If the organization had less than one hundred employees, the aim was to survey all if possible.

If the organization had more than 200 subjects, a 50% representative sample of its employees by organizational departments was selected using the quota sampling technique (Fowler, 1988, pp. 55-58).

In order to get the best representation possible of the persons in management and supervisory positions, all the supervisors and managers were surveyed.

A sample of 10% of the employees answered the self-administered open question survey in the organization with a population of 200 or more employees. A sample of 20% of its employees was selected for the two organizations that had less than one hundred employees. These samples were considered appropriate because these open question surveys were used to supplement the questionnaires. (Downs, 1988, pp. 64-69).

Detailed information about the Guatemalan organizations that were surveyed for the present study is provided in Chapter Three.

### Analytic Procedures

The analytic procedures for this study were completed in two steps. First, statistical analyses were conducted with the data provided by the Communication Satisfaction and organizational commitment

questionnaires. Second, a content analysis was utilized for the information collected by the self-administered open question surveys (Sudaman & Bradburn, 1988, pp. 79-80).

Statistical Analyses. Data from the questionnaires were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 4.1.

First, descriptive statistics were computed to obtain frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, and rank orders of all the items on questionnaires for both the entire data set, and individual organization samples.

Second, Pearson Correlations were computed to determine the relationships among the ten communication satisfaction factors and Global Commitment (CAQ #40), and tenure (Demographic #1) were obtained for the entire sample.

Pearson Correlations were also computed to determine the relationships between:

a) The communication satisfaction dimensions and the Mowday, Porter, and Steers organizational commitment composite.

b) The communication satisfaction dimensions and the Cook and Wall organizational commitment composite and each of its commitment factors: Identification, Loyalty, and Involvement.

c) The communication satisfaction dimensions and the Downs and Varona organizational commitment composite.

d) The communication satisfaction dimensions and these other variables: a) tenure (Demographic Q. #1), and b) Global Commitment (CAQ #40).

Pearson Correlations were computed to assess the relationship across communication satisfaction factors and across commitment factors.

Third, Regression Analyses were used to assess which communication satisfaction factors (as independent predictor variables) predicted organizational commitment factors (as dependent variables).

Fourth, Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) about communication satisfaction dimensions and organizational commitment dimensions were used to compare:

- a) the three Guatemalan organizations,
- b) the varying lengths of employees' tenure.

Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were also conducted to compare:

a) more communication satisfied with less communication satisfied employees on their levels of commitment.

b) more committed with less committed employees on their communication satisfaction.

Fifth, Paired T-Tests were conducted to compare supervisors with subordinates on their levels of communication satisfaction and commitment

Sixth, Factor Analyses were performed for all of the questionnaires using the entire sample. The purpose of these factor analyses was threefold: 1) to uncover possible underlying dimensions, 2) to discover Guatemalan employees' conceptualizations of the communication satisfaction and organizational commitment factors, and 3) to compare the Guatemalan results with results obtained in the USA and Australia. In interpreting these factor analyses, an item was considered to load on a factor if it had a loading of .5 or above on that factor and less than a .4 loading on all other factors.

Seventh, Cronbach Alphas were computed for each research instrument and for each of the communication

satisfaction and commitment factors used in this study to determine the internal reliability of each one.

Content Analyses. Responses to the self-administered open question survey were analyzed using the following procedures suggested by Kaid, and Wadsworth (1989, 293-315). First, the categories to be applied for each question were defined. Second, a written coding instrument containing the categories to be used in analyzing the answers was constructed for the coder. Third, responses were categorized by the researcher. Fourth, another person coded the data and intercoder reliability was determined. The levels of agreement achieved between coder and intercoder were calculated based on simple percentage of agreement. A reliability score of .85% or more was considered acceptable. Finally, the results of the coding process were analyzed and are reported in Chapter Four.

Categories and their units of analysis were formulated for each open question of the survey, with the intention of making them as exhaustive and mutually exclusive as possible. The goal was to develop categories that were clear and free of confusion.

The sets of categories generated by the content analysis processing of the responses to the different questions were of two kinds. First, preset categories were used if the categories previously developed matched to a great extent the topics of the question and the answers of the respondents. Second, new sets of thematic categories were developed using substantive coding (Glaser, 1973, pp. 56-58) for those questions without previously developed sets of categories. The goal was to develop sets of categories that emerged from the content of the actual responses given by the respondents, and that were also adaptable to being integrated into theoretical frameworks.

Content validity was established by correlating the self-administered open question survey results with the inferences made by the researcher on plausible results and by corroborating them with other studies. Concurrent validity was established by correlating the qualitative results obtained in this study with the quantitative results, and with the results obtained in other studies about communication satisfaction, organizational commitment, and managing organizational commitment, that are reported in Chapter Two in the review of the literature.

## ORGANIZATION OF THIS DISSERTATION

This study is presented in six chapters. Chapter One includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the significance of the study, the definitions of terms, and the overview of the methodology. Chapter Two is a review of the literature about communication satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the Guatemalan organizational culture. Chapter Three describes the characteristics of the research instruments, the methodology, and the companies involved in this study. Chapter Four reports the qualitative findings and Chapter Five presents the results of the quantitative analyses. Finally, Chapter Six offers conclusions, a discussion of the findings of this studies, and some suggestions for future research.

## Chapter Two

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the theoretical and research literature in the areas of organizational communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. Second, a summary of the social, economic, and political context in which the Guatemalan organizations operated is described.

#### ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

The importance of communication in organizational functioning has been stated by many organizational theorists (Barnard, 1938; Bavelas & Barrette, 1951; Rogers & Agarwala-Rogers, 1976; Ruch, 1989). As a result of its importance, organizational communication is a topic which has received considerable attention in recent years. Researchers have approached the topic from several different perspectives each of which tends to emphasize some aspects over other aspects of the communication role in an organization. Because communication is such an important part of any organization, researchers have searched for ways to measure communication within organizations for theoretical and managerial purposes.

## The Communication Satisfaction Construct

A relatively new research stream by Downs, Hazen and Quiggins (1973) has attempted to conceptualize and measure a construct named communication satisfaction. Over the last 20 years this construct has become an accepted part of the organizational communication literature and more than twenty five studies involving it have been completed.

The historical development of the communication satisfaction construct has been outlined by Clampitt and Downs (1987, 2-3). The first known reference to communication satisfaction was made by Dale Level (1959) in a study of urban banks. Level was concerned with the amount of general information workers received from management such as advanced notification about changes in company policies, procedures and working conditions, perceptions of freedom to approach subordinates, and being well informed in general. Then Redding (1972), after reviewing several studies on the construct, suggested that "communication satisfaction" might be multi-dimensional in nature, with a wide variety of components such as: 1) being notified of changes, 2) understanding job requirements, 3) access to important

information, 4) accessibility of superiors, and 5) explanation of policies.

Finally, Downs, Hazen, and Quiggins (1973) defined communication satisfaction as an individual's satisfaction with various aspects of communication in his/her organization. These authors suggested that communication satisfaction was a multidimensional construct including dimensions such as feedback, and media quality. Downs and Hazen (1977) explored the multidimensionality of communication satisfaction using an original questionnaire, called "Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire". The results of this study suggested the following: 1) "communication satisfaction" is a multidimensional construct; 2) the primary dimensions of communication satisfaction include: organizational perspective, organizational integration, personal feedback, relation with supervisor, horizontal communication, relation with subordinates, media quality, and communication climate; 3) the results from several factor analyses in different organizations indicate a great amount of stability among the factors; 4) these factors seem to reflect most of the major components of organizational functioning in terms of role relationships, types of information, and the climate of

the organization. Clampitt and Downs concluded, on the basis of the above, that the concept of communication satisfaction can be a useful tool in studying organizational communication.

### Communication Satisfaction Research

Even though "communication satisfaction" is a relatively new construct in the field of organizational communication, much research has been directed toward determining the relationship between communication satisfaction and other organizational variables. The most relevant findings of the various studies that have used the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Clampitt & Downs 1987, pp. 16-24) are in this section. These studies have been grouped according to the types of organization being investigated: 1) nonprofit organizations such as government, educational, and nursing organizations; and 2) profit organizations such as manufacturing and services ones.

Over 25 different studies, theses, and dissertations, have used the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire to analyze organizational communication. These studies often have been simple case studies that have focused on the relationship between communication

satisfaction and job satisfaction. Table 4.1 presents some of the researchers, organizations, subjects, and national settings that have been involved in these investigations.

**TABLE 2.1: Communication Satisfaction Research**

Researcher	Organization	Subjects	Size	Resp.	Country
1 Avery (1977)	Government Agency	Government Employees	135	61%	U.S.A.
2 Thiry (1977)	Hospitals Clinics	Registered Nurses	1,069	71%	U.S.A.
3 Gordon (1979)	University	Admin.	41	66%	U.S.A.
4 Kio (1979)	Government Business	Admin. and Line Workers	134	100%	Nigeria
5 Nicholson (1980)	Urban School District	Admin. and Teachers	290	72%	U.S.A.
6 Jones (1981)	Rural School District	Admin. and Teachers	142	71%	U.S.A.
7 Duke (1981)	Urban School District	Bus. Ed. Teachers	309	63%	U.S.A.
8 Alum (1982)	Service Organization	Managers Line Workers	274	72%	Mexico
9 Wippich (1983)	Urban and Rural School Districts	Teachers	150	75%	U.S.A.
10 Pincus (1986)	Urban Hospital	Nurses	327	66%	U.S.A.
11 Clampitt (1987)	Various	Managers and Workers	1,494	85%	U.S.A.
12 Varona (1988)	Printing	Managers and Workers	167	52%	Guatemala
13 Potvin (1991)	Retail Manufacturing Health	Managers Workers	490	49%	U.S.A.
14 Downs A. (1991)	Higher Educ. Manufacturing	Faculty Workers	195	26%	Australia

## Nonprofit Organizations: Government Organizations.

Avery's (1977) study of a sample of 135 government employees of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration was one of the pioneer studies in using the CSQ. Avery found that these employees were satisfied in the areas of the eight communication factors. The employees in the top positions were more satisfied than those in the lower positions. Significant correlations were also found between each of the eight communication satisfaction factors and job satisfaction. The factors with the strongest correlations were Horizontal Communication, Subordinate Communication, and Communication Climate. He did not investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction and perceived productivity.

A similar study was conducted by Gordon (1979) to investigate the communication satisfaction of 48 administrators at the University of Kansas, and it found statistically significant differences between five groups of administrators. Gordon also found that these administrators were satisfied with the eight communication factors. They were the most satisfied with Supervisor Communication, and the least satisfied with Communication Climate, Media Quality, and Personal

Feedback. The relationship of the CSQ factors to either job satisfaction or perceived productivity was not investigated.

#### Nonprofit Organizations: Educational Organizations.

The first in a series of studies that utilized the CSQ in public school districts was Nicholson' (1980) study of 298 secondary teachers and administrators in an urban school district. These teachers were generally satisfied with the communication satisfaction factors with the exception of the Organizational Perspective factor. The demographic variables of sex, age, and tenure status had no noticeable impact on the degree of communication satisfaction found. A trend noted through regression analysis was that the level of communication satisfaction of the administrators increased with their ages. Administration personnel were more satisfied with Supervisor Communication, Communication Climate, and Media Quality factors, than were those in nonadministrative positions. A correlational analysis revealed that the more trained these educators were, the more satisfied they were with the Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, Organizational Integration, and Communication Climate factors. Finally,

significant correlations were found between all of the communication factors and job satisfaction. The relationship between the communication satisfaction factors and productivity was not investigated.

Jones (1981) studied 142 secondary teachers in a rural school district in Tennessee and found that a majority of the respondents were satisfied with the communication factors. Subordinate Communication and Horizontal Communication were the factors which there was the greatest satisfaction, whereas Personal Feedback, Communication Climate, and Media Quality were the factors which there was the least satisfaction. Correlations between job satisfaction and the CSQ factors were all significant with the exception of Subordinate Communication factor. Jones (1981, 68) concluded that communication satisfaction (as measured by CSQ) had a stronger relationship to job satisfaction for rural secondary teachers than for teachers working in a large urban area.

Duke (1981) studied 309 secondary business educational teachers in a Chicago school district and found that these educators were less satisfied with communication practices than were their colleagues studied by Gordon (1979), Nicholson (1980) and Jones

(1981). Only 38% percent of Duke's sample were overall satisfied with communication. The communication factors with the highest satisfaction were Organizational Integration and Horizontal Communication, and those with the lowest satisfaction rating were Personal Feedback and Communication Climate. No significant differences based on age, marital status, ethnic origin, or teaching experience were found that related to the communication satisfaction factors. However, some communication satisfaction differences based on sex, educational level, and employment status were suggested by an Anova procedure. As was the case with the other secondary teacher studies, Duke also found significant correlations between job satisfaction and the CSQ factors, with the correlation of Communication Climate being the strongest of these.

Separate studies to investigate different questions were made by Barbara Wippich (1983) and Marvin Wippich (1983) using the same sample of 150 secondary and elementary teachers. These teachers were more satisfied with all of the CSQ factors than with the conceptual middle point. Specifically, the teachers were the most satisfied with Supervisor Communication, Organizational Integration, and Horizontal Communication and the least

satisfied with Communication Climate and Personal Feedback. Two communication satisfaction factors, Personal Feedback and Supervisor Communication, were found to be significant predictors of job satisfaction in the Barbara Wippich study. Job satisfaction was measured in this study by using a seven-item scale as opposed to the single-item scale often used by other researchers. Barbara Wippich did not find a significant relationship between communication apprehension and teacher satisfaction. Marvin Wippich found that the communication satisfaction factors were far better predictors of perceived organizational effectiveness than was the communication style construct. The Media Quality factor in particular was deemed to have explained the most variance.

#### Nonprofit Organizations: Nursing Organizations.

A 1977 study by Thiry, which used a sample of 1,160 Kansas nurses, was one of the first to make use of the CSQ. As in the above studies, the respondents were asked to indicate whether they were satisfied with their present communication practices. The areas of the greatest satisfaction were Subordinate Communication and Supervisor Communication, and the areas of the least

satisfaction were Personal Feedback and Communication Climate. The findings of this study revealed significant differences with regard to some demographic variables. Personnel in the "staff" category were consistently less satisfied than were those in the administrative category, who were less satisfied with Supervisor Communication but satisfied with the other factors. Age also had some impact with those in 65+ category the most consistently satisfied and those in the 21-30 age range, the least satisfied. Level of education, however did not show a discernable effect on communication satisfaction. Thiry also found a strong correlation between communication satisfaction and needs fulfillment. Significant correlations were found between all of the communication satisfaction factors and job satisfaction, and, to lesser extent, between them and perceived productivity.

Pincus (1986) used a modified version of the CSQ to study 327 nurses in an urban mid-Atlantic teaching hospital. A new factor of Top Management Communication was added to the other eight communication satisfaction factors. These nurses did not express as much communication satisfaction as did those in the findings of Thiry's (1977) study. The most highly rated factors were Supervisor Communication and Horizontal

Communication, and the lowest rated were Organizational Perspective and Top Management Communication. Pincus did find that communication satisfaction had an impact on both employee satisfaction and performance, but that this relationship was not as strong as that between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

#### Profit Organizations: Manufacturing Organizations.

Alum (1982) studied a sample of 274 workers in an organization in Mexico and found that the mean scores for all of the CSQ factors fell in the satisfied range. He found that the communication satisfaction factors were related differently to job satisfaction and to perceived productivity. Although the CSQ factors, with the exception of Subordinate Communication, were significantly correlated to job satisfaction, only Subordinate Communication and Communication Climate were related to perceived productivity.

Clampitt (1983) studied a sample of 116 employees from a chair manufacturer and 65 employees from a savings and loan bank to investigate the productivity issue. He found that each of the communication factors, as defined by Downs and Hazen (1976), had an "above average" impact on employee productivity. He also found that the type of

an organization seemed to have little effect on the areas of employee communication satisfaction. Employees were satisfied with the communication factors in both of these organizations. The two factors that were the most highly rated in both companies were Subordinate Communication and Supervisor Communication. Personal Feedback rated the lowest in both companies.

Clampitt and Girard (1986) replicated the above study by analyzing a sample of over 1400 individuals from 18 profit-making organizations such as financial, service, manufacturing and media enterprises. The CSQ factors, with the exception of Personal Feedback, were rated satisfactory. As in many other studies, Avery (1977), and Nicholson (1980), Supervisor Communication and Subordinate Communication were the most highly rated. Demographic variables were of limited usefulness in explaining the levels of communication satisfaction. However, on every factor, with the exception of Subordinate Communication, employees in the financial institutions were more satisfied than were those in the service, manufacturing, and media types of organizations which demonstrated that there were some differences between the various type of profit-making organizations. Communication satisfaction was more effective in

explaining job satisfaction than was perceived productivity.

To investigate the difference between profit and nonprofit organizations, Kio (1979) studied a sample of 90 government workers and 44 private workers in Nigeria. As in the former studies, the employees of both types of organizations were satisfied with their organization's communication practices. Subordinate Communication and Supervisor Communication were the most highly rated communication factors; Personal Feedback and Horizontal Communication the least satisfactory. There were some notable findings with regard to demographic variables in this study; namely, line workers in both government and private industry were less satisfied with communication than their administrative counterparts; the government workers were more satisfied with CSQ factors than were those in private industry. Kio found significant correlations between the CSQ factors and job satisfaction and perceived productivity.

Varona (1988) studied two private sector printing organizations in Guatemala with a sample of 122 employees from one and 45 employees from the other. The employees in both of these companies were generally satisfied with their communication practices. Subordinate Communication,

Organizational Integration, and Supervisor Communication were the factors with which the employees were most satisfied. Horizontal Communication, Personal Feedback, and Organizational Perspective were the factors with which employees were the least satisfied. The two companies were significantly different in their levels of satisfaction about communication factors. This difference in the level of communication satisfaction between the two Guatemalan organizations seemed to stem from differences in size, management style, and benefit policies. The communication satisfaction factors correlated significantly with job satisfaction although some factors had stronger correlations than others. The factor of tenure did not explain communication satisfaction for the Guatemalan employees. Some significant differences were found between organizational departments and there appeared to be some indication that employees in managerial roles were more satisfied with communication than others. Varona compared the results of this study with those of American workers and concluded that both Guatemalan and American employees were alike in their ratings of communication satisfaction. The most highly rated factors for American and Guatemalan employees were Subordinate Communication, Supervisor

Communication and Organizational Integration. The lowest rated factors were Personal Feedback and Organizational Perspective.

The findings of these studies using the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire can be summarized as follows (Clampitt and Downs, 1987, 16-24):

1. The communication satisfaction construct is multi-dimensional.

2. The communication satisfaction questionnaire has proved to be a useful tool for organizational diagnosis in a wide range of organizations.

3. The studies reviewed indicate that there are definite areas of greatest and least communication satisfaction, although for the most part employees are not dissatisfied with organizational communication.

4. Demographic variables provided relatively poor explanations of the level of communication satisfaction.

5. There appears to be some indication that employees in managerial roles are more satisfied with communication than those who are not. However, no clearly discernible difference can be detected between employees of profit and nonprofit organizations.

6. Communication satisfaction links significantly to the end-product variables of job satisfaction and productivity.

7. The communication satisfaction construct is more effective than is productivity in explaining job satisfaction.

8. There are no clear and strong patterns of relationships between the CSQ factors and the end-product variables in these studies. These relationships would probably be contingent on the type of organization and industry in which employees work. The correlation between the eight Communication Satisfaction factors and job satisfaction was found to be particularly significant while the communication satisfaction/productivity relationship was not always clear and strong.

### **ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

The term of "commitment" has been variously and extensively defined, measured, and researched but it continues to draw criticism for lack of precision and for concept redundancy (Morrow, 1983; Reichers, 1985). It is the purpose of this section to review the commitment literature to accomplish several goals. The first of these is to summarize the major trends in the

conceptualization of the term. The second is to find out some of the theoretical frameworks that are behind these conceptualizations. The third is to point out some of the implications that different conceptualizations have on the measurement of commitment in organizations. The final goal is to suggest a new conceptualization of organizational commitment that seems to overcome some of the shortcomings present in the former conceptualizations.

### Commitment Conceptualizations

A review of the literature (Buchanan, 1974; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982; Reichers, 1985) showed that there are at least three distinct approaches to defining commitment. They are 1) the exchange (side-bets) approach, 2) the psychological approach, and 3) the attributions approach.

The Exchange Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. The exchange (side-bets) approach views commitment as an outcome of inducement/contribution transactions between the organization and member. Becker (1960) suggested that the person who invests in an organization or occupation does so by placing side-bets

in which values are staked. The more side-bets at stake, the greater becomes the commitment of the person to his organization or occupation. Thus, commitment is primarily a matter of accrued investments. The individual perceives associated benefits (e.g. pension plans or other accrued investments) as positive elements in an exchange that produces a willingness to remain attached to the organization. Implicit is the idea that as investments or side-bets increase over a period of time, the attractiveness of other organizations or occupations will tend to decline. This notion of exchange is explained by March and Simon (1958) and by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972). These authors suggest that individuals come to organizations with certain needs, desires, and skills, and expect to find a work environment where they can utilize their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs. When the organization provides a vehicle for achieving these purposes the likelihood of an increasing commitment is apparently enhanced. When the organization is not a dependable means of satisfying these needs, or where it fails to provide its employees with challenging and meaningful tasks, commitment levels tend to diminish. When employees have high levels of education, it may be difficult for an organization to

provide sufficient rewards (as perceived by the individual) to equalize the exchange. Commitment with this perspective is defined as a function of the rewards and costs associated with organizational membership. This approach, and variations of it, have been used by Alutto, Hrebiniak, and Alonso (1973); Becker (1960); Farrell and Rusbult (1981); and Sheldon (1971).

Two limitations of the exchange approach have been pointed out by Morris and Sherman (1981). First, this approach has generated measures of commitment that almost entirely reduce the concept of commitment to utilitarian considerations. Measures developed under this approach assess commitment exclusively as if there was no other consideration but the likelihood that respondents would leave an organization if additional inducements were available in other employment settings. Under this approach little assessment is provided with respect to ongoing behavioral predispositions within the given employment relationship. Second, another limitation of exchange-based measures of commitment stems from the lack of empirical evidence that they are, in fact, related to particular ongoing behavioral outcomes within the organization.

The Psychological Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. In contrast to the exchange-based conception of commitment, the psychological approach as originally conceived by Porter and Smith (1970), describes commitment as a more active and positive orientation toward the organization. The psychological approach defines commitment as "...an attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization" (Sheldon, 1971). This approach emphasizes the affective attachment of the individual to the organization. Buchanan (1974) and Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) viewed it as a three-component orientation consisting of: 1) identification with the goals and values of the organization, 2) high involvement in its work activities or a willingness to focus strong effort toward helping the organization achieve its goals, and 3) a loyal attachment to the organization or a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974, and Buchanan, 1974). Steers (1977, p. 46) defined organizational commitment "as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization."

The Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was the primary operationalization of the so-called psychological approach and has been the most frequently used measure in all empirical studies that have shown organizational commitment to be related to ongoing behavioral outcomes. This approach, and variations of it, have been used by Angel and Perry (1981); Bartol (1979); Morris and Sherman (1981); Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982); Steers (1977); Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978); and Randall (1988).

The Attributions Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. Reichers (1985), in a recent study, points out a third approach to the conceptualization of commitment which is the attributions conceptualization. Attributions definitions focus on behaviors that result in the attribution of commitment. Attributions are made, in part, in order to maintain consistency between one's behavior and one's attitudes. Thus, commitment is a binding of the individual to behavioral acts and it occurs when individuals attribute an attitude of commitment to themselves after engaging in behaviors that are volitional, explicit, and irrevocable. This approach,

and variations of it, have been used by Kiesler and Sakumura (1966), and Salancik (1977).

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) have distinguished between commitment as an attitude and commitment as a behavior. Attitudinal commitment reflects the individual's identification with organizational goals and his/her willingness to work towards them. Behavioral commitment results from the binding of individuals to behavioral acts. There is a cyclical relationship between these two types of commitment, whereby commitment attitudes lead to committing behaviors which, in turn, reinforce commitment attitudes.

Etzioni (1961) studied three types of organizational commitment. 1) Moral involvement which refers to a positive and high-intensity orientation based on an internalization of organizational goals and values, and an identification with authority. 2) Calculative involvement which refers to a low-intensity relationship based on a rational exchange of benefits and rewards. 3) Alienative involvement which refers to a negative orientation such as that found in exploitative relationships (e.g., inside prisons).

It is apparent, from the review of the literature, that three major trend have dominated the concept of

organizational commitment. They are: 1) the exchange approach, 2) the psychological approach, and 3) the attributions approach. The literature review also reveals variations of the three. An integration of these three conceptualizations seems to be possible and necessary. Definitions from these conceptualizations and based on the psychological approach have shown to be more effective, and thereby have become more popular than the others. Dissatisfaction among researchers regarding current definitions of the term persist. Some researchers suggest that the concept of commitment needs more a formal analysis or additional lines of concrete theoretical reasoning (Becker, 1960; Buchanan, 1974; Steers, 1977; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Reichers, 1985).

### Theoretical Frameworks Behind the Concepts of Commitment

According to Morris and Sherman (1981, 513) "organizational commitment studies have not, in general, linked their respective empirical results to a common, theoretically-grounded framework from which predictor variables were derived". Hence, there is a need for a body of independent studies that rely on a common theoretical framework to incorporate both the antecedents and the outcomes of organizational commitment, and then

build predictive models of a particular measure of the construct. The literature reviewed shows that there have been two major attempts to provide such a theoretical framework of organizational commitment. The first of these was the multivariate predictive framework (Steers, 1977; and Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978), and the second was the multiple commitments framework (Reichers, 1985).

The Multivariate Predictive Framework. In order to study the topic of organizational commitment from a systematic and comprehensive approach, Steers (1977) developed a model that consisted of two parts which were 1) the antecedents of commitment, and 2) the outcomes of commitment. The component dealing with antecedents was grouped into the three main categories of 1) personal characteristics (need for achievement, age, education); 2) job characteristics (task identity, optional interaction, feedback); and 3) work experiences (group attitudes, organizational dependability, personal import).

In another significant effort to consider the full range of relevant factors that may determine the attachment of the individual to the organization, Stevens, Beyer and Trice (1978) have developed a

theoretical model of managerial role contexts that includes both the psychological (individual factors) and exchange (organizational factors) approaches. Their model incorporates personal, role-related, and organizational variables. The relative influence of these factors may depend to a great extent upon the manager's perceptions of his/her role and the assessment of costs or benefits given competing influences.

Students of organizational behavior have attempted to establish reliable linkages between employee attitudes and organizationally relevant behaviors, though with mixed results (Vroom, 1964). Substantial attention has been directed recently toward organizational commitment as the attitudinal component of this relationship (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; Buchanan, 1974; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978). Some studies have proposed that the concept of commitment may disclose reliable linkages between attitudes and behavior, because commitment is presumed to be a relatively stable employee attribute (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Koch & Steers, 1978).

A review of the most recent research on organizational commitment shows that study designs draw

heavily on the multivariate framework (Eisenberg, Monge and Miller, 1983; Leiter and Maslach, 1988; Mottaz, 1988). These studies try to link different organizational variables (involvement in communication networks, interpersonal environment, burnout, task characteristics, pay, promotional opportunities, social involvement, etc.) with organizational commitment.

The multivariate predictive framework is based on role and exchange theory. The role theory, as suggested by Katz and Kahn, 1966, argues that the context of role-taking is important for understanding how multiple factors influence organizational behavior. It also states that role expectations are determined by the technology of the organization, its policies, structure, and sets of rewards and penalties. Exchange theory, on the other hand, suggests a widely accepted paradigm in organization theory whereby organizations and their members are seen in an exchange relationship. Each party makes certain demands on the other while providing something in return. March and Simon (1958) characterized such an exchange in terms of organizational inducements and individual contributions. They pointed out that employees' contributions to the organization take two general forms which are production and participation. They also

described some important differences between the antecedents of an employee's decision to produce in contrast with antecedents of the decision to participate (Angel, & Perry, 1981). This commitment framework has been called the "organizational behavior approach" by Staw (1977).

The multivariate predictive models for the measure of organizational commitment represent a significant step towards the fulfillment of the need for a common theoretical framework from which predictor variables and outcomes can be derived which will then make it possible to build multivariate predictive models of various measures of organizational commitment.

These multivariate predictive models, according to Reichers (1985), retain some shortcomings that will need to be overcome in order to develop a more precise construct of organizational commitment and build new techniques for its measurement. Reichers points out several shortcomings of multivariate predictive models. First, some measures, such as the OCQ, include behavioral intentions that are supposed to be the result of commitment and not necessarily a part of the construct. For example, the consistent relationships found between commitment and turnover may in part be

artifactual. Therefore, future conceptualizations of commitment need to separate the construct from its effects. Second, some models lack an emphasis on the individual's own experience of being committed. Definitions and operationalizations of commitment seem always to evolve from reviews of the literature and hybridizations of previous definitions. Researchers have not asked subjects directly (or even indirectly) for their own perceptions and definitions of commitment. Thus, development and progress in commitment research should include an attempt to understand commitment from the standpoint of the committed. Therefore, there is a need for introducing the interview technique as one of the major methods of assessing organizational commitment. Third, the commitment literature of the past has not been focused on the nature of the organization in organizational commitment; rather the emphasis has been on intra-personal processes, such as attitude and attribution formation, or on individual-organizational relationships that was exemplified by the side bets approaches. An examination of the nature of the organization is lacking because it is the organization which is presumed to be the focus of the individual's commitment.

The Multiple Commitments Framework. To overcome these shortcomings, Reichers (1985) suggested the following reconceptualization of the organizational commitment construct. This reconceptualization was designed to integrate the individual's actual experience of commitment with the organizational aspects of the construct. This approach incorporated elements of the Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979, 1982) definition of commitment as an attitude, including the idea that identification with goals and values is the process through which commitments develop.

Reichers' (1985) reconceptualization of organizational commitment indicates that organizational commitment can be accurately understood as a collection of multiple commitments to various groups that comprise the organization. The theoretical framework for this conception was based on an organizational theory that saw organizations as coalitional entities, as reference groups and as role theory. These multiple identifications with various groups, both inside and outside the organization, constitute multiple commitments.

Some organizational theorists see organizations as coalitional entities that compete for the individual's energies, identifications, and commitments. These

coalitional entities and their constituencies espouse a unique set of goals and values that may be in conflict with the goals and values of other organizational groups. Thus the question: "What is the commitment of an individual?" cannot be satisfactorily answered with the response "organizational goals and values." Rather, specific groups and the goals of specific groups need to be identified, and these may then serve as the foci for the multiple commitments that individuals experience. Blau and Scott (1962) use the term "publics" to describe the various groups that benefit from organizational functioning. They distinguish four such groups of publics as 1) rank and file employees, 2) clients/customers, 3) top managers/owners, and 4) the public at large. This view portrays organizations as political entities in that various subgroups or coalitions lobby for the attention of an organization to their own vested interests and particular goals. It seems likely that employees in organizations are committed, in varying degrees, to several distinct sets of goals and values which may be those espoused by top management as well as those espoused by customers and other relevant publics.

Similarly, reference group theory and role theory depict the multiple identifications that individuals

experience and the conflicts that can result from them. Gouldner (1957, 1958) defined reference groups as those with whom individuals identify and to whom they refer in making judgments about their own effectiveness. Social roles are the reflection of an individual's identification with reference groups. It should be emphasized that "the organization", from this perspective, is for many employees an abstraction that is represented in reality by co-workers, superiors, subordinates, customers, and other groups that collectively comprise the organization. It has been suggested that the understanding of organizational commitment in its current, global sense may be enhanced by an attention to its multiple commitment components.

Several implications can be drawn from this reconceptualization of the concept of organizational commitment. First, a multiple commitments perspective strongly suggests that the commitment experienced by any one individual may differ markedly from that experienced by another. Second, the concept of a commitment profile is suggested as a way to capture all the foci and relative strengths of multiple commitments. Third, a multiple commitments approach could aid in organizational diagnosis and intervention procedures that could pinpoint

the strengths, and the presence or absence of particular commitments. This perspective allows for an examination of the effects of variations in organization structure on organizational commitment. This aspect, according to Morris and Steers (1980) has been largely overlooked in earlier research. The structural variables included in their study were: 1) decentralization (perceived participation in decision making), 2) formalization (the extent to which the employee was aware of written rules and procedures concerning their jobs), 3) supervisory span of control, 4) span of subordination which is the number of supervisors who initiate work for a given employee, 5) perceived functional dependence, and 6) work group size. Fourth, knowledge of the source(s) or type(s) of commitment that is largely responsible for an individual's investment in organizational membership may allow for the prediction of changes in commitment levels. This inability to explain variation in levels of organizational commitment was pointed out as one of the limitations of the former research devoted to organizational commitment (Morrow, 1983; and Randall, 1988). Fifth, to the extent that organizations pursue the conflicting goals of multiple constituencies, individuals who are committed to these constituencies may suffer from

conflicts over the direction that their energies and loyalties should take. Finally, the concept redundancy that has characterized organizational commitment may be decreased when commitment is conceptualized and measured as a multifaceted construct that possesses multi foci.

An analysis of these two conceptual frameworks (the multivariate predictive model and the multiple commitments model) of organizational commitment show that, in reality, we are not dealing with two opposite approaches but rather with two complementary perspectives that can be integrated. The outcome of this integration will provide us with the common and comprehensive theoretically-grounded framework that is needed to build predictive models of a particular measure of the organizational commitment construct.

### Summary and Conclusions

This overview of the conceptualizations of organizational commitment and their theoretical frameworks allows us to draw some general conclusions and suggest some implications for further research.

First, to date three different conceptualizations of organizational commitment have been proposed: 1) the side-bets approach, 2) the psychological approach, and 3)

the attributions approach. Each of these conceptualizations has developed its own measures of organizational commitment. Each one has its advocates who claim the usefulness of its concept and measures in the study of organizational commitment. An analysis of these three different approaches shows that each of them provides us with some interesting insights into the nature of organizational commitment. Even though some of them seem to be more accurate and comprehensive and thus to have more popularity, it is the contention of the researcher that an integration of all three of them is necessary and urgent in order to develop a more precise construct of organizational commitment and to build new techniques for its measurement.

Second, in order to develop a more precise and comprehensive construct of organizational commitment all these three perspectives should be given consideration. First, the side-bets (exchange) perspective which sees commitment as a matter of accrued investments that a person makes in the organization. Second, the psychological perspective which views organizational commitment as a three-component orientation consisting of 1) identification with the goals and values of the organization, 2) a willingness to focus strong effort

towards helping the organization achieve its goals, and 3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. And third, the attributions perspective which defines commitment as a binding of the individual to behavioral acts that results when individuals attribute an attitude of commitment to themselves after engaging in behaviors that are volitional, explicit, and irrevocable. Researchers, in the development of organizational commitment models, may have underestimated the complexity of the commitment process and therefore mistakenly undertaken the study of the concept from only one perspective.

Third, new theories are needed to give greater credibility to the theoretical background of organizational commitment. Since the results of previous research suggest that commitment may be composed of multiple elements, some of which may be causally or temporarily antecedent to other (Stevens, 1976), a theoretical framework for ordering the precedence of various forms of commitment may be a valuable approach to the building of a comprehensive theory of commitment. Such a theory would, ideally, specify the relationships between the elements or forms of commitment and their determinants. Conceptual guidelines are needed for the

development of hypotheses about the nature of such interactions. According to Stevens, Beyer and Trice (1978), commitment is a complex facet of organizational behavior that is only partially explained by existing theories. Therefore, a systems-oriented model that captures additional open-system factors such as socialization, interpersonal factors, the national economic situation, the existence of feasible alternatives for the individual, and the interrelationships of these factors is needed. Some of the questions that need to be answered, as was suggested by Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978), are: What are the various components of commitment that overlap, supersede, subsume, or complement, organizational or occupational commitment? How can they be adequately measured and compared? What are the valid behavioral or attitudinal indicators of these different types of commitment? What are the relevant kinds of commitment to organization, to occupation, to work-groups, and to industry? What are the organizational outcomes associated with the different kinds of commitment? To answer these questions a general theory of commitment is needed.

Fourth, the number of variables developed, as antecedents or outcomes of organizational commitment from the conceptualizations proposed, is considerable. However, the validity of some of these variables is questionable due to the fact that many of the studies that have developed them lacked a comprehensive set of influential variables. There is a need for a comprehensive model that includes individual factors, role-related factors, and the organizational factors. Studies that look at the different types of determinants of organizational commitment simultaneously are needed. The most immediate important thrust of future commitment research, as suggested by Morris and Sherman (1981), seems to be a concentration of effort on identifying the antecedent variables that have the greatest influences on commitment.

Fifth, there exists a need to develop a multiple commitments model measure of organizational commitment that integrates the three conceptualizations of commitment described above. The research conducted in this field has relied heavily on questionnaires that were developed from each of the conceptualizations suggested. It is apparent from the review of the literature that little effort has been made to develop suitable measures

of behavioral commitment. In an examination of the instrumentation utilized by researchers to operationalize organizational commitment, Barge and Schlueter (1988), found that the four most popular instruments were: 1) Mowday, Porter and Steers's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), 2) Cook and Wall's (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI), 3) Hrebiniak and Alutto's (1972) Organizational Commitment Measure (OCM), and 4) Cheneys's (1983) Organizational Identification Measure (OIM). Ferris and Aranya (1983) in another study examined and compared the Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, (1974) and the Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) instruments. They found that most of the measures used in the studies reviewed consisted of from two-to four item scales that had been created on an a priori basis and for which little or no validity and reliability data was presented.

### Commitment Research

The construct of organizational commitment has been researched extensively over the past two decades. These studies have demonstrated the relationships between commitment and several other organizational variables: 1) absenteeism (Steers, 1977; Larson & Fukami, 1984); 2)

leadership style (Morris & Sherman 1981), communication openness (Argyris in Housel & Warren, 1977); 3) job performance (Mowday, Porter & Dubin, 1974; Steers, 1977); and 4) turnover (Kom, Katerberg. & Hulin, 1979, Angel & Perry 1983). Most of these studies of the antecedents of commitment have focused primarily on structural, individual, and role-related variables (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Dornstein & Matalon, 1989). The results of this research stream have been, as Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) have pointed out, that organizational processes have been ignored as potential determinants of commitment. One of these organizational processes that has been ignored is communication and member satisfaction with organizational communication practices.

#### **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Recently the importance of communication in developing commitment has become a major theoretical issue. Some of the pioneer studies that have attempted to investigate the relationship between communication satisfaction and commitment are reported in this section.

Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) examined the relationship between Communication Relationship

Satisfaction (CRS) and Organizational Commitment in research conducted in a Singapore company with 122 white-collar chinese employees. The instruments used to measure CRS was the Organizational Communication Relationship (OCR) questionnaire developed by the International Communication Association (ICA) and Organizational Commitment was measured by the Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) scale. These authors reported the following findings. First, two factors of the four factors ICA-ICA instrument (Top Management and Supervisor Relations) were considered appropriate for this study, after factor analysis was conducted. Second, Pearson correlation analyses of these two factors and organizational commitment revealed that Top Management (.61), Supervisor Relationship (.38) and Global CRS (.54) had significant correlations with organizational commitment. The authors, based upon the results that emerged from the factor analysis of the research instruments, advised other researchers to be cautious when using research instruments in cross-cultural situations or applications. A comparative study by Sekaran's (1986) demonstrated that employees in different countries perceive, organize, and make sense of stimuli in the work place in different manners. Hofstede (1980)

suggested that culture molds the perceptions of individuals in such a way that their perceptual and cognitive structuring of similar stimuli may be different if the individuals are from different cultures.

Potvin's (1991) study addressed the relationship between Communication Satisfaction as conceptualized by Downs & Hazen (1977), and Commitment, as conceived by 1) Mowday, Porter & Steers' (1982) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), 2) Cook & Wall's (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument, 3) Hrebiniak & Alutto's (1972) Commitment Questionnaire, and 4) Cheney's (1980) Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ). The organizations participating in the study were a retail organization, a large Hospital, and a multi-national high technology organization located in the Dallas/Ft. Worth Metroplex and in Houston, Texas. A total of 490 subjects from these organizations were surveyed. The most important findings of Potvin's (1991) study were the following. First, she concluded that there was a definite positive relationship between communication satisfaction and employees' organizational commitment. The strongest correlations appeared between commitment composites and Communication Climate, and the lowest correlations were between commitment factors and

Organizational Perspective. The Subordinate Communication factor also produced fairly low correlations. Second, although it was found that the OCQ, the OIQ, OCI, and the Hrebiniak and Alutto scale are reliable measures, she concluded that care should be taken in comparing results from studies using different commitment instruments. Third, there were strong relationships between employee commitment and job satisfaction, and communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Finally, she concluded that the demographic variables seemed to have no explanatory power with regard to commitment levels. No significant differences in commitment levels were uncovered for 1) men vs. women, 2) managers vs. subordinates, 3) older vs. younger employees, 4) those with more education vs. those with less education, and 5) those with longer organizational tenure vs. those with shorter tenure.

Downs, A. (1991) studied the relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in two Australian organizations. The sample consists of 95 subjects (faculty and staff) of an institute of higher education and of 100 subjects from a manufacturing firm. Three instruments were combined for this research. 1) The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs and

Hazen, 1977) was used to assess communication. 2) The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982) and the Organizational Commitment Instrument (Cook and Wall, 1980) were used to measure organizational commitment. The main conclusions of this study follow. First, a positive relationship existed between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. Second, the exact relationship between communication dimensions and levels of commitment varied somewhat across organizations. Third, the relationship with Supervisors, Personal Feedback, and Communication Climate were the strongest communication predictors of organizational commitment. Fourth, the OCQ and OCI were strongly correlated, suggesting that they measure the same construct, nevertheless, they interact differently with the communication dimensions, Fifth, a composite score is appropriate when using the OCQ. Sixth, the theorized three factor structure of the OCI is not stable. A two factor solution occurred, but a composite score is also useful. Seventh, there exists a significant positive relationship between Job Satisfaction and Communication Satisfaction. Eighth, the use of COMSAT, OCI and OCQ in the Australian context is valid. Ninth, there are many similarities between the results found in the

study of Australian organizations and those found in the study of United States Organizations.

Up to the present time, a common characteristic of the studies conducted to explore the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment is that the communication variable have been constrained to an antecedent condition of commitment. Typically these studies correlate communication variables to commitment. This approach, according to Barge & Schlueter (1988, 131) "neglects the communicative nature of commitment and emphasizes the conception of commitment as a state of being versus a process". Therefore, these two authors suggest that a new theoretical and instrumental departure from current research is needed. This new approach should reconceptualize commitment as a process and incorporate communication strategies and tactics into organizational commitment measures.

#### **AN OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL SITUATION OF GUATEMALA**

Systems theory holds that the understanding of internal organizational activities requires an understanding of the factors that are external to it. The purpose of this section is to summarize the social,

economic, and political context in which the Guatemalan organizations operated.

### Guatemala Profile

Demographic data. Official Name: Republic of Guatemala; Capital: Guatemala City; Government: republic; Subdivisions: 22 Departments and Guatemala City; Land Area: 42, 042 square miles (108,889 square kilometers); Population: 9,200,000; Density: 199 per square mile; Currency: quetzal; Official Language: Spanish; Rate of Literacy: 51 percent (Johnson, 1991, pp 201; Ruch, 1989, p. 81).

The Land. Guatemala is a country located in Central America. This region consists of, in addition to Guatemala, four other nations that are El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. On the north, Guatemala shares a 575 mile border with Mexico. It has a seacoast of 200 miles on the Pacific Ocean and of 53 miles on the Caribbean Sea. The coastal areas have tropical climates and the inland area is mountainous with much land at sufficient altitude to have a moderate climate all year around (Johnson, 1991, pp. 201; Ruch, 1989, p. 81).

The People. Guatemala is largely Indian in language and culture. Fifty three percent of its population are pure Indians of 21 different groups that have descended from the Mayas. The other 43% of the population are a mixture of Spanish and Indian descent. Although an intense penetration of protestant denomination is taking place, most of the people are Roman Catholic and speak Spanish as well as one of 23 Indian languages. Distinct differences exist between the city and the rural dwellers. Approximately 80% of the rural Guatemalans and 40% of the urban residents are illiterate (Infopress, 1987, p. 142). The cities are generally influenced by European and American trends, while the small towns and villages have changed very little in their beliefs and life style since the days before Columbus discovered America (Ruch 1989, pp. 81-82).

A Brief History. The Mayans flourished in the territory that is now Guatemala for over a thousand years until it began to decline in the 1100s. From 1524-1821 Guatemala was a Spanish captaincy-general, comprising all of Central America. It became independent in 1821 and formed a part of the Confederation of Central America

from 1823 to 1839, when the Confederation was dissolved and Guatemala became an independent and sovereign republic. From that date the country has alternated between civil and military governments. A wave of terrorism alternately led by left and right groups began in 1967. In 1970 a fear of anarchy led to the election of an Army Chief of Staff as president. Military candidates were elected as constitutional presidents from 1970 to 1985, when a civilian presidency was restored by the election of Marco Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo, a left-of-center Christian Democrat. In the 1991 general elections, another civilian, Jorge Serrano Elias was elected president of the country. He leaded a coalition of different center political parties (Johnson, 1991, p. 201).

The Economy. In 1989 the work force was divided as follows: 31 percent agricultural workers, 13.2% manufacturing, 36.4% services, Trade, restaurants and hotels, 11.4; 2.1% construction, 3.2% transportation, 0.8% utilities, and 0.5 mining. In 1986, 45% of the work force was either underemployed or unemployed (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 1990, pp. 14-15). Only 10 percent of the work force is unionized. The principal

products of Guatemala are: coffee, cotton, bananas, cattle, corn, beans, sugar, oil, timber, and cardamom. The exports are mainly coffee, cotton, sugar, petroleum, and bananas, while the imports are manufactured products such as machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and fuels. The major trading partners of Guatemala are the United States, Central America, West Germany, and Mexico, and the Caribbean countries (Johnson, 1991, p. 201).

The Social Situation. A notable intensification of guerrilla-army conflicts, reports of tortures and disappearances, and a recent increase in acts of political violence are testimony to the magnitude of the political crisis that continues to wrench Guatemalan society. Along with this there has also been an increase in violence related to common crimes such as kidnappings, assaults, and robberies (Infopress, 1991).

#### SUMMARY

This chapter examined the theoretical and research literature in the areas of organizational communication satisfaction, organizational commitment, and relationship between organizational communication and organizational

commitment. It also described the social, economic, and political context in which the Guatemalan organizations operated. Chapter three describes the research instruments, the participating organizations, and the qualitative and quantitative data analyses used in this study.

## Chapter Three

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methodology used in this exploratory study. The information delineates the research instruments, the participant organizations, statistical and the content analysis procedures.

#### THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The research instruments used in this study were 1) the Downs (1990) Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ), 2) the Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), 3) the Cook and Wall (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI), and 4) the Downs and Varona (1990) Commitment Questionnaire (CQ).

#### The Downs Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ)

The "Communication Audit Questionnaire" is a revised form generated by Downs (1990) of the "Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire", which was originally developed by Downs and Hazen (1977). This instrument was designed to explore the relationship between communication and the outcome variable of job

satisfaction (Downs, & Hazen, 1977, pp. 63-73). Downs and Hazen determined that the communication satisfaction construct was multidimensional, having eight dimensions.

Structure. The actual structure of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire is as follows. Thirty five items (# 4 to # 38) ask about employees' satisfaction with various types of communications. Seven out of the eight factors correspond to this part of the instrument. Five more items (# 42 to # 46) ask about supervisors' satisfaction with some aspects of their subordinates' communications. Four items (#1, #2, #39, and #40) refer to the "end-product" variables. Two of them (#1 and #2) ask employees to indicate their degrees of job satisfaction and whether their level of job satisfaction has decreased, increased, or stayed the same over the past six months. Questions #39 and #40 are used to measure employees' productivity. Two questions (#3 and #41) are open-ended and seek to determine what types of communication changes could be made that would increase employee satisfaction and productivity. In the revision of the questionnaire Downs (1990) added ten more items (# 47 to # 56) for two new factors (Top Management Communication and Interdepartmental Communication). There

are items that may be used to ask demographic questions, such as the employees' education, age, tenure, and the department in which they work. Companies can add other questions to the survey in order to gather more information regarding a specific topic such as Media Quality, etc.

Response Format and Scoring. The 40 items which refer to communication satisfaction are scored on identical 7 point scale, with 1 being "very satisfied" and 7 being "very dissatisfied". There is also one job satisfaction which is scored on a 7 point scale with 1 being "very dissatisfied" and 7 being "very satisfied". The one "productivity on the job" item is scored on a 7 point scale with 1 being "very low" and 7 being "very high".

Communication Satisfaction Factors. The ten factors of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire are described by Downs (1977, 1990) as follows:

- 1) Organizational Perspective deals with the broadest kinds of information about the organization as a whole. It includes items on notifications about changes, information about the organizations' financial standing,

and information about the over-all policies and goals of the organization.

2) Personal Feedback is concerned with the need of the workers to know how they are being judged and how their performance is being appraised.

3) Organizational Integration revolves around the degree to which individuals receive information about their immediate environment. Items include the degree of satisfaction which employees experience with information about departmental plans, the requirements of their job, and some personnel news.

4) Supervisor Communication includes both the upward and downward aspects of communicating with superiors. Three of the principal items are the extent to which superiors are open to ideas, the extent to which supervisors listen and pay attention, and the extent to which superiors and supervisors offer guidance to their employees in solving job-related problems.

5) Communication Climate reflects communication about the organizational and personal levels. It includes items such as the extent to which communication in an organization motivates and stimulates workers to meet organizational goals and the extent to which it makes them identify with the organization. It also includes

estimates of whether or not peoples' attitudes toward communicating are healthy for an organization.

6) Horizontal Communication concerns the extent to which horizontal and informal communication is accurate and free flowing. This factor also includes satisfaction with the activeness of the grapevine.

7) Media Quality deals with the extent to which meetings are well organized, and written directives are short and clear, and the degree to which the amount of communication is about right.

8) Subordinate Communication focuses on upward and downward communication with subordinates. Only workers in supervisory positions respond to these items which include subordinate responsiveness to downward communication, and the extent to which subordinates initiate upward communication.

9) Top Management Communication evaluates the communication of top management with organization members. This factor includes items about top management attitudes towards openness to new ideas, caring, and willingness to listen.

10) Interdepartmental Communication deals with the communication that is needed between the different departments of the organization in order to facilitate

the efficiency of the organization. It includes items about problem solving, teamwork, and communication among managers.

Reliability assessment. Two types of reliability assessment support the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire:

1) Test-Retest Reliability. In order to test reliability, Downs and Hazen (1977,69) administered the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire to twenty subjects and then one week later it was readministered to these same subjects. The reliability coefficient obtained between the two administrations was .94.

2) Internal Consistency Reliability. A study by Crino and White (1981, 835-836) to examine the dimensional stability and the intrascale internal consistency of the Downs and Hazen instrument, produced two estimates of internal consistency for each subscale. The alpha coefficients were quite high, ranging from a low of .75 for Horizontal Informal Communication to a high of .86 for Personal Feedback. The average correlation among the subscale items were also considered "quite high" ranging from .38 for Horizontal Informal Communication to .54 for Personal Feedback.

3) Internal Consistency Reliability of the CAQ in the present study. The Cronbach Alphas obtained for the CAQ using the entire sample of this study were .97 for the CAQ, and for the factors the Cronbach Alphas ranged from a low of .64 for Horizontal Communication to a high of .92 for Top Management Communication (Table 5.1).

Validity Assessment. Downs and Hazen (1977, 65-71) applied both the construct validity and the discriminant validity test to the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire.

Construct validity. The original questionnaire of 88 items was administered to many organizations and the factors obtained were analyzed. The same process was used with the revised questionnaire of 46 items in order to compare the factor structures derived from each. The findings showed a great degree of stability among the factors. Crino and White (1981, 835), with some reservations, concluded that there was support for an eight factor solution.

Discriminant Validity. The results of item validity analyses, by Downs and Hazen (1977, 69-71) in the second

stage of the development of the instrument, revealed that 83 out of the 88 items discriminated significantly between "satisfied" and "dissatisfied" workers. All of the items which loaded significantly (.40 or above) on the communication satisfaction dimensions, discriminated significantly between "satisfied" and "dissatisfied" workers.

Evaluation of the Questionnaire. Some later evaluations of the original Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire by Clampitt and Downs (1987, 14-16) revealed: 1) the thoroughness of the construction of this satisfaction measure (Hecht, 1978, 363); 2) the reasonableness of an eight factor solution (Crino and White, 1981; Downs and Hazen, 1977; Wippich, 1983); 3) a proposal for the introduction of another factor: Top Management Communication by Pincus (1986); 4) proposals by Clampitt and Girard (1987) for two new dimensions: General Communication Effectiveness and Informal Communication. Clampitt and Girard suggested that certain factors may be unique to different types of industry.

Clampitt and Downs (1987, 23-25) concluded their study by pointing out some pragmatic and theoretical concerns that deserved closer attention: 1) the items for

the CSQ factors should be refined, 2) the theoretical nature of the factors needs to be further examined, and 3) The nature of "satisfaction" needs to be more fully explained.

Uses of the questionnaire. According to Greenbaum (1986) the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire was one of the two most popular instruments used to measure organizational communication during the eight year period, 1976-1983. During the later years of that time period the trend of research usage was towards increasing applications of this technique. Over the past twenty years more than twenty studies have used the communication satisfaction instrument to analyze organizational communication. These studies have been simple case studies and have focused on the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Table 2.1 contains some of the researchers, organizations, subjects, and national settings that have been used in these investigations.

## The Mowday, Porter, and Steers Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

The Mowday, Porter and Steers Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was developed in 1979 and is the most frequently used instrument for measuring organizational commitment. The OCQ measures a combination of employee attitudes and behavioral intentions reflective of the moral involvement of the employee with the organization (Barge & Schlueter (1988)). The OCQ is characterized by three dimensions: " 1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; 2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and 3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1979, p. 226). Responses to this 15-item OCQ were measured on a 7-point Likert-like scale, and the respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the items.

The OCQ has achieved acceptable levels of reliability and face validity and, in addition, its convergent and predictive validity were also found to be high (Barge & Schlueter 1988). Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) reported that after administered the OCQ to over 2500 employees of various organizations, the internal

reliability for the instrument was .90, and test-retest reliabilities have ranged from .53 to .75 over two to four month periods. The OCQ also achieved high levels of internal reliability: .90 for the entire sample in the Potvin (1991) study, and .89 for the Downs A. (1991) study. However, the internal reliability of the OCQ, for the entire sample used in this study, was not as high (.76) (Table 5.1).

#### The Cook and Wall Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI)

The Cook and Wall (1980) Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI) was designed for use with United Kingdom blue-collar employees. The three theoretical components of commitment that characterized this measure were identification, involvement, and loyalty (Barge & Schlueter (1988). The instrument consisted of nine items, with three items representing each theoretical component. The responses were based upon a 7-point Likert-like format. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the items.

The levels of reliability and face validity of this instrument were acceptable, but its convergent and predictive validity were found to be low (Barge &

Schlueter (1988). Cook and Wall (1980) reported a coefficient alpha of .79 for internal reliability in a sample of 390 subjects, and the test-retest reliability coefficient was .50. The OCI also achieved acceptable levels of internal reliability for the entire sample in the Potvin (1991) study (.83), and Downs A. (1991) study (.81). The internal reliability of the OCI, for the sample used in this study, was however low (.55) (Table 5.1).

#### The Downs and Varona Commitment Questionnaire

This Commitment Questionnaire of 20 items was developed by Downs and Varona (1990) to measure some aspects of commitment that were not included in the Mowday, Porter and Steers Questionnaire nor in the Cook and Wall Instrument. The first ten items assessed the impact of some antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment such as superior communication, coworkers' relationships, tenure, and work quality. They also evaluated the strength of other types of commitments such as those related to career, experience, and position. The last ten items evaluated the strength of some of the outcomes of organizational commitment such as loyalty, support for decisions, willingness to do extra work, and improved communication. The responses to this new set of

items were based upon a 7 point Likert-like format. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each of the items.

The internal reliability of this commitment questionnaire, for the sample used in this study, was .74 (Table 5.21).

### Translation of the Instruments

The first procedure required to initiate this study was a translation of the English version of the instruments into the Spanish language. The translation of the questionnaires from their original English versions into Spanish was carefully conducted using accepted procedures for intercultural research (Hofstede, 1980, pp. 34-35; Brislin, Lonner, & Thorndike, 1973, pp. 32-58). The description of these procedures were presented in chapter 1.

### Validation of the Instruments

To establish the reliability of the instruments for doing research in the Guatemala culture two strategies suggested by the literature on this issue were followed (Johnson and Tuttle 1989, 474). First, a pretest to determine if the instruments were reliable for Guatemalan

employees was conducted using a sample of Latin American subjects that were the closest available cultural group to the Guatemalan culture. As a result of this pretest some changes in the wording of the items were made to render the questionnaires reliable and valid for Guatemalan people.

### Administration of the Questionnaires

The questionnaires were administered to the Guatemalan employees in groups of 6 to 30 people who met together for this purpose in a room or in the place where they were working. The researcher explained to each group the characteristics of the questionnaire and the logistics of answering the different sections. The employees were then assured that their participation was completely voluntary and that their responses would be held in the strictest of confidence. They also were encouraged to participate and to do so in an honest manner because the results of the study would be used to improve the communication practices in their company. The respondents were invited to ask for help if the meaning of any of the questions was not clear and few of the employees did ask for help. The fact that some, but not

all, asked for help, was taken by the researcher as proof that the employees did understand the questionnaire.

### PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

Initially, contacts were made with the top management officials of several Guatemalan organizations by means of a letter that explained the specific purpose, procedures and benefits that organizations participating in this study might hope to obtain. The targeted organizations were Guatemalan organizations with an average of 100 or more members.

Several of the organizations contacted rejected the proposal for the reasons that in some cases the time suggested for conducting the research was not the best for their organization and in others that they did not see any usefulness in participating in this kind of research. Three organizations made a positive response to the research proposal. The final decision about whether or not to use these organizations for this study was made by the researcher after a personal contact had been made with the presidents of each of the organizations. The three selected were a school, a hospital, and a food factory located in Guatemala City.

## Organization 1: A School

Organization One was a private Catholic school for females that had been run by lay persons since its founding in 1905. The school was located in downtown Guatemala City and served 2,533 middle-class students. The faculty of 99 members consisted of 96 females and 3 males. All of these faculty members had a University degree or were in the process of earning one. The administrative staff of 18 people was made up of 15 women and 3 men. Maintenance personnel and bus drivers were not available to answer the questionnaires.

The school provided four levels of education: 1) pre-school education (2 years); 2) elementary education (6 years); 3) junior high education (3 years); and 4) senior high education with optional majors in: Pre-school teaching, Elementary school teaching, High school, Bilingual secretaries, and Accounting (3 years).

A total of 87 out of the 117 employees (74%) completed both questionnaires and a total of 25 employees (25%) answered the open question survey (19 teachers and 6 supervisors). Table 3.1 displays the distribution of the sample by departments and positions.

Table 3.1: Organization 1 (School) Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions

Departments	Supervisors	Subordinates	Totals
1. Pre-school	1	10	11
2. Elementary	2	29	31
3. Junior High	1	16	17
4. Senior High	2	19	22
5. Administration	1	5	6
-----			
Totals:	7	80	87

Organization 2: A Hospital

Organization Two was a private Catholic children' hospital founded and operated by the Guatemalan Archdioceses since 1985. The hospital was located in one of the neighborhoods of Guatemala City and served patients that were the children of poor families, without any distinctions based on religious creed. An average of three thousand children were served monthly by this hospital. It had a staff of 75 members, and their educational levels varied from physicians with medical degrees to clerical and janitorial workers who had not finished even elementary school.

The hospital had a General Director, an Administrative Director, and a Medical Director. The administrative department consisted of two sections: a) administrative services (budget and accounting, purchasing, and personnel); and b) supportive services

(laundry, kitchen, maintenance, and storage). The medical department included these services: a) diagnostic and treatment, b) medical, and c) general technical.

A total of 46 out of the 75 employees (61%) completed both questionnaires and a total of 17 employees (33%) 8 employees and 9 supervisors answered the open question survey. Table 3.2 displays the distribution of the sample by departments and positions.

Table 3.2: Organization 2 (Hospital) Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions

Departments	Supervisors	Subordinates	Totals
1. Administration	8	14	21
2. Medical Services	7	17	25
-----			
Totals	15	31	46

Organization 3: A Food Factory

Organization Three is a food factory which produces snack type foods such as cornchips, pork rinds, cheese balls, and wafers. These products were sold under the "Filler's" trade name or franchise, and were distributed in Guatemala and in other Central American and Caribbean countries. Since 1989 a Venezuelan consortium named POLAR has owned this company. While the headquarters of this consortium were in Caracas, the Guatemalan company

reports directly to the office of this consortium that were located in Miami. The managers and workers of this company were all Guatemalan.

Organization Three had a General Manager over the following departments: 1) Production, 2) Accounting, 3) Marketing, and 4) Human Resources. The Production department encompasses the production of snacks and wafers, and also kitchen, packing, maintenance, and warehouse operations. The factory had about 400 employees with a diverse range of educational background. The executives (3%) have the highest educational level with most of them holding university degrees. The majority of the people in the accounting, administration, and marketing/sales departments (18%) had some university studies. The maintenance and operational workers in the wafer production area (35%) had reached the Junior high school level of education. The employees working in the kitchens and in snack production and packing (36% of the population) had an educational level of elementary school or less.

A total of 177 out of the 400 employees (44%) completed both questionnaires and a total of 37 employees (9%) answered the open question survey (17 employees and

20 supervisors). Table 3.3 displays the distribution of the sample by departments and positions.

Table 3.3: Organization 3: Factory. Sample Distribution by Departments and Positions

Departments	Supervisors	Subordinates	Totals
1. Accounting	4	10	14
2. Marketing/Sales	8	25	33
3. Warehouse	2	6	8
4. Wafers	8	50	58
5. Packing	3	27	30
6. Kitchens	2	15	17
7. Maintenance	4	4	8
8. Human Resources	2	7	9
-----			
Totals:	33	144	177

Entire Sample Summary.

The entire sample for this study was a composite of the three organizations described above. Table 3.4 displays the distribution of the entire sample by organizations and by positions.

Table 3.4: Entire Sample by Organizations and Positions

Organizations	Supervisors	Subordinates	Totals
Org. 1 (School)	7	80	87
Org. 2 (Hospital)	15	31	46
Org. 3 (Factory)	33	144	177
-----			
Totals:	55	255	310

## DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis techniques which were used for this study are reviewed next. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to answer the research questions that were formulated for this study (Chapter 1).

### Quantitative Analysis

The data collected from the three Guatemalan organizations were entered into an "IBM 6000" computer and analyzed, utilizing the Statistical Computer Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 4.1) to perform the following statistical procedures.

Descriptive Statistics. Means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions were obtained for each item of the questionnaires both across all the organizations and within each of the organizations. These allowed the researcher, at a quick glance, to ascertain the frequency of responses. He could also see whether one of the responses was an overwhelming favorite or whether the responses were about equally divided between the possible choices.

Each of the items, in addition, was ranked, on the basis of means, from "most" to "least" satisfied for the Communication Audit Questionnaire. This same procedure was used to rank from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" for the Organizational Commitment Questionnaires. This procedure allowed the researcher to determine quickly the items that pointed to areas of relative strengths or weaknesses.

The factor scores for each of the communication dimensions and commitment dimensions were calculated from the means and ranked in order from "most satisfied" to "least satisfied" or from "strongly agree" to strongly disagree". This procedure allowed the researcher to determine quickly the factors that pointed to areas of relative strengths or weaknesses.

Evaluation of Instruments. To determine the internal reliability of each of the instruments used in this study, Cronbach Alphas were computed using the SPSS program RELIABILITY. Additionally, Cronbach Alphas were computed for each of the dimensions of Communication Satisfaction, and the Cook and Wall factors.

Factor Analysis. A factor analysis of the Communication Audit Questionnaire and of the organizational commitment instruments was performed. The purposes of this factor analysis were threefold: 1) to uncover possible underlying dimensions; 2) to discover how Guatemalan employees conceptualized the organizational commitment construct; and 3) to compare Guatemalan organizations with American and Australian organizations. In interpreting these dimensions, an item was considered to load on a factor if it had a loading of .5 or above on that factor and less than a .4 loading on all other factors.

Correlations. First, Pearson Correlations between the ten communication satisfaction factors and 1) Global Commitment (CAQ #40); and 2) tenure (Demographic #1) were obtained for the entire sample. This allowed the researcher to detect the degree of association (small, moderate, or large) between the ten communication satisfaction factors and the other organizational variables (Kenny, 1987, pp. 111-112).

Second, Pearson Correlations were also computed

using only the Organization 3 (Factory) sample to determine the relationship between:

a) Communication satisfaction dimensions and the Mowday, Porter, and Steers organizational commitment composite.

b) Communication satisfaction dimensions and the Cook and Wall organizational commitment composite and each of its commitment factors: Identification, Loyalty, and Involvement.

c) Communication satisfaction dimensions and the Downs and Varona organizational commitment composite.

d) Communication satisfaction dimensions and the other variables of: a) tenure (Demographic Q. #1), and b) Global Commitment (CAQ #40).

Finally, Pearson Correlations were computed using the entire sample to assess the relationship across communication satisfaction factors, and across commitment factors.

The Regression Analyses. For the purpose of the prediction of the effect of communication factors on commitment factors, the Stepwise Multiple Regression procedure was used excluding from the analysis the Subordinate Communication factor. This procedure was

considered appropriate because of the particular structure of the CAQ. This questionnaire had one factor called Subordinate Communication that consisted of five questions which were answered only by supervisors. For these regression analyses, the communication factors were treated as the predictor variable and the commitment factors as the dependent variable.

Regressions were first calculated across the Organization 3 (Factory) data to assess the prediction power of 1) each of the communication satisfaction factors, and 2) the communication satisfaction composite on the commitment composites and factors. These analyses were only performed across Organization 3 because in this organization the communication and commitment questionnaires were matched.

Regressions were also calculated across the entire data set to assess the prediction power of the communication satisfaction factors and the communication satisfaction composite on global commitment CAQ # 40.

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). To determine significant differences for the CAQ factors and for the commitment factors the following comparisons were made using the Anova Procedure.

First, organizations were compared on CAQ factors and commitment factors.

Second, tenure was compared on CAQ factors and commitment factors.

Third, more committed and less committed were compared on CAQ factors.

Fourth, more satisfied with communication and less satisfied were compared on commitment composites and factors.

Paired T-Tests were conducted to compare supervisors with subordinates on their levels of communication satisfaction and commitment.

### Qualitative Analysis

Responses to the self-administered open question survey were transcribed and content analyzed using the following procedures which were suggested by Kaid, and Wadsworth (1989, pp. 293-315). First, the categories to be applied to each question were defined. Second, a written coding instrument describing the categories to be used in analyzing the answers was constructed for use by the intercoder. Third, the responses were categorized by the researcher. Fourth, intercoder reliability was

determined. Finally, the results of the coding process were analyzed and reported in chapter four.

Defining Categories. For each interview question, categories and their units of analysis were formulated in an effort to make them as exhaustive and mutually exclusive as possible. The goal was to develop categories that were clear and free of confusion.

The types of categories developed for this study were subject matter categories or substance ("what is said") categories (Berelson (1952)). Theme analysis procedures were used to examine the responses to the self-administered open question survey with supervisors and subordinates. The content was organized according to the specific nature of the topics encountered in the responses. The unit of analysis for every set of categories was a thematic unit (recurring elements). The unit of enumeration, which is the way in which quantification was accomplished for each category and unit, was the frequency count.

The sets of categories generated in order to make the content analysis of the responses to the different questions were of two kinds. First, preset categories were used when it was apparent that the categories

previously developed matched to a great extent the topic of the question and the answers of the respondents. This was the case for most of the communication satisfaction questions. After a thorough analysis of the topics and responses of the communication satisfaction questions, it was considered suitable to use the ten communication satisfaction factors developed by Downs (1977, 1990). New categories were added to these communication satisfaction questions as needed to classify answers which did not fit the ten communication satisfaction dimensions previously adopted. Second, new sets of substance categories were developed for the questions on organizational commitment and managing organizational commitment. The strategy used to generate these new sets of categories was substantive coding (Glaser, 1973, pp. 56-58). Two main criteria were used to generate this new set of thematic categories: 1) categories had to emerge from the content of the actual responses given by the respondents, and 2) categories had to be relevant for integrating them into a theoretical framework.

Implementing the Coding Process. In order to be systematic and objective in the content analysis, a written coding instrument containing the categories to be

used in analyzing the responses was constructed for use in the coding operation. Each category was defined so that it would indicate the types of topics to be included. Based on this coding instrument, the researcher proceeded to content analyze the responses to each of the open questions.

Intercoder Reliability. To assess the reliability of the content analysis coding performed by the researcher the intercoder reliability procedure was used. The purpose of this procedure was to assure the accuracy and consistency of the coding process. To accomplish this procedure of assessing of the intercoder reliability, an experienced independent coder was selected. A training session was held with the coder during which the researcher explained the study and the coding instrument in detail. The final step of the training process was to have the coder individually code a representative sample of the content to be analyzed. Two goals were accomplished by this step: 1) to assess the intercoder reliability, and 2) to assess the ability of the coder to use the coding instrument. As a result of this training session some category definitions were revised and

modified to make them more exhaustive and mutually exclusive.

Prior to the implementation of the intercoding process, it was mutually determined by the researcher and the intercoder that a sample of 10% of the responses for each question was adequate representation for establishing intercoder reliability. A table of random numbers was used to select a representative sample of responses from each question for intercoding. Both of the coders separately categorized each response according to the sets of categories established for each question. The levels of agreement achieved between the work of the coder and the intercoder, were calculated by computing a simple percentage of agreement. All of these scores were at the 85% level or higher which indicated that the coders achieved an acceptable degree of objectivity, the categories were reliable, and that the coding rules were precise. The specific results for each question are reported in Chapter 4.

Content and Concurrent Validity. Content validity may be considered to be established when the inferences made by the researcher, on the results obtained for each interview question, are considered plausible and can be

proven so through corroboration with the results of other studies. Another argument for the validity of the content analysis may be based on the rationale of concurrent validity since the results of the content analysis portion of this study correlated with the results obtained by this study for the quantitative analysis on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. Moreover, content analysis results of this study also correlated with the results obtained by other studies on communication satisfaction, organizational commitment and managing organizational commitment, as these were reported in Chapter 2.

#### CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has described the research instruments used for gathering data, the procedures for administering the research instruments, the participating organizations, and the quantitative and qualitative analyses utilized in this study. The results of the qualitative analysis are presented in chapter four and the results of the quantitative analysis are presented in chapter five.

## Chapter Four

### QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter reports the results obtained through the self-administered open question survey that was conducted in the three Guatemalan organizations. Each of the three areas of Communication Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Managing Organizational Commitment that were investigated are individually reported and discussed in separate sections of this chapter.

#### THE SELF-ADMINISTERED OPEN QUESTION SURVEY

Two different forms of self-administered open question survey were used: one for supervisors and the other for subordinates. The survey content was organized into three sections: 1) Communication Satisfaction, 2) Organizational Commitment, and 3) Managing Organizational Commitment. The main difference between the two forms was that the supervisors' form included not only what was in the employees' form but also some additional questions that were aimed to evaluate the supervisors' perceptions of employees' behaviors and attitudes with regard to communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Appendix C contains the supervisors' and the subordinates' open question survey forms. The respondents were provided with the open question survey form and requested to respond by answering the open-ended questions individually and in writing.

Sample

A total of 77 subjects from the three Guatemalan organizations answered the self-administered open question surveys. Table 4.1 displays the sample of the self-administered open question survey by organizations and by positions.

Table 4.1: Sample of the Self-administered Open Question Survey by Organizations and by Positions

ORGANIZATION	SUBORDINATES		SUPERVISORS		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (School)	19	43	6	17	25	32
ORG 2 (Hospital)	8	18	9	26	15	20
ORG 3 (Factory)	17	39	20	57	37	48
-----						
TOTAL	44	100	35	100	77	100

The sample of the self-administered open question survey represented 25% of the sample that answered the questionnaires, with 64% the supervisors' sample and 19% of the subordinates' sample. This percentage is considered appropriate by researchers when interviews are

conducted to supplement and triangulate results obtained by questionnaires (Downs, 1988,65).

### The Coding System

The responses to the open question survey were transcribed and then they were content analyzed according to the rules presented in Chapter Three.

Chi Squares were performed across the responses that were content analyzed for each question to determine significant differences in responses among the organizations and between subordinates and supervisors.

## COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION

### Levels of Communication Satisfaction

Question # 1: How would you rate your level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization? was answered by both subordinates and supervisors. The supervisors also answered the additional Question # 7: How would you rate your subordinates level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization? A total of 44 subordinates and 35 supervisors from the three Guatemalan organizations

answered these questions and the results are summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Levels of Communication Satisfaction for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as Perceived by Supervisors. By Organizations Separately and by all of the Organizations Combined

SUBORDINATES

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (School)	4	21	14	75	1	5	19	43
ORG 2 (Hospital)	0	0	5	63	3	37	8	18
ORG 3 (Factory)	2	12	12	71	3	17	17	39
-----								
TOTAL	6	14	31	70	7	16	44	100

SUPERVISORS' PERCEPTION OF SUBORDINATES COM. SATISFACTION

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	1	17	4	66	1	17	6	17
ORG 2 (H)	1	11	6	67	2	22	9	26
ORG 3 (F)	2	10	14	70	4	20	20	57
-----								
TOTAL	4	11	24	69	7	20	35	100

SUPERVISORS

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	1	17	4	66	1	17	6	17
ORG 2 (H)	2	22	6	67	1	11	9	26
ORG 3 (F)	1	5	16	80	3	15	20	57
-----								
TOTAL	4	12	26	74	5	14	35	100

These results lead to two observations. First, most of the supervisors and subordinates had only average levels of satisfaction. Second, the Guatemalan

subordinates and their supervisors were similar in their levels of satisfaction with organizational communication practices; 70% of subordinates and 74% of their supervisors rated their levels of communication satisfaction as average. Third, the supervisors had a fairly accurate perception of their subordinates' levels of satisfaction with organizational communication practices; the supervisors' estimates of percentage of 12% high, 74% average, and 14% low for employees' levels of satisfaction with communication practices were similar to the actual employees' percentages of 14% high, 70% average, and 16% low. Fourth, no significant difference emerged among the organizations with regard to their employees' levels of communication satisfaction.

### Factors that Foster Satisfaction with Organizational Communication Practices

Question # 2: What are the major factors that foster your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization? was answered by both subordinates and supervisors. The supervisors also answered the additional Question # 8: What are the major factors that foster your subordinates' level of satisfaction with the

communication practices in this organization? A total of 66 separate responses including 26 by employees, and 40 by supervisors were coded into the analysis of these two questions.

The Content Analysis Categories for the  
Communication Satisfaction Questions

According to the procedures established in Chapter Three for category development, the ten communication satisfaction factors, as they were developed by Downs (1977, 1989), were considered as the appropriate set of categories for the communication satisfaction questions. The definitions adopted for these categories were the same ones given by Downs (1977, 1989) and they also were reported in Chapter Two of this study. However, four more ad hoc categories were added to those of Downs in order to classify those answers that did not fit into the ten communication satisfaction categories. These new categories were named and defined as follows.

1) Objective Achievement incorporated all the answers that explicitly mentioned the achievement of

personal or organizational objectives as a source of communication satisfaction.

2) Job Aspects contained all the job related aspects that were not included in the other categories, such as tenure, job security, and job performance.

3) Organizational Aspects consisted of all the organizational related aspects that were not included in the other categories, such as inappropriate organization of the personnel, the size of the organization, lack of coordination, organization mission, and organization activities.

4) Personal Aspects included all the individual characteristics that were not previously mentioned in the other categories, such as to communicate with people that is honest or have good education; the individual motivation and responsibility to communicate with others; and economic or family problems.

A intercoder reliability score of 91% was achieved for analyzing answers to these questions, and the results are summarized in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: Factors that foster Communication Satisfaction for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors**

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. ORG. PERSPECTIVE	0	0	0	0	2	6
2. PERS. FEEDBACK	1	3	2	7	1	3
3. ORG. INTEGRATION	1	3	0	0	3	8
4. SUPERVISOR COM.	9	26	2	7	11	32
5. COMM. CLIMATE	10	29	8	29	6	17
6. HORIZONTAL COM.	1	3	0	0	0	0
7. MEDIA QUALITY	0	0	1	4	2	6
8. SUBORDINATES COM.	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. TOP MANAG. COM.	2	6	3	11	1	3
10. INTERDEPART. COM.	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. OBJECTIVES ACHIEV.	1	3	2	7	0	0
12. JOB ASPECTS	4	11	3	11	4	11
13. ORGANIZAT. ASPECTS	2	6	4	14	4	11
14. PERSONAL ASPECTS	4	11	2	7	1	3
-----						
TOTAL	35	100	27	100	35	100

These data demonstrate that the major factors that foster satisfaction with organizational communication practices for Guatemalan subordinates were issues related to: Communication Climate (29%), Supervisor Communication (26%), Job Aspects (11%), and Personal Aspects (11%). These four categories accounted for 77% of the total responses. On the other hand, the major factors for Guatemalan supervisors were issues that were related to Communication Climate (29%), Organizational Aspects (14%), Top Management Communication (11%), and Job Aspects (11%). These categories accounted for 65% of the total responses. In comparing these results the following

observations are in order. First, subordinates and supervisors were similar in their perceptions of the factors that foster communication satisfaction. Both agreed that the issues related to Communication Climate, Communication with Superiors (Supervisor or Top Management), and Job Aspects were the most important ones. The issues reported as the main sources of communication satisfaction in the category of Communication Climate were good interpersonal relationships, and communications with clients, colleagues, and supervisors. In the category of Communication with Superiors (supervisor and top management) the topics included the superiors' willingness to listen, to trust, and to accept new ideas. The issues with regard to the category of Job Aspects were the nature of the work and the way the job was organized.

Second, the supervisors' perception of the major factors that foster employees' satisfaction with the organizational communication practices was close to the subordinates' perception. Their perceptions were the same for the three areas of Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Job Aspects.

## The Factors that Inhibit Satisfaction with Organizational Communication Practices

Question # 3: What are the major factors that inhibit your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization? was answered by both the employees and the supervisors. The supervisors also answered Question # 9: What are the major factors that inhibit your subordinate's level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization? A total of 68 separate responses were coded into the analysis of these two questions. These included 27 by subordinates and 41 by supervisors. The same fourteen categories developed for communication satisfaction and defined above were used for the content analysis of these responses.

An intercoder reliability score of 91% was achieved and the results of the analysis are summarized in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Factors that Inhibit Satisfaction with the Organizational Communication Practices for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors**

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. ORG. PERSPECTIVE	2	5	0	0	0	0
2. PERS. FEEDBACK	2	5	1	3	0	0
3. ORG. INTEGRATION	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. SUPERVISOR COM.	7	18	7	22	7	21
5. COMM. CLIMATE	7	18	9	28	14	43
6. HORIZONTAL COM.	0	0	1	3	1	3
7. MEDIA QUALITY	2	5	0	0	0	0
8. SUBORDINATES COM.	1	3	1	3	1	3
9. TOP MANAGEMENT COM.	0	0	4	13	3	9
10. INTERDEPART. COM.	0	0	4	13	1	3
11. OBJECTIVES ACHIEV.	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. JOB ASPECTS	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. ORGANIZAT. ASPECTS	7	18	0	0	1	3
14. PERSONAL ASPECTS	11	28	5	15	5	15
-----						
TOTAL	39	100	32	100	33	100

The major factors that constrained satisfaction with organizational communication practices for subordinates were the factors related to the categories of Personal Aspects (28%), Supervisor Communication (18 %), Communication Climate (18%), and Organizational Aspects (18%). These four categories accounted for 82% of total responses. The majors factors that inhibited satisfaction with organizational communication practices for the supervisors were the factors related to the categories of Communication Climate (28%), Supervisor Communication (22%), Personal Aspects (15%), Top Management Communication (13%), and Interdepartmental Communication

(13%). These categories accounted for 91% of the total responses.

These results prompted four observations. First, the subordinates and the supervisors again had similar perceptions of the factors that inhibited communication satisfaction. Both, the subordinates and the supervisors acknowledged that the problems related to the categories of Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Personal Aspects were the main source of communication dissatisfaction. The most common complaints in the category of communication climate were lack of communication, lack of participation in decision making, gossiping, and personnel with negative attitudes. The issues mentioned with regard to supervisor communication were lack of two-way communication between supervisors and employees, supervisors who did not trust their subordinates, lack of openness to new ideas and suggestions, and delays in finding solutions to the problems and needs. Some of the personal problems reported as inhibitors of communication satisfaction were lack of time to communicate, lack of honesty, and negative attitudes on the part of some of the members of the organizations.

Second, supervisors had an accurate perception of the major factors that restrained their subordinates satisfaction with the organizational communication practices. They agreed on three of the categories reported as being the principal sources of communication dissatisfaction for subordinates: Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Personal Aspects.

Third, in comparing the results of the factors that either foster (Q.#3) or inhibit (Q.#4) communication satisfaction, it was noted that the same issues were the sources of both communication satisfaction and communication dissatisfaction for Guatemalan employees. These findings seem to suggest that there were four main areas of concern for organizational communication in the three Guatemalan organizations that were studied. These areas were: 1) Communication Climate, 2) Superior Communication (Supervisors and Top Managers), 3) Personal Characteristics, and 4) Organizational Aspects.

### The Communication Satisfaction Impact on Organizational Commitment

Question # 4: Do you think that your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization has

any impact on your organizational commitment? A total of 44 subordinates and 35 supervisors of the three organizations answered this question and the results are summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Communication Satisfaction impact on Organizational Commitment for Subordinates and Supervisors for the Organizations Separately and Together

SUBORDINATES

ORGANIZATION	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	15	79	1	5	3	16	19	43
ORG 2 (H)	5	62	0	0	3	3	8	18
ORG 3 (F)	9	52	4	24	4	24	17	39
-----								
TOTAL	29	66	5	11	10	23	44	100

SUPERVISORS

ORGANIZATION	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	4	66	1	17	1	17	6	17
ORG 2 (H)	3	33	4	44	2	23	9	26
ORG 3 (F)	16	80	4	20	0	0	20	57
-----								
TOTAL	23	66	9	26	3	8	35	100

Most (66%) of both the subordinates and their supervisors believed that their satisfaction with organizational communication practices influenced their organizational commitment. Although no significant difference emerged between the subordinates and their supervisors, perhaps it is noteworthy that 26% of the supervisors compared to 11% of the subordinates were

emphatic in saying there was no connection between communication and commitment. No significant difference emerged either among the three organizations.

As part of question # 4, respondents were also asked to state how communication satisfaction impacts organizational commitment if they believe that it does so. Responses were given by 19 subordinates and 14 supervisors. These 33 responses were coded in the analysis of these two questions and the results are summarized in Table 4.6.

After a close analysis of these answers, it was apparent that responses were not dealing directly with the specific purpose of the question but rather were in reality pointing out issues related to organizational communication functions. Therefore, a new set of four categories were developed for the content analysis of these responses. Farace, Monge, and Russell (1977, pp. 76-77) classification and definitions of communication functions were adopted as the set of categories for this question because they seem to fulfill all of the conditions required for developing categories that were stated in Chapter Three. The four categories were defined as follows.

1) Communication Production related to communication that helped to improve performance and productivity by knowing what to do and how to do it.

2) Communication Innovation focused on communication involving the suggestion of new ideas for doing work, new types of work, and new procedures and policies that could improve the operation of the organization.

3) Communication Maintenance dealt with Communication that enhances the employee's sense of motivation and participation, or the nature and quality of interpersonal relations, or the identification with and loyalty to the company.

4) Miscellaneous was developed as the fourth category to include the responses that mentioned issues that were not related to the question, such as "I feel frustrated with the way people are treated in the different departments", "My commitment is based upon the kind of commitment they (supervisors) convey to me through being honest and role models."

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved for this question and results are reported in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: How Communication Satisfaction Impacts Organizational Commitment for Subordinates and Supervisors**

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		
	No.	%	No.	%	
1. PRODUCTION	7	27	14	70	**
2. INNOVATION	3	11	3	15	
3. MAINTENANCE	13	51	3	15	**
4. MISCELLANEOUS	3	11	0	0	
-----					
TOTAL	26	100	20	100	

\*\* = significant at  $p < 0.01$

Chi Square analyses demonstrated that supervisors were significantly different from subordinates in their perceptions as to how communication satisfaction impacts organizational commitment. The supervisors thought that it was through achieving the production functions of communication (70%), such as improving productivity and performance; but employees thought that it was through achieving the maintenance functions of communication (51%), such as improving interpersonal relationships, participation, and motivation. These findings seem to indicate that supervisors were more concerned with productivity than subordinates; and that the subordinates were more interested in relationships than were supervisors.

## Communication Satisfaction Defined

Question # 5: How do you define Communication Satisfaction? was answered by both the subordinates and the supervisors. A total of 40 separate responses (22 by subordinates, 18 by supervisors) were coded in the analysis of this question. The fourteen categories developed for communication satisfaction and defined above were used for the content analysis of these responses. An intercoder reliability score of 90% was achieved and the results of the analysis are summarized in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Communication Satisfaction Definition of Subordinates and Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. ORG. PERSPECTIVE	0	0	1	4
2. PERS. FEEDBACK	4	16	4	15
3. ORG. INTEGRATION	0	0	0	0
4. SUPERVISOR COM.	3	12	3	11
5. COMM. CLIMATE	18	72	15	57
6. HORIZONTAL COM.	0	0	0	0
7. MEDIA QUALITY	0	0	0	0
8. SUBORDINATES COM.	0	0	0	0
9. TOP MANAGEMENT COM.	0	0	0	0
10. INTERDEPART. COM.	0	0	1	4
11. OBJECTIVES ACHIEV.	0	0	3	11
12. JOB ASPECTS	0	0	0	0
13. ORGANIZAT. ASPECTS	0	0	0	0
14. PERSONAL ASPECTS	0	0	0	0
-----				
Total	25	100	27	100

The results displayed in this table indicate that the subordinates and the supervisors defined communication satisfaction in similar manners. Most of the subordinates' (100%) and supervisors' (85%) definitions mentioned issues that fell into three categories: 1) Communication Climate (72% of subordinates' responses, and 57 of supervisors responses), 2) Personal Feedback (16% of subordinates' responses, and 15% of supervisors' responses), and 3) Supervisor Communication (12 % of subordinates' responses and 11% of supervisors' responses).

Definitions in the category of communication climate were phrased as follows: "Communication satisfaction occurs when there is an interchange of ideas, appropriate channels, support, love, and mutual understanding", "Communication satisfactions is feeling comfortable talking with somebody else", "Communication satisfaction arises when the interchange of ideas is tranquil, honest, objective, clear, direct, on time, and a common agreement is reached".

Definitions emphasizing issues related to personal feedback were formulated as follows. Communication satisfaction occurs "when it is possible to communicate

positive and negative things and to have them accepted in a mature fashion", and "When there is advice, help, and constructive feedback".

In the category of supervisor communication, some of the definitions were: Communication satisfaction occurs when "there is dialogue and you are respected, listened and valued"; "When the points of view of myself and others are taken into account"; "When problems are solved and questions are answered".

It is apparent from these findings that Guatemalan supervisors and subordinates conceptualized the communication satisfaction construct more from a relationship perspective than from any other perspective. This means that for the supervisors and the subordinates the quality of the relationship that is involved in the communication process was the main source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Therefore, agreement, understanding, honesty, serenity, advice, help, support, listening, taking into account, and respect were the communication dimensions that were the most highly valued by supervisors and subordinates.

## Suggestions for Improving Communication Satisfaction

Question # 6: What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve communication? was answered by both the subordinates and the supervisors. A total of 46 separate responses (26 by subordinates, 20 by supervisors) were coded into the analysis of this question. The fourteen categories developed for communication satisfaction and defined above were used for the content analysis of these responses. An intercoder reliability score of 90% was achieved and the results are summarized in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Suggestions for Improving Communication Satisfaction given by Subordinates and Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBOR.		SUPER.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. ORG. PERSPECTIVE	2	4	0	0
2. PERS. FEEDBACK	0	0	1	2
3. ORG. INTEGRATION	1	2	0	0
4. SUPERVISOR COM.	5	10	3	8
5. COMM. CLIMATE	26	52	21	58
6. HORIZONTAL COM.	2	4	0	0
7. MEDIA QUALITY	3	6	4	11
8. SUBORDINATES COM.	0	0	0	0
9. TOP MANAGEMENT COM.	0	0	2	5
10. INTERDEPART. COM.	2	4	3	8
11. OBJECTIVES ACHIEV.	0	0	0	0
12. JOB ASPECTS	0	0	0	0
13. ORGANIZAT. ASPECTS	5	10	2	8
14. PERSONAL ASPECTS	4	8	0	0
-----				
TOTAL	50	100	36	100

The results in this table indicate that the subordinates (52% of the responses) and the supervisors (58% of the responses) acknowledged that issues related to the Communication Climate category, such as workshops about human relations, motivation, and communication were the most needed actions to be taken to improve communication in their organizations. Another area of agreement was the need to improve Supervisor Communication, 10% of the subordinates' responses chose it as did 8% of the supervisors. These responses mentioned that the supervisors needed to interact more frequently with their employees, listen and respect their suggestions, and provide more direct feedback concerning these suggestions. A final area of consensus was the need to improve some Organizational Aspects (10% of the subordinates responses, and 8% of the supervisors responses), such as better work schedules, provide technical training, establish a reward system, and unify systems of operation for the whole organization.

## ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

### Levels of Organizational Commitment

Question # 1: How would you rate your level of commitment to this organization? was answered by both subordinates and supervisors. In addition, the supervisors also answered Question # 6: How would you rate your subordinates' level of commitment to this organization? A total of 44 subordinates and 35 supervisors for the three Guatemalan organizations answered these questions. Results are summarized in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Levels of Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, Supervisors, and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors. Presented Separately by Organizations and Combined

SUBORDINATES

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	13	68	6	32	0	0	19	43
ORG 2 (H)	3	37	5	63	0	0	8	18
ORG 3 (F)	10	59	7	41	0	0	17	39
-----								
TOTAL	26	59	18	41	0	0	44	100

SUPERVISORS' PERCEPTION OF SUBORDINATES COMMITMENT

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	0	0	6	100	0	0	6	17
ORG 2 (H)	2	22	5	56	2	22	9	26
ORG 3 (F)	3	15	17	85	0	0	20	57
-----								
TOTAL	5	14	28	80	2	6	35	100

SUPERVISORS

ORGANIZATION	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ORG 1 (S)	6	100	0	0	0	0	6	17
ORG 2 (H)	4	44	5	56	0	0	9	26
ORG 3 (F)	14	70	6	30	0	0	20	57
-----								
TOTAL	24	69	11	31	0	0	35	100

Three observations about these results seem appropriate. First, all the Guatemalan subordinates and supervisors surveyed expressed their commitment to their organizations with a significant percentage of them (59% of the subordinates and 69 % of the supervisors) indicating a high level of commitment. Second, no

significant difference emerged between the subordinates and their supervisors, and among the three organizations with regard to their levels of commitment. Third, Chi Square analyses demonstrated that there was a significant difference, at the .01 level of confidence, as to how supervisors perceived their subordinates' organizational commitment level of commitment. In fact, supervisors perceived their subordinates as being less committed than the subordinates actually said they were.

#### Factors that Foster Organizational Commitment

Question # 2: What are the major factors that foster your organizational commitment? was answered by both the subordinates and the supervisors. The supervisors also answered Question # 8: What are the major factors that foster your subordinates' level of organizational commitment? Of the total of 87 separate responses coded into the analysis of these two questions, 26 were by subordinates and 61 by supervisors.

#### Coding Categories

According to the rules established in Chapter Three for generating categories, new sets of thematic

categories were developed for the questions about organizational commitment since no preset categories were found that fit the content of the answers. The two main criteria used to generate this new set of thematic categories were: 1) categories emerged from the content of the actual responses given by the respondents, and 2) categories that were appropriate for integrating the themes of the responses into a viable theoretical framework.

Based on the above rules the following set of categories was developed for use in content analyzing the responses on the major factors that fostered organizational commitment.

1. Career Commitment included all of the answers mentioning commitment to the career as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

2. Mission Commitment consisted of all of the answers reporting the mission and objectives of the organization along with the people they served as the factors that fostered organizational commitment.

3. Personal Needs contained all the responses indicating commitment to one's self or to one's own family as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

4. Higher Goals embraced all of the answers manifesting commitment to God /or to country, as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

5. Trust and Participation encompassed all of the answers displaying trust and participation as the factors that fostered organizational commitment.

6. Work Ethic included all of the answers that mentioned willingness to do a good job (dedication, responsibility, honesty) as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

7. Organizational Loyalty entailed all of the answers reporting the desire of helping the organization as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

8. Economic Incentives involved all of the answers that stated that salary or other economic rewards were factors that fostered organizational commitment.

9. Tenure incorporated all of the answers that reported the length of time spent working for the organization as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

10. Commitment to Superiors incorporated all of the answers alluding to the willingness to do something for their superiors or supervisors as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

11. Good Communication/Relationships encompassed all of the answers manifesting that good communication and relationships with supervisors and/or coworkers as factors that fostered organizational commitment.

12. Positive Feedback consisted of all of the answers stating that gratitude or other forms of positive feedback was the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

13. Job Security included all of the answers that reporting job stability as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

14. Job Position incorporated all of the answers referring to the status of holding a certain job as the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

15. Result Achievement contained all of the answers manifesting that the achievement of specific results was the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

16. Job Promotion included all of the answers indicating that advancement in position was the factor that fostered organizational commitment.

An intercoder reliability score of 80% was achieved and the results are summarized in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Factors that Foster Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, and for Supervisors; and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. CAREER COMMITMENT	3	4	2	4	0	0
2. MISSION COMMITMENT	17	24	4	8	1	2 *
3. PERSONAL NEEDS	10	14	4	8	2	4
4. HIGHER GOALS	5	7	5	9	1	2
5. TRUST/PARTICIPAT.	1	1	1	2	6	12
6. WORK ETHIC	14	20	14	27	10	20
7. ORGAN. LOYALTY	9	12	7	13	7	14
8. ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	2	3	5	9	9	18
9. TENURE	1	1	1	2	1	2
10. COMMIT. TO SUPERIOR	1	1	1	2	2	4
11. COMMUNI./RELATIONS	5	7	1	2	8	16
12. POSITIVE FEEDBACK	1	1	2	4	0	0
13. JOB SECURITY	1	1	1	2	0	0
14. JOB POSITION	3	4	3	6	0	0
15. RESULT ACHIEVE.	0	0	1	2	0	0
16. JOB PROMOTION	0	0	0	0	3	6
-----						
TOTAL	73	100	52	100	50	100

\* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

The results of this table show that 16 different categories emerged as themes that seemed to have motivated organizational commitment for Guatemalan subordinates and supervisors. Chi Square analyses demonstrated that the supervisors and the subordinates were significantly different, at the .05 level of confidence, on the mission commitment factor. In fact, commitment to the organization mission was a more important factor for the subordinates than was for the supervisors.

Close examination of the nature of these categories made it apparent that all of them could be sorted out into three broad themes according to the locus of their motivation. These three umbrella dimensions were:

1) Personal Motivators included those themes in which the source of motivation originated in the individual, such as work ethic, career commitment, mission commitment, personal needs, and higher goals.

2) Organizational Motivators encompassed those categories whose source of motivation was generated from organizational characteristics, such as organizational loyalty, tenure, job security, job position, job promotion, result achievement, and economic incentives.

3) Relational Motivators which referred to the categories that had as their main source of motivation relational aspects, such as trust and participation, commitment to the supervisor, communication/relationships, and positive feedback.

The results of this content analysis are reported in tables 4.11.

Table 4.11: Factors that Foster Organizational Commitment for Subordinates, and for Supervisors; and for Subordinates as perceived by Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Personal Motivators	49	67	30	58	21	42 **
2. Organiz. Motivators	16	22	17	32	18	36
3. Relatio. Motivators	8	11	5	10	11	22
-----						
TOTALS	73	100	52	100	50	100

\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

First, the subordinates and the supervisors were similar and consistent in reporting that Personal Motivators were by far the greatest promoters of organizational commitment. They accounted for 67% of the subordinates' responses and 58% of the supervisors' responses. The main motivators reported in this category were: 1) the pleasure of serving those who benefit from one's work such as students, patients, and clients, 2) a strong sense of responsibility and dedication to work, and 3) the desire for self actualization and career advancement.

Second, both the subordinates with 22% of their responses and their supervisors with 32 % of their responses were also consistent in reporting Organizational Motivators as a second category of factors that motivated organizational commitment. The topics most frequently mentioned this category were: 1) a sense of

loyalty for the organization, 2) job security, and 3) economic incentives.

Third, the Relational Motivators category contained 11% of subordinates' responses and 10% of supervisors' responses. The issues reported here as motivators were: 1) the trust provided by superiors, 2) good communication with supervisors and coworkers, and 3) the positive feedback provided by supervisors and clients.

Chi Square analyses demonstrated that the supervisors' perception of factors that fostered subordinates' organizational commitment was significant difference, at the .01 level of confidence, from what the subordinates reported with regard to personal motivators. Subordinates, in fact, emphasized more the personal motivators than the supervisors perceived.

### Factors that Inhibit Organizational Commitment

Question # 3: What are the major factors that inhibit commitment in your organization? was answered by both the subordinates and the supervisors. The supervisors also answered Question # 8: What are the major factors that inhibit your subordinates' organizational commitment? A total of 87 separate

responses (21 by subordinates, and 48 by supervisors) were coded into the analysis of these two questions.

Following a close examination of the responses provided by the respondents, it was concluded that the same sixteen categories used for the factors that fostered organizational commitment were suitable for use in the content analysis of this question. However, it was then found necessary to develop four more categories to code the responses that did not fit into any of the previously developed sixteen categories. The additional four categories were:

1. None included all of the answers that explicitly mentioned that there was no factor that inhibited organizational commitment.

2. Other Occupations contained all of the answers that reported that other occupations outside the job as constraining factors on organizational commitment.

3. Organizational Practices consisted of all of the answers that stated that specific organizational practices or norms restrained organizational commitment, such as lack of task definition.

4. Time incorporated all of the answers that specifically mentioned that lack of time was a hampering factor for organizational commitment.

An intercoder reliability score of 86% was achieved for this analysis and the results are summarized in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12: Factors that Inhibit Organizational Commitment for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors**

CATEGORIES	SUBOR.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. CAREER COMMITMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. MISSION COMMITMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. PERSONAL NEEDS	1	2	4	12	2	6
4. HIGHER GOALS	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. TRUST/PARTICIPAT.	0	0	3	9	5	15
6. WORK ETHIC	0	0	0	0	2	6
7. ORGAN. LOYALTY	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	4	10	1	3	6	16
9. TENURE	0	0	0	0	1	3
10. SUPERVISOR COMMUNI.	1	2	1	3	2	6
11. COMMUNI./RELATIONS	8	17	8	23	5	15
12. FEEDBACK	7	15	2	6	2	6
13. JOB SECURITY	1	2	0	0	1	3
14. JOB POSITION	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. RESULT ACHIEVE.	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. JOB PROMOTION	0	0	1	3	0	0
17. OTHER OCCUPATIONS	2	4	1	3	2	6
18. NONE	15	33	11	31	3	9
19. ORGAN. PRACTICES	6	13	2	6	3	9
20. TIME	1	2	1	6	0	0
-----						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>

Twenty different categories emerged as things which discouraged organizational commitment. It was determined, after a close review of the nature of these categories, that all of them could be classified into three broader dimensions according to the origin of the inhibitor.

1. Personal inhibitors included those categories in which the source of restriction originates in the individual, such as the work ethic, career commitment, mission commitment, personal needs, and higher goals.
2. Organizational inhibitors encompassed those categories whose source of restraint was generated by organizational characteristics, such as loyalty, tenure, job security, job position, job promotion, results achievement, and economic incentives.
3. Relational inhibitors referred to the categories that had the main source of constraint in relational aspects, such as trust and participation, commitment to supervisor, communication/relationships, and feedback.
4. None inhibitors included all of the answers that explicitly mentioned that there was no factor that inhibited organizational commitment.

The results of this content analysis are displayed in table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Factors that Inhibit Organizational Commitment for Employees, for Supervisors, and for Employees as perceived by Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		SUB. BY SUP.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Personal Inhibitors	4	9	6	17	6	17
2. Organiz. Inhibitors	11	24	4	11	11	32
3. Relatio. Inhibitors	16	35	14	40	14	40
4. None Inhibitors	15	32	11	31	3	10
-----						
TOTALS	46	100	35	100	34	100

These results show the following. First, the subordinates and the supervisors were similar and consistent in reporting Relational inhibitors as the main factors that discouraged organizational commitment. They accounted for 35% of the subordinates' responses and 40% of the supervisors' responses. The main inhibitors reported in this category were: 1) lack of communication, 2) lack of appreciation or positive feedback, and 3) lack of trust.

Second, the subordinates and their supervisors were also consistent in reporting that there were no factors that constrained organizational commitment. This response appeared in 32% of the subordinates responses and 31% of the supervisors responses.

Third, Organizational inhibitors were reported as the third category with 24% of subordinates' responses and 11% of supervisors' responses. The topics most frequently mentioned under this category were: 1) low salaries, 2) unequal treatment of employees, and 3) a lack of common goals at the administration level.

Finally, in fourth place was the Personal inhibitors category with 9% of the subordinates' responses and 17% of their supervisors' responses. The issues reported here

as inhibitors were: 1) lack of interest (apathy), 2) lack of time, and 3) other occupations.

It is worth noting that the supervisors' perception of factors that inhibited their subordinates' organizational commitment was close to what the employees themselves reported. No significant difference emerged between supervisors and subordinates.

### Organizational Commitment Defined

Question # 4: How do you define Organizational Commitment? was answered by both the subordinates and the supervisors. Responses from 19 by the subordinates and 15 by the supervisors were coded into the analysis of this question.

### Coding Categories

The coding categories for this question were defined after a thorough review of 1) the literature on the conceptualization of organizational commitment and 2) the content of the answers provided by the respondents. The following sets of typologies of organizational commitment were developed as the most appropriate for

representing the actual responses and for integrating them into a theoretical framework.

1. The psychological approach included all of the responses that defined organizational commitment as an attitude towards an organization, which consisted of identification with the goals and values of the organization, willingness to help the organization achieve its goals, and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Porter, and Steers 1979).

2. The exchange approach contained all of the responses that defined organizational commitment as a function of the rewards and costs associated with organizational membership (Alutto, Hrebiniak, and Alonso 1973) .

3. The Work Ethic approach consisted of all of the answers that described organizational commitment as the willingness to do a good job by giving the best of oneself and being responsible for the performance of that job.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14: Organizational Commitment Definitions of Subordinates and Supervisors**

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Psychological Approach	20	45	14	45
2. Exchange Approach	6	14	1	3
3. Work Ethic Approach	18	41	16	52
-----				
TOTAL	44	100	31	100

The Guatemalan subordinates and supervisors conceptualized organizational commitment from two major perspectives: 1) the psychological perspective with 45% of the subordinates and supervisors' responses and 2) the work ethic perspective with 41% of subordinates' responses and 51% of supervisors' responses. A third perspective that emerged, although not strongly, was the exchange perspective (14% of subordinates' responses and 3% of supervisors' responses). No significant difference emerged between subordinates and supervisors.

Definitions from the "psychological perspective" were formulated in terms of "feeling" part of an organization, contributing to organization development, identifying with organizational goals and philosophy, or following the organization norms. Conceptualizations from the "work ethic" perspective were phrased in terms of willingness to give the best of oneself in order to do a good job or to be responsible in the performance of the

job. Definitions in the category of the "exchange perspective" were expressed in terms of a bilateral contract of rights and obligations that had developed between employees and the organization in order to achieve both parties' objectives, or the willingness to do a good job in exchange for one's salaries.

These findings led to the conclusion that the Guatemalan employees viewed organizational commitment as a multidimensional concept encompassing employees' willingness: 1) to identify with the organization's mission and contribute to its development, 2) to give their best in order to do a good job, and 3) to perform some obligations as an exchange for getting some economic and social benefits.

These findings corroborate to some extent the conclusions reported by other studies in the literature review on organizational commitment (Chapter Two). In fact the psychological and exchange perspectives have been widely reported by several scholars (Mowday, Porter and Steers 1982, 19-28). The strength with which the work ethic dimension has emerged in this study is new in these findings. Based on these results, it is evident that the work ethic was a major dimension of organizational commitment for Guatemalan employees. These findings

challenged the research trends that have treated the work ethic as a form of work commitment that is different from organizational commitment (Morrow, 1983). However, since these findings cannot be considered conclusive because of the exploratory nature of this study, this issue will remain open for further research.

### Suggestions for Improving Organizational Commitment

Question # 5: What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve organizational commitment? was answered by 22 subordinates and 24 supervisors for a total of 46 separate responses to be coded in the analysis of this question.

Based upon the rules established in Chapter Three, the following new set of thematic categories emerged from a close examination of the responses given to this question.

1. Motivation included all of the answers that suggested that more motivation is needed to encourage organizational commitment.

2. Economic Incentives contained all of the answers that reported better salaries or other types of rewards.

3. Interdepartmental Communication focused on communication exchanges among the different departments in an organization.

4. Supervisor Communication related to the two-way vertical communication exchanges that subordinates have with their superiors.

5. Trust and Participation included all of the answers that alluded to trust and participation as the way to improve organizational commitment.

6. More Discipline consisted of all of the answers that stated that more discipline was needed.

7. Top Management Communication related to the two way vertical communication exchanges that top management had with their subordinates.

8. Communication/Relationships involved general attitudes toward company communications.

9. Personal Aspects contained all of the answers that indicated the need for giving consideration to the personal characteristics of employees.

10. Organizational Aspects included all of the organizationally related aspects that were not included in the other categories, such as personnel organization, the size of the organization, and coordination.

11. Nothing incorporated all of the answers that explicitly mention "nothing".

12. Miscellaneous consisted of all of the answers that mentioned issues that were not included in any of the above categories.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and the results are summarized in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Suggestions for Improving Organizational Commitment as Given by Subordinates and Supervisors

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		
	No.	%	No.	%	
1. MOTIVATION	13	24	0	0	**
2. ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	13	24	9	31	
3. INTERDEPART. COM.	1	2	0	0	
4. SUPERVISOR COM.	4	7	0	0	
5. TRUST/PARTICIPATION	5	9	1	3	
6. MORE DISCIPLINE	4	7	0	0	
7. TOP MANAG. COM.	2	4	1	3	
8. COMMUNICATION/RELATIONS	6	10	4	14	
9. PERSONAL ASPECTS	4	7	1	3	
10. ORGANIZAT. ASPECTS	2	4	8	28	
11. NOTHING	1	2	3	10	
12. MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	2	7	
-----					
TOTAL	55	100	29	100	

\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

First, the subordinates and the supervisors agreed that to improve economic incentives (24% of subordinates' responses and 31% of supervisors' responses), and communication and interpersonal relationships (10% of subordinates' responses and 14% of supervisors'

responses) were the most needed strategies to encourage the employees' organizational commitment.

Second, Chi Square analysis demonstrated that the subordinates and their supervisors were significantly different, at the .01 level of confidence, as to the need of more motivation in order to encourage organizational commitment. Only the subordinates (24%) suggested that more motivation was needed.

In summary, the most needed strategies to encourage organizational commitment were, for subordinates, more motivation and the enhancement of economic incentives; and for supervisors, the enhancement of economic incentives and organizational changes.

## MANAGING ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

### Important Things in this Organization for Commitment

Question # 1: What is important to you in this organization to be committed to? A total of 38 separate responses with 50% each for subordinates and supervisors were coded in the analysis of this question.

After a thorough inspection of the responses given to this question and with reference to the coding rules

set forth in Chapter Three, the set of categories that was judged to be the most appropriate for the content analysis of this question was the set of categories developed for factors that foster organizational commitment.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and the results are summarized in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Important things in this Organization for Subordinates and for Supervisors to be Committed to

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. CAREER COMMITMENT	1	2	2	7
2. MISSION COMMITMENT	23	53	10	34
3. PERSONAL NEEDS	2	5	1	3
4. HIGHER GOALS	1	2	2	7
5. TRUST/PARTICIPAT.	1	2	0	0
6. WORK ETHIC	3	7	3	10
7. ORGAN. LOYALTY	3	7	3	10
8. ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	3	7	1	3
9. TENURE	0	0	0	0
10. COMMIT. TO SUPERIOR	2	5	0	0
11. SUPERVISOR COMMUNI.	0	0	0	0
12. COMMUNI./RELATIONS	0	0	0	0
13. POSITIVE FEEDBACK	0	0	0	0
14. JOB SECURITY	4	9	4	13
15. JOB POSITION	0	0	0	0
16. RESULT ACHIEVE.	0	0	3	10
17. JOB PROMOTION	0	0	0	0
18. MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	1	3
-----				
TOTAL	43	100	30	100

First, both the subordinates (53%) and the supervisors (34%) acknowledged that the most important dimension of their organizations for them to be committed

to was its Mission. These results revealed that a strong sense of mission characterized the employees of all of the three organizations. The major focus of their commitment was to serve the Guatemalan people by providing them with a good education, health, or food. This strong sense of mission was most evident in the responses of the school and hospital employees and less so in the responses of the factory employees. This might be explained by the different nature of the organizations. The school and the hospital were Catholic institutions with a management style that distinctly promoted a religious motivation. A certain sense of mission also pervaded the factory employees as a result of a recently implemented management strategy that had been aimed to foster the idea of serving people through the production of food. To inculcate this goal an organizational creed and song has been created.

Second, subordinates (9%) and supervisors (13%) agreed that the another important focus of their commitment was to have a job that was stable. It is understandable, in a country like Guatemala where more than 40% were unemployed or underemployed, that job security was the second major focus of their commitment within the organizational context.

Third, some employees and the supervisors also recognized that to do a good job ( the Work Ethic) and the performance of the organization (Organizational Loyalty) were important targets of their organizational commitment.

### How Supervisors Communicate What Is Important

Question # 2: How do supervisors communicate to their employees what they believe it is important for the organization to be committed to? A total of 19 separate responses (11 by employees, and 9 by supervisors) were coded into the analysis of this question.

Based upon the rules established in Chapter Three, the following new set of thematic categories emerged from a close examination of the responses given to this question.

1. Meetings involved any answer that reported that meetings, workshops, and other forms of group communication were the means used by supervisors to communicate what was important in the organization.

2. Individual Talks contained all of the answers that alluded to individual talks and other forms of interpersonal communication.

3. Memos included references to memos and other forms of written communication.

4. Role Modeling encompassed all of the answers that indicated personal example and responsibility in job performance.

5. Appropriate Communication involved the quality of the communication used by supervisors, communication that was clear and precise, and communication that took into account the capabilities of the employees.

6. Do not Know consisted of all of the answers that explicitly mentioned that the managers did not know how to communicate what was important about the organization.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: How Supervisors Communicate What Is Important. Subordinates and Supervisors Perceptions

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. MEETINGS	17	40	14	34
2. INDIVIDUAL TALKS	7	16	17	42 *
3. MEMOS	11	26	7	17
4. ROLE MODELING	1	2	3	7
5. APPROPRIATE COM.	5	12	0	0
6. DON'T KNOW	2	4	0	0
-----				
TOTAL	43	100	41	100

\* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

These results revealed that both subordinates and supervisors agreed that Meetings, Individual Talks, and Memos were the most common forms of communication used by supervisors to convey important information about the organization. Chi Square analyses demonstrated that supervisors and subordinates were significantly different, at the .05 level of confidence, on Individual Talks. In fact, supervisors (42%) reported significantly more the use of individual talks than did subordinates

### Typical Behaviors of Low Committed Employees

Question # 3: What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with low level of organizational commitment?. A total of 32 separate responses (17 by employees, and 15 by their supervisors) were coded into the analysis of this question.

1. Tardiness was the category for any answer that explicitly reported tardiness.
2. Lack of Work Ethic referred to some forms of low level of job performance or irresponsibility.
3. Absenteeism indicated levels of absenteeism.
4. Lack of Trust and Participation alluded to a lack of participation and trust.

5. Bad Communication and Bad Relationships suggested inappropriate forms of communication, gossiping, or negative relationship attitudes.

6. Lack of Loyalty referred to some forms of disloyal behaviors to the organization.

7. Miscellaneous included other negative behaviors not included in the above categories, such as undiscipline or dissatisfaction.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.18.

Table 4.18: Typical Behaviors of Low Committed Employees. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. TARDINESS	4	9	4	9
2. LACK OF WORK ETHIC	17	41	11	24
3. ABSENTEEISM	1	2	4	9
4. LACK OF TRUST/PARTI.	7	16	13	28
5. BAD COM./RELATIONS	12	28	11	24
6. LACK OF LOYALTY	1	2	0	0
7. MISCELLANEOUS	1	2	3	6
-----				
TOTAL	43	100	46	100

The results displayed in this table clearly indicate that Lack of Work Ethic, Bad Communication and Bad Relationships, and Lack of Trust and Participation were the most typical behaviors of low committed employees for both subordinates and supervisors. Some of the specific behaviors reported with regard to the lack of work ethic

category were irresponsibility in dealing with job duties, and low job performance and productivity. Lack of communication, gossiping, complaining were mentioned in the category of bad communication and bad relationships. Apathy and distrust were cited in the area of lack of trust and participation.

### Managing Low Committed Employees

Question # 4: What do supervisors do with low committed employees? A total of 32 separate responses were coded into the analysis of this question with 16 each for subordinates and supervisors.

The following new set of thematic categories emerged from the close examination of the responses given to this question.

1. Motivation was the category for all of the answers that explicitly mentioned motivation as the method used by supervisor to motivate low committed subordinates, such as trust and participation, and satisfying their needs and demands.

2. Firing included all the answers that indicated that termination was the strategy used by supervisors.

3. Pressure involved all of the responses that reported that some form of pressure was used by supervisor, such as coercion to be more productive, salary reduction, or reprimands.

4. Very Little/Nothing enclosed all of the answers that mentioned that supervisors did very little or nothing.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: What Supervisors Do With Low Committed Employees. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		
	No.	%	No	%	
1. MOTIVATION	16	41	47	98	**
2. FIRING	7	18	0	0	**
3. PRESSURE	10	26	1	2	**
4. VERY LITTLE/NOTHING	6	15	0	0	**
-----					
TOTAL	39	100	48	100	

\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

Chi Square analyses demonstrated that supervisors and subordinates were significantly different, at the .01 level of confidence, in their perceptions of what supervisors do to manage the low committed employees. First, although both the subordinates and their supervisors acknowledged that motivation was the most common strategy, supervisors (98%) emphasized it

significantly more than did subordinates (41%). Some of the motivational strategies reported were: making them feel that they were a part of the organization; making them aware of the importance of their work for themselves, for their organization, and for the people that they were serving; helping them discover the causes of their low level of commitment; giving them moral support; and satisfying their needs and demands. Second, the subordinates (26%) emphasized significantly more some forms of pressures, like close control, reprimands, and salary reduction, than did supervisors (2%). Third, subordinates also emphasized significantly more the use of firing and the absence of any action than did supervisors.

### Typical Behaviors of Highly Committed Employees

Question # 5: What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with high levels of organizational commitment? A total of 59 separate responses were coded into the analysis of this question with 29 by subordinates and 30 by supervisors.

The set of thematic categories that emerged after the preliminary analysis of the responses and with

reference to the rules established in Chapter Three was the following.

1. Punctuality was the category for any answer that explicitly reported promptness as a typical behavior of highly committed employees.

2. Work Ethic included any answer that referred to good job performance, responsibility, and a willingness to do extra work.

3. Participation involved any answer that indicated participation, such as sharing ideas and organizing activities.

4. Good Communication and Good Relationships enclosed any answer that cited good communication and good relationships, such as a concern for people, enthusiasm, and a desire to improve.

5. Organizational Loyalty included any answer that mentioned organizational loyalty behaviors, such as caring for the organization's performance, and identification with the needs of the organization.

6. Egotism involved any answer that explicitly reported some form of selfish behavior or excessive desire for pleasing people.

An intercoder reliability score of 90% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Typical Behaviors of Highly Committed Employees. Subordinates' and Supervisors' Responses

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. PUNCTUALITY	4	8	1	2
2. WORK ETHIC	13	25	18	35
3. PARTICIPATION	6	12	13	24
4. GOOD COM./RELATIONS	13	25	16	30
5. ORGAN. LOYALTY	9	18	2	4
6. EGOTISM	6	12	3	5
-----				
TOTAL	51	100	53	100

According to this table, both the subordinates and their supervisors agreed that the most typical behaviors displayed by high committed employees were: 1) Behaviors related to work ethic (25% of the subordinates' responses and 35% of the supervisors responses), such as responsibility and dedication to the job, efficiency, and high levels of productivity. 2) Behaviors associated with good communication skills and interpersonal relationships (25% of subordinates' responses and 30% of supervisors responses), such as a positive attitude, enthusiasm, respect, concern for other people, a sense of humor, and good listening skills. 3) Behaviors that showed a readiness to participate and cooperate (12% of the subordinates' responses and 24% of the supervisors' responses), such as sharing ideas and organizing activities.

## Managing Permanent Commitment

Question # 6: What do supervisors do to foster permanent commitment? A total of 44 separate responses (19 by employees, and 25 by supervisors) were coded into the analysis of this question.

The following set of categories were developed for the content analysis of these responses.

1. Motivation included all of the answers that indicated that motivation was the form used by supervisors to encourage permanent commitment,
2. Economic Incentives involved all of the answers that mentioned salary and other economic rewards.
3. Moral Incentives enclosed all of the answers that alluded to some form of moral incentives.
4. Good Communication and Good Relationships included all of the answers that named good communication skills, interpersonal relationships as well as caring behaviors.
5. Trust and Participation involved all of the answers that indicated that trust and participation were strategies for encouraging permanent commitment.

6. Performance Appraisal enclosed all of the answers that explicitly mentioned some form of evaluation that included positive feedback.

7. Very Little/Nothing included all of answers that reported that supervisors were doing very little or nothing.

An intercoder reliability score of 100% was achieved and results are summarized in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: What Does Top Management Do To Foster Permanent Commitment. Employees' and Supervisors' Responses

CATEGORIES	SUBORD.		SUPERV.		
	No.	%	No.	%	
1. MOTIVATION	11	27	25	48	*
2. ECONOMIC INCENTIVES	5	13	0	0	
3. MORAL INCENTIVES	2	5	2	4	
4. GOOD COM./RELATIONS	3	7	13	25	*
5. TRUST/PARTICIPATION	2	5	4	8	
6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL	1	2	8	15	
7. VERY LITTLE/NOTHING	14	34	0	0	*
-----					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100</b>	

Chi Square analyses demonstrated that the subordinates and the supervisors were significantly different, at the .05 level of confidence, in their perceptions on the three major strategies used by top management to encourage permanent commitment on the part of their employees. First, supervisors (48%) reported significantly more than did subordinates (27%) the use of

motivation. Second, supervisors (25%) reported also significantly more than subordinates (7%) the use of good communication and relationships. Finally, subordinates (34%) reported significantly more than supervisors (0%) that top management was doing very little or even nothing in order to foster permanent commitment.

### SUMMARY

This chapter has presented results from the content analysis of the self-administered open question survey. The following observations summarize the main findings:

#### Observations on Communication Satisfaction

1. Overall, both the supervisors and the subordinates were satisfied with their organizational communication practices.

2. Issues related to Communication Climate and Superior Communication, and Communication with Top Managers were acknowledged as the critical ones in fostering, inhibiting, or improving communication satisfaction.

3. Communication satisfaction was conceptualized as a multidimensional construct, the most important dimension being the quality of the relationship that took

place in the communication between coworkers and between supervisors and subordinates.

#### Observations on Commitment

4. Most of the supervisors and the subordinates were highly committed to their organizations.

5. Commitment to the mission of the organization and a strong sense of responsibility and dedication to work were perceived as the most important motivators of organizational commitment. Lack of communication, lack of appreciation or positive feedback, and lack of trust were the main inhibitors of organizational commitment.

6. Organizational commitment was conceptualized as a multidimensional construct which included the employees' willingness to: 1) identify themselves with the organization's mission and contribute to the organization's development, 2) give their best in order to do a good job, and 3) perform some obligations as an exchange for getting some economic and social benefits.

7. Behaviors related to work ethic, communication and interpersonal relationships, and participation were the most typical behaviors of low and high committed employees.

8. Motivation, economic incentives, and some organizational changes were recognized as the best strategies to encourage the employees' commitment to their organizations

9. Meetings, individual talks, and written memos were the most common forms used by supervisors for communicating what was important in their organizations.

10. Overall, the supervisors had an accurate perception of the subordinates' views of the factors that fostered, inhibited, or improved their communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, some significant differences emerged with regard to: a) how communication satisfaction impacts organizational commitment; b) the subordinates' level of commitment; and c) the influence of personal motivators on subordinates' commitment.

11. Although supervisors and subordinates had similar perceptions of the issues about communication satisfaction and organizational commitment, they were significantly different on several of the issues dealing with the management of organizational commitment.

12. No significant difference emerged among the organizations with regard to their employees' levels of communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

In the next chapter, results from the quantitative analyses are presented.

## Chapter Five

### QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of all of the statistical analyses made for this study: 1) the evaluation of research instruments; 2) the factor analysis of the research instruments; 3) a comparison of the organizations on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment; 4) the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment; 5) a comparison of position on communication factors and commitment composites and factors; 6) a comparison of tenure on communication factors and commitment composites and factors.

The data were analyzed using the SPSS version 4.1.

#### AN EVALUATION OF THE STUDY RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The internal reliability of each of the research instruments used in this study was determined by computing the Cronbach Alphas. Additionally Cronbach Alphas were completed for the Cook and Wall factors and for the ten CAQ factors. The results of these analyses are reported in Table 5.1.

**TABLE 5.1: Cronbach Alphas for Research Instruments**

Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Downs' CAQ	50	.97
Commitment Composite Quest.	44	.85
MPS Commit. Questionnaire	15	.76
C&W Composite	9	.55
C&W Identification	3	.33
C&W Loyalty	3	.09
C&W Involvement	3	.43
D&V Commit. Questionnaire	20	.74
<b>CAQ Factors</b>		
Org. Perspective	5	.82
Pers. Feedback	5	.85
Org. Integration	5	.71
Supervisors Com.	5	.91
Com. Climate	5	.89
Horizontal Com.	5	.64
Media Quality	5	.79
Subordinates Com.	5	.89
Top Management	5	.92
Interdepart. Com.	5	.87

The Cronbach Alphas, ranging from 74 to 95, show that the consistency of the intercorrelations of items was satisfactory for the Downs' Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ); the Commitment Composite Questionnaire (CCQ), the Mowday, Porter, and Steers' Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and the Downs & Varona's Commitment Questionnaire. However, the low alphas obtained for Cook & Wall's Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI) composite and factors raises serious concerns with the consistency of the intercorrelations of the items on the instrument as a

whole and for each of the factors individually. It is noteworthy that the Loyalty factor gained an Alpha of only .09.

The consistency for the intercorrelations of items was also satisfactory for all of the Communication Satisfaction Factors, ranging from the highest for the Top Management Communication (.92) and the Supervisor Communication (.91) to the lowest for Horizontal Communication (.64).

### FACTOR ANALYSIS

To surface possible underlying factors in each of the instruments used in this study, a Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation was performed on: the Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ); the Commitment Questionnaire Composite (Questions 1-44); the Mowday, Porter, and Steer's OCQ (Questions 1-15); the Cook and Wall's Commitment Questionnaire (Questions 16-24); the Downs & Varona Commitment Questionnaire (Questions 25-44). In interpreting factors, an item was considered to load on a factor if it had a loading of .5 or above on that factor and less than a .4 loading on all other factors.

## Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ)

### Principal Components Factor Analysis for CAQ

A Factor Analysis with the Varimax Rotation was performed across all of the Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) items simultaneously to determine whether Factor analysis for this sample was the same as that determined by Downs (1977). Table 5.2 displays the factor analysis results for the Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ).

Table 5.2: Principal Components Factor Analysis for the CAQ for the entire sample

Factors	Items	Loadings	Eigenv	Pct Var	Cum Pct
Top Manage.	43,44,42,45,46		15.33	30.7	30.7
Super. Com.	20,25,22,29,18		3.48	7.0	37.6
Org. Persp.	13,14,16,17,15,6		2.66	5.3	43.0
Subor. Com.	53,56,55,52,54		2.19	4.4	47.4
Intdep.Com.	48,49,51,47,50		1.74	3.5	50.8
Pers. Feed.	4,7,8,5,9		1.60	3.2	54.1
Horiz. Com.	30,31,33,27		1.34	2.7	56.7
Media Qual.	34,35,38		1.19	2.4	59.1
Com.Climate	32,10,21		1.08	2.2	61.3
Inform.Com.	28,37		1.06	2.1	63.4

For the complete statement of the CAQ items see Appendix A.

The factor analysis results displayed in this table show that, as might be expected, some of the items clustered as specified by the authors of the CAQ

questionnaire and some did not. For Top Management Communication, Subordinate Communication, and Interdepartmental Communication all of the five items loaded the same for the entire sample of this study as for the original items. For the factors of Supervisor Communication and Organizational Perspective four items loaded the same for this sample as for the original items. For the Personal Feedback and Horizontal Communication factors three items loaded the same for this sample as for the original items. Only two of the items loaded on Media Quality. For the Communication Climate factor, only one item loaded the same as for this sample. No item loaded on the Organization Integration factor for this sample. Finally, a new factor called, Informal Information, emerged with two items loading on it.

Based upon these results, the following observations are in order. First, three factors, Top Management Communication, Subordinate Communication, and Interdepartmental Communication, retained their integrity with this sample. These findings confirm, on the one hand, the results of other studies with regard to the consistency of the Subordinate Communication factor (Crino and White 1981, 835); and, on the other hand,

support the dependability of the two new factors Top Management Communication and Interdepartmental Communication added by Downs (1990) to the CAQ.

Second, although there were some differences, basically four more factors retained their integrity: Supervisor Communication, Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback and Horizontal Communication.

Third, the variances in the other factors seemed to suggest that some adjustments may need to be made for Guatemalans, specially in the Media Quality, Communication Climate, and Organization Integration factors.

Fourth, these same findings and the new factor that surfaced in this sample called, Informal Communication, had previously been found by Clampitt and Girard's (1987) study.

Finally, the fact that the factor analysis results for the Guatemalan sample corroborated the findings of similar studies in the U.S. culture, suggested that cultural differences did not influence the basic structure of the CAQ. However, these results demonstrated the multidimensionality of the Communication Satisfaction construct for the Guatemalan sample.

## Commitment Questionnaires

### Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Commitment Composite Questionnaire (CCQ)

Additionally, a Factor Analysis with the Varimax Rotation was performed across all three of the commitment instruments simultaneously to determine if there were any possible underlying commitment factors for the Commitment Composite Questionnaire (CCQ). Table 5.3 reports the results of this analysis.

Table 5.3: Principal Components Factor Analysis for the  
Commitment Composite Questionnaire

#### A three-factor solution

Factor	Items	Loadings	Eigenv.	Pct Var	Cum Pct
No. 1	Org. Commitment		8.16	18.6	18.6

#### MPS' OCQ:

2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
10. I am extremely glad I chose this organization to work for, over others that I was considering at the time I joined.
14. For me, this is the best of

all possible organizations to work for.

15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.

C&W's OCI:

1. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for.

6. In my work I feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well.

D&V's Commitment Questionnaire:

5. The longer I work for this organization, the more committed I am to it.

My commitment to this organization causes me to:

11. Keep organizational interest in mind when I make decisions about my work.

12. Feel great loyalty to the organization and want to maintain membership with it.

13. Support top management and decision about the goals and values of the organization.

15. Do extra work in order to make the organization more effective.

19. Concentrate on achieving goals.

No. 2 Org. Identification

3.03 6.9 25.5

C&W's OCI

8. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff.

MPS's OCQ:

3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

No. 3 Org. Loyalty

1.92 4.4 29.9

D&V's Commitment Questionnaire:

14. I would Refuse a similar job in another organization even if it paid more.

C&W's OCI

4. Even if the firm were not doing too well financially I would be reluctant to change to another employer.

This table shows that the factor analysis of the Commitment Composite Questionnaire (CCQ) yielded a first factor with 14 items loading significantly on it that accounted for 28.9% of the variance. Out of these 14 items: 6 belonged to the MPS's OCQ, 2 belonged to the C&W's OCI, and 6 to the D&V commitment scale. After careful content analysis of those items, the factor was named "Organizational Commitment." A second factor, with three items loading significantly on it and accounting for 6.9% of the variance, was named "Organizational Identification." Of the three items: 1 belongs to the C&W's OCI and 2 to the MPS's OCQ. A third factor, with two items loading significantly on it and accounting for

4.4% of the variance, was called "Organizational Loyalty." Of these two items, one belongs to the D&V commitment scale and the other to the C&W's OCI.

After analysis of the content of the items in each of these factors and given the fact that they come from instruments developed by different authors, it does not seem advisable to consider these factors for further studies.

Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Mowday, Porter, and Steers ' Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

The Factor Analysis with a Varimax Rotation was also performed across all of the items from 1 to 15 of Mowday, Porter, and Steers's OCQ simultaneously, to uncover any possible underlying commitment factors. Table 5.4 reports the results of this analysis.

Table 5.4: Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Mowday, Porter, and Steers (OCQ)

A three-factor solution

Factor	Items	Loadings	Eigenv	Pct Var	Cum Pct
No. 1	Org. Identification		4.33	28.9	28.9

6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.

- 2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
- 10. I am extremely glad I chose this organization to work for, over others that I was considering at the time I joined.
- 5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
- 14. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations to work for.
- 15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.
- 13. I really care about the fate of this organization.
- 8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

No. 2 Org. Loyalty

1.80

12.0

41.0

- 11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization.
- 9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.
- 12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.
- 7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.
- 3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

No. 3 Willingness to accept  
any assignment 1.32 8.8 49.8

4. I would accept almost any  
type of job assignment in  
order to keep working for  
this organization.

This table shows that the factor analysis of the Mowday, Porter, and Steers' Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) yielded a first factor with 8 items loading significantly on that factor. After a careful review of those items, that factor was named Organizational Identification. A second factor, with five items loading significantly on it, was named Organizational Loyalty. Finally, a third factor, with only one item loading significantly on it, was called Willingness to Accept any Assignment.

These results suggest that Identification and Loyalty were the best factor solution for the Mowday, Porter, and Steers' Organizational Commitment Questionnaire for this sample. These factors could be used in further studies.

Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Cook  
and Wall's Organizational Commitment Questionnaire  
(OCI)

A Factor Analysis with the Varimax Rotation was also

performed across all of the items from 1 to 9 of Cook and Wall's OCI simultaneously to uncover any possible underlying commitment factors for the Cook and Wall's Commitment Questionnaire. Table 5.5 reports the results of this analysis.

Table 5.5: Principal Components Factor Analysis for the Cook and Wall Organizational Commitment Instrument (OCI)

Factor	Items	Loadings	Eigenv	Pct Var	Cum Pct
No. 1	Involvement		2.34	26.0	26.0
	6. In my work I feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well.				
	9. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me.				
	[1. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for.				
	5. I feel myself to be part of the organization.]				
No. 2	Lack of Identification		1.34	14.9	40.9
	8. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff.				
	[3. I am not willing to put myself out just to help the organization.				
	2. I sometimes feel like leaving this employment for good.]				

No. 3 Loyalty 1.09 12.1 53.1

7. The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not seriously make me think of changing my job.

4. Even if the firm were not doing too well financially I would be reluctant to change to another employer.

[ ]= Items not in the Original Factor

The results of this table show that a three factor solution emerged from this sample although the items loaded somewhat differently from the loading of the three factors theorized by the authors. The first factor, which could be labeled "Involvement", contained two of the items, 6 and 9, of the theorized Involvement factor as well as items 1 and 5 from the theorized Identification factor. The first factor accounted for 26.0 of the variance. The second factor, which could be named "Lack of Identification", contained three items (8,3 and 2) each of which had been in different theorized factors. This factor accounted for 14.9% of the variance. The third factor, called Loyalty, retained two of the original items, 7 and 4 of the theorized Loyalty factor. This factor accounted for 12.1% of the variance.

Principal Components Factor Analysis for the  
Downs and Varona Commitment Questionnaire

Finally, a Factor Analysis with the Varimax Rotation was performed for items 1 to 20 of the Downs and Varona' Commitment Questionnaire simultaneously to uncover possible underlying commitment factors for the Downs & Varona Commitment Scale. Table 5.6 reports the results of these analyses.

Table 5.6: Principal Components Factor Analysis for Downs and Varona Commitment Questionnaire

A five-factor solution

Factor	Items Loadings	Eigen v	Pct Var	Cum Pct
No. 1	Org. Commitment influences loyalty and extra work.	4.99	25.0	25.0
	My commitment to this organization causes me to:			
	13. Support top management and decision about the goals and values of the organization.			
	15. Do extra work in order to make the organization more effective.			
	12. Feel great loyalty to the organization and want to maintain membership with it.			
	8. An important goal for me is to increase my status.			
No. 2	Org. Commitment influences Communication	1.57	8.8	33.8
	My commitment to this organization causes me to:			

- 18. Communicate information openly to others.
- 20. Seek feedback and suggestions from others to improve my work.
- 19. Concentrate on achieving goals.

No. 3 Relationships influence  
Org. Commitment 1.30 7.2 41.0

- 6. My relationship with my supervisor contributes to my job commitment.
- 3. Communication from Top management influences the level of my commitment.
- 4. The friendliness and support of other employees in my work unit make me committed to this organization.
- 5. The longer I work for this organization, the more committed I am to it.

No. 4 Importance of Personal  
Advancement 1.21 6.8 47.8

- My commitment to this organization causes me to:
- 14. Refuse a similar job in another organization even if it paid more.
- 16. Refuse to take a job in another organization even if it would advance my career.
- 7. It is more important to me to work in a job to experience job challenge and personal growth, than to receive higher pay.

No. 5 Work Quality 1.22 6.2 54.0

- 10. I will not let people downplay the quality of my work.

This table shows that the five-factor solution yielded four main clusters of items. The first cluster of four items (8,12,13 and 15), accounted for 25% of the variance, and was named "Organizational Commitment influences loyalty and extra work." A second cluster of three items (18,19 and 20), accounting for 8.8% of the variance, was called "Organizational commitment influences communication." A third factor of four items (3,4,5 and 6), accounting for 6.8 of the variance, was named "Relationships influence organizational commitment." A fourth cluster of three items (7,14 and 16), accounting for 6.8% of the variance, was called "Importance of Personal Advancement." A final cluster of one item (5), that accounted for 6.2% of the variance, was named "Work Quality."

A review of the items that loaded significantly on each of the clusters revealed that those theoretical factors still remained multidimensional. This finding clearly indicated that the Downs & Varona questionnaire was, by its very nature, not a factor scale. On the contrary, it was a scale in which each item seems to be assessing something different from the others. Therefore, it was not considered appropriate to apply any of the factor solutions to it.

## COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONS

Descriptive statistics were computed for the Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) items and factors, and for the Commitment Questionnaire items and factors. This was done for the three Guatemalan organizations together (entire sample) and also for each organization separately.

### Communication Satisfaction

#### Level of Job Satisfaction

Frequency distributions and means were calculated for the CAQ item 1: "How satisfied are you with your job?" in order to discover the level of job satisfaction of Guatemalan employees on a 1-7 scale, on which 1 was "Very Dissatisfied" and 7 was "Very Satisfied". Results for the entire sample and each organization are presented in Table 5.7.

**Table 5.7: Job Satisfaction: Frequency Distributions and Means for the Entire Sample and for each Organizations**

Samples	Scale							Means
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Entire Sample (N=307)	12	6	8	4	74	130	65	5.58
Org. 1 School (N=86)	2	2	1	0	16	44	22	5.83
Org. 2 Hospital (N=46)	0	2	1	1	18	16	7	5.47
Org. 3 Factory (N=175)	10	2	6	3	40	70	36	5.49

These results reveal that, overall, Guatemalan employees were satisfied with their jobs. The 5.58 mean obtained for the entire sample fell in between "Somewhat Satisfied" and "Satisfied". In terms of differences among organizations, it is relevant to report that the school teachers were somewhat more satisfied with their jobs than were the employees of the other two organizations (hospital and factory).

#### Most Satisfied and Least Satisfied CAQ Items

Means were computed for each item on the CAQ, using both 1) entire sample and 2) individual organization samples. Tables 5.8 and 5.9 contain the means and rank orders for the 5 CAQ items that had the highest satisfaction means and the 5 CAQ items that had the lowest satisfaction means for the various samples. Means were based on a 1-7 scale for each of the communication satisfaction items, 1 being "Very Dissatisfied" and 7 "Very Satisfied". A Table showing frequency counts for each of the possible response categories for these CAQ items for the entire sample can be found in Appendix A.

**TABLE 5.8:** Means and Rank Orders of the Five Most Satisfied CAQ Items for Entire Sample and for Each Organization

CAQ Items	Entire (N=307)		Org.1 (N=86)		Org.2 (N=46)		Org.3 (N=175)	
	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean
25: Supervisor trusts me	1	5.79	3	6.14	1	5.96	5	5.57
56: Subord. initiate Com.	2	5.54	1	6.17			4	5.58
52: Subord. responsive	3	5.53	5	5.83			3	5.59
4: Infor. about progress	4	5.50					2	5.63
11: Infor. on requirements	5	5.46						
6: Infor. on Org. policies			2	6.14				
32: Work group compatible			4	5.85	5	5.27		
50: Com. among supervisors					2	5.67		
51: Depart. priorities agree					3	5.28		
31: Com. adapts to emergen.					4	5.27		
53: Subord. anticipate com.							1	5.68

This table shows that the trust provided by supervisors to employees (item 25) was the communication practice with which employees of the three organizations were more consistently satisfied. Three other areas of communication satisfaction that surfaced in two of the three organizations were the affinity of the work group (item 32), the subordinates's willingness to respond to downward communication (item 52), and to initiate accurate upward communication (item 56).

**TABLE 5.9: Means and Rank Orders of the Five Least Satisfied CAQ items for Entire Sample and for each Organization**

CAQ Items	Entire	Org.1	Org.2	Org.3
	(N=307)	(N=86)	(N=46)	(=175)
	R Mean	R Mean	R Mean	R Mean
12: Inform. on government	1 4.05	2 4.62	2 3.93	1 3.79
28: Grapevine is active	2 4.06	4 4.68	1 3.58	2 3.86
16: Inform. on finances	3 4.33	1 4.41	4 4.19	3 4.32
27: Conflicts are handled	4 4.63		5 4.29	
15: Inform. on benefits	5 4.64			5 4.39
9: Recognition of efforts		3 4.64		
48: Good Interdepart. Com.		5 4.70		
13: Inform. on changes			3 4.09	
37: Informal com. efficiency				4 4.38

This table shows that information about government actions (item 12), organization's financial standing (item 16), and the extent to which the "grapevine" was active (item 28) were the communication practices with which employees of the three organizations were least satisfied.

A comparison of tables 5.8 and 5.9 reveals that employees indicated more agreement with the least satisfied than with the most satisfied communication practices. Even though the three Guatemalan organizations were very similar in their greatest satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the organizational communication practices, some differences emerged that are worth reporting. For example, it is interesting to observe that organization 2 (Hospital) presented a quite different picture from the other two organizations (School and

Factory) on the most satisfied items. In fact, only the hospital employees were most satisfied with items 50 and 51 which assessed interdepartmental communication, and item 31 which measured adaptability of communication practices in case of an emergency. These differences between the hospital and the other two organizations (school and factory) might be explained by the fact that the hospital is a smaller organization with only two departments. It appeared that the hospital had established a flexible communication system for emergency situations.

Paired T-Tests for Most and Least Satisfied CAQ for Entire Sample

For the purpose of guaranteeing the relevance of the above findings and discussion, Paired Sample T-tests were conducted using the "most satisfied" and "least satisfied" CAQ item means from Tables 5.8 and 5.9. Results are contained in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10: Paired T-Tests between Most and Least Satisfied CAQ Items for Entire Sample

CAQ Items	Mean	Difference	T. Value	DF	Prob.
25:	5.77	1.73	14.27	282	.000
12:	4.04				
-----					
56:	5.46	1.02	3.15	49	.000
28:	4.44				
-----					
52:	5.51	.88	3.20	53	.003
16:	4.62				
-----					
4:	5.45	.82	7.56	286	.000
27:	4.63				
-----					
11:	5.44				
15:	4.61	.82	7.58	295	.000

This Table demonstrates that the difference between "most satisfied" and "least satisfied" CAQ items were statistically significant.

#### CAQ Factors by Organizations

Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the ten CAQ factors and then rank ordered, using both 1) individual organization samples and 2) the entire sample. Table 5.11 contains the means of the ten CAQ factors in rank order from the highest to the lowest satisfaction means for the various samples.

**TABLE 5.11: Entire Sample and Each Organization: Means for the Ten Communication Satisfaction Factors in Rank Order**

CAQ Factors	Entire S. (N=307)		Org. 1 (N=86)		Org. 2 (N=46)		Org. 3 (N=175)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Subordinate Com.	1	5.44	1	5.73	3	5.01	1	5.54
Supervisor Com.	2	5.36	2	5.65	1	5.26	2	5.25
Org. Integration	3	5.13	3	5.49	4	4.88	3	5.02
Horizontal Com.	4	4.96	4	5.36	5	4.81	6	4.79
Comm. Climate	5	4.94	8	5.22	6	4.71	5	4.87
Personal Feedback	6	4.93	9	5.15	9	4.57	4	4.91
Media Quality	7	4.90	5	5.29	7	4.69	7	4.76
Interdepart. Com.	8	4.89	10	5.03	2	5.18	8	4.74
Top Manag. Com.	9	4.86	7	5.23	8	4.62	9	4.73
Org. Perspective	10	4.60	6	5.28	10	4.30	10	4.35

This table shows that although there were considerable variations among the organizations, the following observations were in order. Subordinate Communication, and Supervisor Communication, were the two factors that emerged as being rated more consistently satisfied for the three organizations. Supervisor Communication and Subordinate communication related to the two-way vertical communication between supervisors and subordinates. Organizational Perspective, Top Management Communication, and Interdepartmental Communication were the three factors that were rated more consistently as less satisfied. Organizational Perspective relates to information about the organization as a whole. Top Management Communication alludes to the vertical communication that top management has with

subordinates. Interdepartmental Communication focuses on communication exchanges among the different departments in the organization.

In terms of similarities and differences among the three organizations, the findings revealed that school teachers (Organization 1) were more satisfied with the communication practices than were the employees of Organization 2 (Hospital) and Organization 3 (Factory). School teachers were the only ones who rated the communication factors above 5. Organizations also differed with regard to the factors with which they were the most dissatisfied. For Organization 1 (School), these factors were: Interdepartmental Communication, Personal Feedback, and Communication Climate. For Organization 2 (Hospital) these factors were: Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, and Top Management Communication. And, for Organization 3 (Factory) these factors were: Organizational Perspective, Top Management, and Interdepartmental Communication. The three organizations however were very consistent on the factors with which they were most satisfied: Subordinate Communication, and Supervisor Communication. These findings demonstrate that there were real differences

among the employees of the three organizations on their levels of communication satisfaction.

Comparison of Organizations on CAQ Factors

To uncover significant differences on communication satisfaction factors, Analyses of Variance and Post Hoc Pairewise Comparison Tests were computed to compare organizations. For the purpose of this analysis the three organization samples were treated independently: 1) Organization 1 (School) with a sample of 86 subjects, 2) Organization 2 (Hospital) with a sample of 46 subjects, and 3) Organization 3 (Factory) with a sample of 174 subjects. Table 5.12 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 5.12: Comparison of Organizations on Communication Satisfaction Factors: Entire Sample

Factors	Organization Means			F	P
	1 Sample 86	2 46	3 174		
Org. Perspective	5.28	4.30	4.34	20.68	.001
Pers. Feedback	5.15	4.57	4.91	3.81	.02
Org. Integration	5.49	4.87	5.10	8.26	.001
Supervisors Com.	5.65	5.26	5.25	3.04	.04
Org. Climate	5.22	4.71	4.85	3.63	.02
Horizontal Com.	5.36	4.81	4.79	9.86	.001
Media Quality	5.29	4.69	4.75	6.05	.001
Subordinates Com.	5.73	5.01	5.54	1.23	.29
Top Management	5.23	4.62	4.73	4.33	.01
Interdepart. Com.	5.03	5.18	4.74	3.17	.04
Comsat Composite	5.03	4.77	4.88	8.44	.001

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed the following results, first, Organization 1 (School) was different, at the .05 significance level, from Organization 2 (Hospital) and 3 (Factory). The employees of Organization 1 (School) were significantly more satisfied than employees of Organization 2 (Hospital) and Organization 3 (Factory) with the communication practices related to Organizational Perspective, Organizational Integration, Horizontal Communication, and Media Quality factors.

Second, organization 1 was different at the .05 significance level, from organization 2 on the Personal Feedback factor. This result showed that employees of organization 1 (School) were significantly more satisfied than were the employees of organization 2 (Hospital) with communication practices related to Personal Feedback.

Third, organization 1 was different from organization 3 at the .05 significance level on the Top Management Communication factor. This implies that employees of organization 1 (School) were significantly more satisfied than were the employees of organization 3 (Factory) with the communication practices related to the Top Management Communication factor.

Finally, the Scheffe procedure for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed that organization 1 was significantly different at the .01 level of significance from organization 2 and 3 on the Communication Satisfaction composite. These results show that employees of organization 1 (School) were significantly more satisfied than employees of organization 2 (Hospital) and organization 3 (Factory) with overall organizational communication practices.

### Organizational Commitment

#### Strong Agreement and Strong Disagreement of Commitment Questionnaire Items: Entire Sample and by Organizations

The means and standard deviations were computed for each item on three commitment questionnaires: 1) Mowday, Porter, and Steers (MPS); 2) Cook and Wall (C&W); and 3) Downs and Varona (D&V) using both individual organization samples and the entire sample. Table 5.13 contains the means of the five items that had "strong agreement" means and the five items that had "strong disagreement" for the various samples.

TABLE 5.13: Means of Five Strong Agreement Commitment Items for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Commitment Items	Entire	Org.1	Org.2	Org.3
	(N=307)	(N=86)	(N=46)	(=175)
	R Mean	R Mean	R Mean	R Mean
C&W 9: My work helps org.	1 6.36	1 6.76		3 6.20
C&W 6: My effort for org.	2 6.27	4 6.51	3 6.30	
D&V 6: Sup.influ. commit.	3 6.25		5 6.22	2 6.28
MPS 2: I praise this org.	4 6.19			4 6.17
C&W 1: I proud of work	5 6.19		1 6.36	5 6.14
MPS 15: It was a mistake		2 6.63		
D&V 10: Nobody defame work		3 6.57		
D&V 12: I want this org.		5 6.27		
MPS 1: I do extra effort		2 6.30	1 6.30	
C&W 5: I belong this org.			4 6.27	

This table indicates that for Guatemalan employees the commitment aspects with which they had the strongest agreement were: 1) to know that their work had made a contribution to the good of the organization (C&W 9), 2) that they were making some effort, not just for themselves but for the organization as well (C&W 6); 3) that the relationship with their supervisors influenced their job commitment (D&V 6), 4) that they presented their organizations to their friends as great organizations to work for (MPS 2); and 5) that they were proud to be able to tell people who it was they that worked for (C&W 1).

In comparing the three organizations on the commitment items with which the employees indicated the strongest agreement, it was apparent that the three

organizations presented more differences than similarities. Organization 1 (School), however, surfaced as being quite different from the other two: organization 2 (Hospital) and organization 3 (Factory).

**TABLE 5.14:** Means and Standard Deviations for Five Strong Disagreement Commitment Items for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Commitment Items	Entire (N=307)		Org.1 (N=86)		Org.2 (N=46)		Org.3 (=175)	
	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean	R	Mean
MPS 7: I could work org.	1	3.17	1	2.94	1	2.87	1	3.37
D&V 16: Refuse other job	2	3.85	2	3.61	2	3.48		
MPS 12: Diff.agree policies	3	3.88			3	3.68	2	3.73
C&W 4: Refuse change org.	4	4.10	4	4.04			5	3.99
MPS 11: No gain staying	5	4.15					4	3.98
MPS 4: I do any work			3	3.75	4	4.02		
D&V 9: Pride no influ. work			5	4.22				
D&V 19: Commit. influ. goal					5	4.07		
D&V 1: More career commit.							3	3.76

The results in this table show that for Guatemalan employees the commitment aspects with which they indicated the strongest disagreement were: 1) that they could be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar (MPS 7); 2) that their commitment to the organization caused them to refuse to take a job in another organization, even if it would have advanced their career (D&V 16); 3) that they found it difficult to agree with the organization's policies on

important matters relating to its employees (MPS 12); 4) that they would be reluctant to change to another organization, even if the organization were not doing too well financially (C&W 4); and 5) that there was not too much to be gained by sticking with the organization (MPS 11).

In comparing the three organizations on the commitment items with which employees indicated the strongest disagreement, it was interesting to note that the employees of the three organizations expressed the strongest agreement with the statement that they could be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar (MPS 7).

Paired T-Tests for Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree CCQ Items for Entire Sample

Additionally, Paired Sample T-tests were conducted using the "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" CCQ item means from Tables 5.13 and 5.14. Relevant T-test statistics demonstrating significant differences between these items in terms of subject responses are contained in Table 5.15.

Table 5.15: Paired T-Tests between Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree CCQ Items for the Entire Sample

Variable	Mean	Difference	T. Value	DF	Prob.
C&W 9:	6.38	3.21	23.41	283	.0001
C&W 7:	3.16				
-----					
C&W 6:	6.29	2.46	17.86	282	.0001
D&V 16:	3.83				
-----					
D&V 2:	4.57	.68	4.05	272	.0001
MPS 12:	3.88				
-----					
MPS 2:	6.18	2.06	15.00	276	.0001
C&W 4:	4.11				
-----					
C&W 1:	6.17	2.00	15.87	289	.0001
MPS 11:	4.17				
-----					

This table demonstrates that the difference between "strong agreement" and "strong disagreement" commitment items was statistically significant at the .0001 level of significant. This finding endorses the discussion provided above on the commitment items with the strong agreement and strong disagreement.

Commitment Factors by Organizations

Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the commitment factors and then rank ordered, using :  
 1) individual organizations and 2) the entire sample.  
 Table 5.16 contains the means for the Mowday, Porter and Steers commitment composite, the Cook and Wall commitment composite, the Downs and Varona composite, and for the

three Cook and Wall commitment factors: identification, loyalty, and involvement. They are placed in rank order from the highest to the lowest agreement means for the various samples.

TABLE 5.16: Entire Sample and by Organizations: Means for the Commitment Factors in Rank Order

Commit Factors	Entire Sample (N=307)		Org. 1 (N=86)		Org. 2 (N=46)		Org. 3 (N=175)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
C&W Involvement	1	5.79	1	6.28	1	5.67	1	5.58
C&W Identifica.	2	5.66	2	6.07	2	5.64	2	5.46
D&V Composite	3	5.37	4	5.62	4	5.23	3	5.29
C&W Composite	4	5.29	3	5.62	3	5.26	5	5.12
MPS Composite	5	5.21	5	5.26	5	5.19	4	5.19
C&W Loyalty	6	4.39	6	4.52	6	4.46	6	4.30

This table shows that employees of the three organizations rated the commitment factors quite consistently. Cook and Wall's Involvement factor had the highest means, and Cook and Wall's Loyalty factor had the lowest means in the three organizations. These results suggest that Guatemalan employees had a stronger sense of organizational involvement and identification than organizational loyalty as measured by the instruments used in this study.

Comparison of Organizations on Commitment Composites  
and Factors

To uncover significant differences on commitment composites and factors, Analyses of Variance and Post Hoc Pairwise Comparison Tests were computed to compare organizations. For the purpose of these analyses, each organization's samples were treated independently as follows: 1) Organization 1 with a sample of 86 subjects, 2) Organization 2 with a sample of 46 subjects, and 3) Organization 3 with a sample of 174 subjects. Table 5.17 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 5.17: Comparison of Organizations on Commitment Composites and Factors: Entire Sample

Factors	Organizations			F	P
	1 Sample (86)	2 (46)	3 (175)		
Commit. Compos.	5.49	5.22	5.22	6.51	.001
MPS's Composite	5.26	5.18	5.18	.29	.74
C&W's Composite	5.62	5.26	5.12	11.48	.0001
C&W's Identifi.	6.06	5.64	5.45	10.00	.0001
C&W's Loyalty	4.51	4.46	4.30	.92	.39
C&W's Involvem.	6.28	5.67	5.57	13.06	.0001
D&V's Composite	5.61	5.22	5.29	8.03	.0001
Global Commitment	5.94	4.78	5.13	17.53	.0001

The Scheffe and the Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed that group 1 was significantly different from group 2 and 3 at the .05 level on: 1) the Commitment Composite, 2) the

C&W's Composite, 3) the C&W's Identification factor, 4) the C&W's Involvement factor, 5) the D&V's composite, and 6) Global Commitment. These results suggest that the employees from Organization 1 (School) were significantly: 1) more overall committed to the organization as measured by the Commitment Composite and Global Commitment 2) more committed to the organization as measured by the C&W' composite, 3) more identified with the organization as measured by the Cook and Wall's Identification factor, 4) more involved with the organization as measured by the Cook and Wall's Involvement factor, and 5) more committed to the different aspects of commitment measured by the D&V commitment scale than were the employees from the other two organizations, the hospital and the factory. These findings led to the conclusion that the school teachers were significantly more committed to their organization than were the hospital and factory employees.

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION

## SATISFACTION AND COMMITMENT

### Correlation Analyses

#### Correlations between CAQ Factors and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Pearson Correlations were calculated between the ten CAQ factors and global commitment (CAQ 40) for the entire sample and for each organization. Table 5.18 contains the results of these correlations.

Table 5.18: Correlation between CAQ Factors and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Factors	All Orgs (N=307)	Org. 1 (N=86)	Org. 2 (N=46)	Org. 3 (N=175)
Org. Perspective	.21 ***	.14	-.18	.19 *
Pers. Feedback	.18 **	.17	-.12	.20 **
Org. Integration	.18 **	.18	.01	.12
Supervisor Com.	.15 **	.25	-.16	.13
Com. Climate	.21 ***	.19	-.14	.24 **
Horizontal Com.	.20 ***	.20 *	-.09	.16 *
Media Quality	.17 **	.21 *	-.22	.17 *
Subordinate Com.	.19	.08	.04	.21
Top Management	.19 **	.17	-.06	.18 *
Interdepart. Com.	.17 **	.16	-.01	.22 **

- \* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level
- \*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level
- \*\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.001$  level

The correlation coefficients displayed in this table allow the following observations. First, all of the Communication Satisfaction factors, except Subordinate Communication, indicated small yet statistically significant direct relationships with Global Commitment in the full data set. Second, for organization 1 (School), only the two Communication Factors of Horizontal Communication and Media Quality demonstrated small and significant direct relationships with Global Commitment. For organization 2 (Hospital) none of the Communication Factors correlated significantly with Global Commitment. For Organization 3 (Factory), seven of the ten Communication Satisfaction factors indicated small yet and significant direct relationship with Global Commitment. However, none of these correlations were particularly meaningful even though statistically significant because correlations of .40 to .60 would be considered functionally strong.

Correlations between CAQ Factors and Commitment

Composites and Factors for Organization 3 (Factory)

Pearson Correlations were also calculated between the ten CAQ factors and the commitment composites and

factors for Organization 3 (Factory). Table 5.19 contains the results of these correlations.

Pearson correlations and regressions were computed only for Organization 3 (Factory) on the relationship between Commutation Satisfaction factors and Commitment composites and factors because only in this organization were the responses to the CAQ and the Commitment Questionnaires matched. The Organization 3 sample (N=142) was half of entire sample.

Table 5.19: Correlation between CAQ Factors and Organizational Commitment Composites and Factors for Organization 3

Factors	Comit	MPS	C.&W.Iden.	Loy.	Invol.	D.&V.	Gl.C.
Org. Persp.	.33***	.24**	.25**	.18*	.07	.29**	.32*** .15
Pers. Feed.	.34***	.32***	.22**	.20*	.11	.15	.32*** .21*
Org. Integ.	.41***	.43***	.27**	.28**	.06	.23**	.34*** .13
Super.Com.	.32***	.37***	.16	.18*	.02	.11	.29** .11
Com.Climate	.41***	.41***	.22**	.23**	.11	.15	.37*** .22**
Horiz. Com.	.34***	.31***	.26**	.19*	.17*	.18*	.30*** .20*
Media Qual.	.31***	.36***	.21*	.20*	.08	.15	.25** .17*
Subor.Com.	.67***	.60***	.42*	.46**	.39*	.23	.70*** .42*
Top Manag.	.30***	.31***	.13	.14	.08	.06	.26** .14*
Interd.Com	.40***	.41***	.24**	.19	.15	.18*	.31*** .23**
Comsat Comp	.47***	.46***	.28**	.26*	.13	.21*	.40*** .27**

- \* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level
- \*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level
- \*\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.001$  level

First, the correlation coefficients displayed in this table showed that there was, for example, a positive

correlations of .47 between Commitment Composite and Comsat Composite indicating that there existed a direct relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. Second, all the Communication Satisfaction factors had a direct relationship with the Mowday, Porter, and Steers commitment composite and the Downs and Varona commitment composite. In both cases the correlation with the Comsat Composite was above .40. However, the only factor to reach that level with the Downs and Varona composite was Subordinate Communication. Third, correlations between the communication satisfaction factors and MPS composite were functionally strong for Organizational Integration, Communication Climate, Subordinate Communication, and Interdepartmental Communication. Finally, the relationship between the Communication Satisfaction factors and the Cook and Wall commitment composite and factors and Global Commitment was very small in most cases and non statistically significant in many of them. In general, then, these correlations revealed that there was a direct relationship between the communication satisfaction factors and commitment. Subordinate Communication was the factor that had the highest correlations with the commitment composites and factors. The Mowday, Porter,

and Steers composite and the Downs and Varona composite had the highest correlations with the communication satisfaction factors.

Correlation between Commitment Factors for the Entire Sample

In addition, Pearson Correlations were calculated among all the commitment composites (instruments) and factors to determine how they were related.

Table 5.20: Correlation Among Commitment Factors. Entire Sample

	MPS	Ident.	Loyal.	Invol.	C&W	D&V	Glo.
Commit Comp.	.82***	.62***	.40***	.63***	.76***	.86***	.35***
MPS Comp.	---	.54***	.20**	.47***	.55***	.51***	.34***
C&W Identif.		---	.20*	.49***	.75***	.37***	.35***
C&W Loyalty			---	.23**	.65***	.28***	.22**
C&W Involve.				---	.78***	.42***	.23**
C&W Comp.					---	.49***	.37***
D&V Comp.						---	.19*
Global Commit.							---

- \* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level
- \*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.01$  level
- \*\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.001$  level

The correlations display in this table indicate that overall the correlation among the commitment composites and factors was statistically significant for all of them. The Cook and Wall's Loyalty factor and Global Commitment shown the lowest correlations. In fact, none of the correlations with Global commitment were

functionally strong, therefore, there was doubt as to the ability of this measure. On the other hand, the Mowday, Porter, and Steers composite correlates meaningfully with the Cook and Wall composite (.55), the Downs and Varona composite (.51), and the Cook and Wall factors of Identification (.54) and Involvement (.47).

Comparison of Less Satisfied Versus More Satisfied  
on Commitment Composites and Factors.

To uncover significant differences on commitment composites and factors, Analyses of Variance were computed to compare less satisfied and more satisfied employees. For the purpose of this analysis the subjects of the Organization 3 sample were divided into two groups based on their overall Communication Satisfaction: numbers 1 to 4 responses were categorized as being less satisfied (71 subjects) and number 5 to 7 responses were termed as being more satisfied (70 subjects) on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 was "Very dissatisfied" and 7 "Very satisfied". Table 5.21 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 5.21: Comparison of Less Satisfied Versus More Satisfied Employees on Commitment Composites and Factors for Organization 3 (Factory)

Factors	Satisfaction Means		F	P
	1	2		
	Less Satisf.	More Satisf.		
	Sample 71	70		
Commit. Composite	5.00	5.48	21.67	.0001
MPS Composite	4.96	5.48	17.90	.0001
C&W Identification	5.31	5.79	6.49	.01
C&W Loyalty	4.16	4.41	1.31	.25
C&W Involvement	5.36	5.91	7.46	.001
C&W Composite	4.94	5.38	9.39	.001
D&V Composite	5.03	5.53	16.17	.0001
Global Commitment	4.83	5.57	12.23	.0001

The results of this table show that employees that were more satisfied with communication practices were significantly different from less satisfied employees at the .01 level of significance on the commitment composites and factors with the exception of the Cook and Wall's Loyalty factor. These results suggest that more satisfied employees with the communication practices in the organization were significantly more committed to the organization. This finding suggested that there were relationships among communication satisfaction level and commitment.

Comparison of Committed Versus Non committed

To uncover significant differences on communication satisfaction factors, Analyses of Variance were computed

to compare less committed and more committed employees. For the purpose of this analysis subjects of the entire sample were divided into two groups based on their Global Commitment (CAQ 40). Responses 1 to 4 were categorized as being less committed (119 subjects) and number 5 to 7 responses were termed as being more committed (171 subjects) on a scale of 1 to 7. Table 5.22 displays the results of this analysis.

Table 5.22: Comparison of Less Committed Versus More Committed Employees on Communication Satisfaction Factors. Entire Sample

Factors	Commitment Means		F	P
	1	2		
	Less Commit.	More Commit.		
Sample	119	171		
Org. Perspective	4.29	4.88	15.09	.0001
Pers. Feedback	4.75	5.03	4.25	.04
Org. Integration	4.95	5.25	6.17	.01
Supervisor Com.	5.17	5.47	3.87	.05
Com. Climate	4.69	5.08	7.49	.001
Horizontal Com.	4.72	5.09	9.41	.001
Media Quality	4.73	5.03	3.99	.04
Subordinate Com.	5.28	5.46	.22	.63
Top Management	4.63	5.03	5.66	.01
Interdepart. Com.	4.72	5.01	3.95	.04
Comsat Composite	4.76	5.10	9.33	.001

This table shows that more committed employees were significantly different from less committed employees at the .05 level of significance, on the Comsat Composite and most of the CAQ factors except for the Subordinate Communication factor. These results suggest that more

committed employees were significantly more satisfied with the communication practices in their organizations than were less committed employees.

Paired T-Tests between Comsat Composite and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for Entire Sample and for Each Organization

For the purpose of discovering if Guatemalan employees were significantly more committed to their organizations than satisfied with the communication practices, Paired T-tested were conducted using the Comsat Composite and the Global Commitment (CAQ 40) means for the entire sample and for each organization.

Results are reported in Table 5.23.

Table 5.23: Paired T-Tests between Comsat Composite and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Variable	Mean	Difference	T. Value	DF	Prob.
<u>Entire Sample:</u>					
Comsat Composite	4.96	-.35	-4.29	292	.0001
Global Commitment	5.31				
<u>Organization 1:</u>					
Comsat Composite	5.29	-.64	-4.77	85	.0001
Global Commitment	5.94				
<u>Organization 2:</u>					
Comsat Composite	4.77	-.00	-.03	45	.97
Global Commitment	4.78				
<u>Organization 3:</u>					
Comsat Composite	4.84	-.29	-2.64	160	.001
Global Commitment	5.13				

These results demonstrated: 1) that overall, Guatemalan employees were significantly more committed to their organizations than satisfied with the communication practices in these organizations, and 2) that employees from organization 2 (school) were the only ones that were not significantly more committed to their organization than satisfied with its communication practices.

### Regression Analyses

For the purpose of explaining the relationship between communication and commitment, a Stepwise Multiple Regression was performed within organization 3 (Factory), and across the entire data set. In this analysis the communication factors were treated as the predictor variables and the commitment factors as the dependent variables. A Stepwise Multiple Regression was performed leaving out the Subordinate Communication factor because the items that make up this factor were answered only by supervisors.

**Table 5.24: Stepwise Multiple Regression. (Using Organization 3 Sample and Entire Sample): All CAQ Factors, Excluding Subordinate Communication on Commitment Composites, Factors, and Global Commitment (CAQ.40)**

Commitment Composites and Factors	CAQ Factors Predictors	Mult. R	F	Signif.
<u>Organization 3 (Factory)</u>				
MPS Composite	Media Quality			
	Org. Integration			
	Supervisor Com.	.53	16.13	p<.0001
C&W Composite	Horizontal Com.			
	Org. Integration	.30	13.10	p<.0001
C&W Identific.	Org. Integration	.30	12.39	p<.0001
C&W Loyalty	Horizontal Com.	.20	5.24	P<.05
C&W Involvement	Org. Perspective	.27	10.51	p<.001
D&V Composite	Com. Climate			
	Org. Integration	.52	23.01	p<.0001
Global Commit.	Interdepart. Com	.22	6.78	p<.001
Global Commit.	Comsat Composite	.24	7.78	p<.00
MPS Composite	Comsat Composite	.48	39.37	p<.0000
C&W Composite	Comsat Composite	.31	13.45	p<.000
D&V Composite	Comsat Composite	.50	41.83	p<.0000
<u>Entire Sample</u>				
Global Commit.	Horizontal Com.			
	Org. Perspective	.24	8.99	p<.001
	Comsat Composite	.23	16.46	p<.000

The results of this table show that the different measures of commitment had somewhat different communication predictors, indicating that the measures themselves were different. Nevertheless, the Comsat composite was a significant predictor of all the commitment composites.

For Organization 3, Organizational Integration was the CAQ factor that displayed the most consistency as a significant predictor of commitment composites and factors. This factor predicted 1) Mowday, Porter and Steer commitment composite; 2) Cook and Wall commitment composite; 3) Downs and Varona commitment composite; and 4) Cook and Wall Identification factor. The next factor that also displayed considerable consistency as a significant predictor of commitment composites and factors was Horizontal Communication. It predicted: 1) Cook and Wall composite; 2) Cook and Wall Loyalty factor; and 3) Global Commitment. The other CAQ factors that appeared as significant predictors of commitment composites and factors were: Media Quality, Supervisor Communication, Organizational Perspective, Communication Climate, and Interdepartmental Communication.

For the entire sample, the best predictors of Global Commitment (CAQ 40) were Horizontal Communication, Organizational Perspective, and Comsat Composite. The latter suggested that there was a relationship between general commitment and general communication satisfaction. While the Global Commitment score did not correlate strongly with the other commitment instruments, it is interesting to note that its communication

predictors were similar to those of the other instruments.

## COMPARISON OF POSITION

### Communication Satisfaction

#### Most Satisfied and Least Satisfied CAQ Items by Position: Entire Sample

To discover the statistical similarities and differences between the response of supervisors and subordinates, means were computed by position for the five CAQ items that had the highest satisfaction means and the five CAQ items that had the lowest satisfaction means and then the items were rank ordered, using the entire sample. Tables 5.25 and 5.26 present the results in rank order.

**TABLE 5.25: Means and Rank Orders for the Five Most Satisfied CAQ Items by Position**

CAQ Items	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
25: Supervisor trust me	1	6.00	1	5.76
32: My work group is compatible	2	5.81		
10: Departmental information	3	5.70		
22: Supervisor offers guidance	4	5.67	5	5.30
20: Supervisor listens to me	5	5.62		
4: Info. about job progress			2	5.51
11: Info. about job requirements			3	5.43
54: No communication overload			4	5.43

This table shows that supervisors and subordinates were similar on two items that satisfied them and different in three. They agreed that supervisor trust (item 25) and the guidance for solving job related problems (item 22) offered by superiors were the two communication practices with which they were the most satisfied.

**TABLE 5.26: Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Least Satisfied CAQ items by Position**

CAQ Items	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
28: Informal commu. efficiency	1	4.42	2	3.97
12: Info. about govern. actions	2	4.54	1	3.95
27: Conflicts are handled	3	4.75	5	4.61
36: Healthy commu. attitudes	4	4.77		
49: There is a sense of teamwork	5	4.85		
16: Financial standing inform.			3	4.21
15: Benefits and pay inform.			4	4.56

This table shows that supervisors and subordinates agreed that the efficiency of informal communication (item 28), the information provided about government actions affecting the organization (item 12), and the way conflicts were handled (27) were the three communication practices with which they were least satisfied.

Comparison of Positions on CAQ factors. Entire Sample.

To discover similarities and differences between supervisors and subordinates on communication factors, means and standard deviations were computed by position for nine of Communication Satisfaction Factors and then rank ordered, using the entire sample. Table 5.27 presents the results.

TABLE 5.27: Positions for Entire Sample: Means for the Communication Satisfaction Factors in Rank Order

CAQ Factors	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Supervisor Comm.	1	5.67	1	5.95
Org. Integration	2	5.39	2	5.08
Horizontal Comm.	3	5.27	4	4.89
Personal Feedback	4	5.22	7	4.88
Top Manag. Comm.	5	5.16	8	4.80
Comm. Climate	6	5.11	3	4.91
Media Quality	7	5.02	6	4.88
Org. Perspective	8	5.00	9	4.52
Interdepart. Comm.	9	4.93	4	4.89

While the means showed that supervisors were generally more satisfied than were the subordinates on the communication satisfaction factors, the rank correlation analysis showed a  $r = .99$  between the two rankings. This result revealed that there was a very dependable relationship between supervisors and subordinates on their ranking of the communication satisfaction factors.

## Paired T-Tests for CAQ by Position for Entire Sample

For the purpose of discovering if supervisors were significantly more satisfied with the communication factors than were their subordinates, Paired T-tested were conducted using the Paired Sample T-tests were conducted using the mean for communication factors by position for the entire sample. Results are reported in Table 5.28.

Table 5.28: Paired T-Tests between Supervisors and Subordinates on Communication Factors for Entire Sample

Variable	Pos.	Mean	T. Value	DF	Prob.
CAQ Composite	Sup.	5.22	2.32	83	.02 *
	Sub.	4.91			
Org. Perspective	Sup.	4.99	2.86	86	.001 **
	Sub.	4.52			
Pers. Feedback	Sup.	5.21	2.00	79	.04 *
	Sub.	4.87			
Org. Integration	Sup.	5.39	2.31	89	.02 *
	Sub.	5.07			
Supervisor Com.	Sup.	5.67	2.16	86	.03 *
	Sub.	5.30			
Com. Climate	Sup.	5.10	1.14	81	.25
	Sub.	4.90			
Horizontal Com.	Sup.	5.26	3.1	102	.001 **
	Sub.	4.88			
Media Quality	Sup.	5.01	.81	86	.42
	Sub.	4.87			
Top Management Com.	Sup.	5.15	1.83	87	.07
	Sub.	4.79			
Interdepart. Com.	Sup.	4.93	.23	74	.82
	Sub.	4.89			

These results indicate that supervisors were significantly more satisfied than subordinates with

regard to the following communication factors:  
 Organizational Perspective, Horizontal Communication,  
 Organization Integration, Supervisor Communication,  
 Personal Feedback, and Communication Satisfaction  
 composite.

Organizational Commitment

Strong Agreement and Strong Disagreement of  
 Commitment Items by Position

To discover the similarities and differences between supervisors and subordinates, means and standard deviations were also computed by position for the five commitment items that had the "strongest agreement" means and the five commitment items that had the "strongest disagreement," for the various samples. Tables 5.29 and 5.30 present the results.

TABLE 5.29: Means for the Five Strong Agreement Items by Position

Item No.	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
C&W 9: My work helps the org.	1	6.44	1	6.34
MPS 6: Proud of being in this org.	2	6.41	3	6.21
MPS 2: I praise this org.	3	6.40	5	6.14
C&W 6: My effort for myself and org.	4	6.40	2	6.24
D&V 19: Concentrate on goals	5	6.25		
C&W 1: Proud of saying I work here			4	6.19

This data revealed that supervisors and subordinates were similar with regard to the commitment items with which they had a strong agreement. In fact, they coincided on four out of the six "strong agreement" items. It is worthwhile to note that for supervisors the fifth commitment item with a strong agreement was "my commitment to this organization causes me to concentrate on achieving the most important goals" (D&V 19), while for subordinates the fifth commitment item with a strong agreement was "I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for" (C&W 1).

**TABLE 5.30: Means for the Five Strong Disagreement Commitment Items by Position**

Item No.	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
D&V 1: More committed to career	1	3.16		
MPS 7: Work diff. org. sim. work	2	3.17	1	3.17
MPS 12: Diffic. agree with policies	3	3.71	3	3.92
MPS 4: Willing accept any work	4	3.91		
D&V 16: Refuse a job career advanc.	5	3.92	2	3.84
C&W 4: Refuse change bad finance			4	4.08
MPS 11: Not much gain being here			5	4.10

This table shows that both supervisors and subordinates were similar on three items that they strongly disagreed with and different on two items. They disagreed with that they could be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar,

that they found it difficult to agree with the organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees, and that they would refuse a similar job in another organization even if it paid more.

T-Test analyses between "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" items demonstrated that they were significantly different at the .0001 level of significance for both supervisors and subordinates.

#### Commitment Factors by Position for Entire Sample

To discover similarities and differences between supervisors and subordinates on the commitment factors, means and standard deviations were computed by position for the Mowday, Porter and Steers commitment composite, the Cook and Wall commitment composite, the Downs and Varona composite, and the three Cook and Wall commitment factors: Identification, Loyalty, and Involvement in rank order from the highest to the lowest agreement means for the various samples. Table 5.31 displays the results.

TABLE 5.31: Position: Means for the Commitment Factors in Rank Order by Position

Commitment Factors	Superv. (N=53)		Subord. (N=244)	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
C&W Involvement	1	5.96	1	5.75
C&W Identification	2	5.79	2	5.62
Global Commitment	3	5.49	4	5.27
C&W Composite	4	5.44	5	5.24
D&V Composite	5	5.40	3	5.36
MPS Composite	6	5.27	6	5.19
C&W Loyalty	7	4.55	7	4.34

This Table shows that both supervisors and subordinates rated the commitment factors consistently. Cook and Wall's theorized Involvement factor had highest means, and Cook and Wall's theorized Loyalty factor had the lowest means.

A T-Test analysis of the commitment factors by position did not show any significant differences between supervisors and subordinates.

Paired T-Tests between Comsat Composite and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) by position for the Entire Sample, and between Comsat Composite and Commitment Composite for Organization 3.

For the purpose of discovering if the Guatemalan supervisors and subordinates were significantly more committed to their organizations than satisfied with

their communication practices, Paired T-tested were conducted using the Comsat Composite and the Global Commitment (CAQ 40) means for the entire sample, and the Comsat Commitment and Commitment Composite for Organization 3 (Factory).

Table 5.32: Paired T-Tests between the Comsat Composite and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) by Position for the Entire Sample and between Comsat Composite and Commitment Composite by position for Organization 3.

Variable	Mean	Difference	T. Value	DF	Prob.
<u>Supervisors:</u>					
<u>Entire Sample</u>					
Comsat Composite	5.18	-.30	-1.70	50	.09
Global Commitment	5.49				
<u>Supervisors:</u>					
<u>Organization 3</u>					
Comsat Composite	5.19	-.19	-1.59	23	.12
Commit Composite	5.39				
<u>Subordinates:</u>					
<u>Entire Sample</u>					
Comsat Composite	4.92	-.35	-3.82	240	.0001
Global Commitment	5.27				
<u>Subordinates:</u>					
<u>Organization 3</u>					
Comsat Composite	4.75	-.45	-5.57	116	.0001
Commit Composite	5.21				

Only the subordinates were significantly more committed to their organizations than they were satisfied with its communication practices. Although the supervisors were also more committed to their

organizations than they were satisfied with its communication practices, the difference was not statistically significant. The effect of the small size of the sample (50 supervisors) might explain the absence of a statistically significant difference between comsat composite score and global commitment score for supervisors .

## COMPARISON OF TENURE

### Communication Satisfaction

#### Correlation between CAQ Factors and Tenure for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Pearson Correlations were calculated between the ten CAQ factors and tenure for the entire sample and for each organization. Table 5.33 contains the results of these correlations.

Table 5.33: Correlation between CAQ Factors and Tenure for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Factors	All Orgs (N=307)	Org. 1 (N=86)	Org. 2 (N=46)	Org. 3 (N=142)
Org. Perspective	.05	-.06	.14	.11
Pers. Feedback	.02	-.05	-.14	.09
Org. Integration	.01	-.06	.02	.06
Supervisor Com.	-.03	-.04	.13	-.03
Org. Climate	.01	-.05	-.16	.11
Horizontal Com.	.10	.08	-.04	.17 *
Media Quality	.06	-.11	-.03	.16
Subordinate Com.	.12	-.17	-.07	.26
Top Management	.04	-.19	.16	.001
Interdepart. Com.	-.08	-.15	-.07	-.001

\* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Horizontal Communication was the only communication satisfaction factor that correlated significantly at the .05 level of significance with tenure, although the correlation was too low (.17) to be considered meaningful.

### Organizational Commitment

#### Correlation between Tenure and Global Commitment

Pearson Correlations were calculated between tenure and global commitment for the entire sample and for each organization. Table 5.34 contains the results of these correlations.

Table 5.34: Correlation between Tenure and Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the Entire Sample and for Each Organization

Factors	All Orgs (N=307)	Org. 1 (N=86)	Org. 2 (N=46)	Org. 3 (N=142)
Tenure	.24 ***	.11	.06	.36 ***

\*\*\* = Significant at  $p < 0.001$  level

Tenure demonstrated a significant, but not particular strong relationship (.24 \*\*\* and .36\*\*\*) with Global commitment for both the entire sample and for Organization 3.

Correlation between Tenure and Organizational Commitment Composites and Factors for Organization 3 (Factory)

Pearson Correlations were also calculated between tenure, and commitment factors for Organization 3 (Factory). Table 5.35 contains the results of these correlations.

Table 5.35: Correlation between Tenure and Organizational Commitment Composites and Factors for Organization 3

Factors	MPS	C.&W.	Iden.	Loyal.	Invol.	D.&V.
Tenure	.13	.15	.16*	.10	.06	.13

\* = Significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Tenure showed a significant but small (.15\*) direct relationship with the Cook and Wall's Identification factor.

Comparison of Tenure on the CAQ factors

To uncover significant differences on communication factors, Analyses of Variance and Post Hoc Pairewise Comparison Tests were computed to compare tenure for the entire sample and for each organization separately. Tables 5.36 to 5.38 display only the results of this analysis that were statistically significant.

Table 5.36: Comparison of Tenure on the CAQ factors.  
Entire Sample

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
Years	< 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	54	103	57	92		
Pers. Feedback	5.15	4.74	4.76	5.09	2.65	.04
Org. Climate	5.26	4.72	4.70	5.13	4.02	.001
Horizontal Com.	5.06	4.72	4.82	5.24	4.65	.001
Top Management	5.15	4.54	4.76	5.09	3.40	.01
Interdepart. Com.	5.39	4.75	4.55	4.97	5.26	.001

In general, a comparison of the means suggested that the most satisfied with communication were those with the least and those with the most numbers of years of service.

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed the following results: First, no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level on Personal Feedback. Second, the employees with less than 1 year, and more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more satisfied than were employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure concerning the communication practices related to the Organizational Climate factor. Third, the employees with more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more satisfied with Horizontal Communication than were the employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure, and 4 to 6 years of tenure. Fourth, the employees with more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more satisfied with Top Management Communication than employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure. Fifth, the employees with less than 1 year tenure were significantly more satisfied with Interdepartmental Communication than were employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure, 4 to 6 years of tenure, or more than 6 years tenure.

Organization 1 (School)

Table 5.37: Comparison of Tenure on CAQ Factors by Organizations. Organization 1 (School)

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P	
	1	2	3	4			
	Years < 1	1-3	4-6	> 6			
	Sample	16	26	13	32		
Supervisor Com.		6.11	5.25	5.84	5.66	3.05	.03
Org. Climate		5.77	4.81	5.27	5.25	2.93	.03
Top Management		6.00	5.00	4.91	5.16	3.74	.01
Interdepart. Com.		5.88	4.69	4.43	5.10	5.53	.001

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed the following results: First, the employees with less than 1 year of tenure were significantly more satisfied with Supervisor Communication and Organizational Climate than were employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure. Second, the employees with less than 1 year of tenure were significantly more satisfied with Top Management Communication and Interdepartmental Communication than were the employees with 1 to 3 years tenure, 4 to 6 years tenure, and more than 6 years tenure.

Organization 2 (Hospital)

The Analysis of Variance results for Organization 2 showed that no two groups were significantly different at the .05 level.

Organization 3 (Factory)

Table 5.38: Comparison of Tenure on the CAQ Factors.  
Organization 3

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
Years	< 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	18	63	37	59		
Horizontal Com.	4.97	4.52	4.72	5.07	3.11	.02
Top Management	5.23	4.33	4.66	5.04	2.77	.04

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed that the employees with more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more satisfied with Horizontal Communication and Top Management Communication than were the employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure.

Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Composites and Factors

To uncover significant differences on commitment composites and factors, Analyses of Variance and Post Hoc Pairewise Comparison Tests were computed to compare tenure for the entire sample and for each organization separately. Tables 5.39 to 5.42 display only the results of this analysis that were statistically significant.

Entire Sample

Table 5.39: Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Composites and Factors: Entire Sample

Factors	Tenure				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
	Years < 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	52	104	56	86		
Commit. Comp.	5.32	5.19	5.26	5.43	2.60	.05
Global Commit.	5.09	5.03	5.21	5.87	8.00	.0001
D&V Composite	5.40	5.24	5.33	5.54	3.41	.01

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures showed that: 1) employees with more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more committed to the organization than employees with less than 1 year of tenure, 1 to 3 years tenure, and 4 to 6 years tenure; 2) that employees with more than 6 years of tenure were more committed to the organization and more committed to the aspects measured by the Downs and Varona composite, than employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure.

Organization 1 (School)

Table 5.40: Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Factors: Organization 1 (School)

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
	Years < 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	16	26	13	32		
Commit. Composite	5.84	5.27	5.37	5.57	3.98	.01
C&W Identification	6.62	5.73	6.25	6.01	4.30	.00
D&V Composite	5.86	5.35	5.47	5.79	5.40	.00

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed that employees with less than 1 year tenure were significantly more committed and identified with the organization than were employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure, and more identified with the organization than were employees with 6 years of tenure. Employees with less than 1 year and more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more committed to the organization than were employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure.

Organization 2 (Hospital)

Table 5.41: Comparison of Tenure on Commitment Factors: Organization 2 (Hospital)

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
Years	< 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	54	103	57	92		
Involvement	5.25	6.30	5.55	7.00	3.71	.01

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures showed that employees with 1 to 3 years of tenure were significantly more involved with the organization than employees with less than 1 year of tenure.

### Organization 3 (Factory)

Table 5.42: Comparison of Tenure on Global Commitment (CAQ Q. 40) Organization 3 (Factory)

Factors	Tenure Means				F	P
	1	2	3	4		
Years	< 1	1-3	4-6	> 6		
Sample	18	63	37	59		
Global Commitment	4.56	4.90	5.00	5.71	5.70	.001

The Scheffe and Student-Newman-Keuls procedures for Post Hoc, Multiple Pairwise Comparisons showed that employees with more than 6 years tenure were significantly more committed to the organization than were employees with less than 1 year of tenure, 1 to 3 years of tenure, and 4 to 6 years of tenure.

### SUMMARY

This chapter has reported the results of all of the statistical analyses made for this study. First, the Cronbach Alphas results for the evaluations of the research instruments. Second, the results of a Factor Analysis of the research instruments. Third, the Anova results for a comparison of the organizations on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. Fourth, the results of Pearson correlations and Stepwise Multiple Regressions between the factors of communication

satisfaction and organizational commitment. Fifth, the Paired T-Test results for a comparison of position on the communication factors, and commitment composites and factors. And sixth, the Anova results for a comparison of the different lengths of tenure on communication factors and commitment composites and factors.

In the next and final chapter, the major conclusions of this study are outlined and discussed, along with the limitations and suggestions for further research.

## Chapter Six

### CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the general conclusions based on the findings reported in Chapters Four and Five. Additionally, suggestions are made for future research in the areas of organizational commitment and communication.

#### Review of the Research Questions

To accomplish the purposes of this study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What are the differences and similarities in employees' responses for: a) the communication satisfaction factors, and b) the organizational commitment factors among the Guatemalan companies?
2. What are the relationships among the communication satisfaction factors and: a) the Mowday, Porter, and Steers organizational commitment composite, b) the Cook and Wall commitment composite and factors, c) the Downs and Varona commitment composite, and d) the participant's Global Commitment for the Guatemalan companies.
3. What are the relationships among the Mowday, Porter, and Steers commitment composite and: a) the Cook

and Wall commitment composite and factors, b) the participant's Global Commitment, and c) the Downs and Varona commitment composite? And what are the relationships among the Cook and Wall commitment factors for the employees of the Guatemalan companies?

4. What impact does work tenure have on the communication satisfaction dimensions and on the organizational commitment dimensions for the Guatemalan employees?

5. What are the differences and similarities between supervisors and subordinates for the ten communication satisfaction factors and for the organizational commitment factors for the Guatemalan companies?

6. What are the differences and similarities between managers/supervisors and subordinates on a) factors that foster and inhibit communication satisfaction, b) conceptualizations of communication satisfaction, and c) suggestions for improving communication satisfaction?

7. What are the differences and similarities between managers/supervisors and employees on a) factors that foster and inhibit organizational commitment, b) conceptualizations of organizational commitment, and c) suggestions for improving organizational commitment?

8. What do Guatemalan top managers and supervisors do to manage their employees's organizational commitment?

The major conclusions and discussion of this study are grouped as follows: 1) conclusions on communication satisfaction, 2) conclusions on organizational commitment, 3) a conclusion on the relationships between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment, 4) conclusions on the research instruments, and 5). conclusions on the limitations of this study and some suggestions for future research.

### Conclusions on Communication Satisfaction

1. Although the employees of the three Guatemalan organizations were slightly satisfied with the communication practices in their organizations, the school teachers were significantly more satisfied than were the employees of the other two organizations. Additionally, certain communication satisfaction factors and items were perceived as having greater levels of satisfaction for the employees than did others.

Research Question # 1a addressed the differences and similarities in responses for the communication

satisfaction factors among the Guatemalan companies.

The Guatemalan employees rated their overall communication satisfaction and the ten communication satisfaction factors above the midrange on a 1 to 7 scale, where 1 was "very dissatisfied" and 7 "very satisfied". The mean of the Communication Satisfaction composite for the entire sample was 4.96 on the same scale of 1 to 7, which is very close to the category called "slightly satisfied" (Table 5.23). These quantitative results were corroborated by the qualitative results. In fact, most of the supervisors (74%) and their subordinates (70%) rated their levels of communication satisfaction as average (Table 4.2).

In terms of similarities and differences among the three organizations, the findings revealed that school teachers (Organization 1) were significantly more satisfied, at the .01 level, with overall organizational communication practices than were the employees of Organization 2 (Hospital) and Organization 3 (Factory). School teachers were the only ones who rated the communication factors above 5. The organizations also differed with regard to the factors with which they were the most dissatisfied. The school teachers were significantly more satisfied than were the employees of

Organization 2 (Hospital) and Organization 3 (Factory) with the communication practices related to Organizational Perspective, Organizational Integration, Horizontal Communication, and Media Quality factors (Tables 5.11 and 5.12).

Supervisor Communication, Subordinate Communication, and Organizational Integration were the three communication satisfaction factors that emerged as being rated "most satisfied" for the entire data set, and also separately for Organization 1 (School) and Organization 3 (Factory). For Organization 2 (Hospital) Supervisor Communication and Subordinate Communication were ranked as first and second, and Organizational Integration was ranked as fourth. On the other hand, Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, and Top Management Communication were the three factors that emerged as being rated the least satisfied for the entire data set, although their were variations among the three organizations on the communication factors with which they were the least satisfied. For Organization 1, these factors were: Interdepartmental Communication, Personal Feedback, and Communication Climate; for Organization 2, Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, and Top Management Communication; and, for Organization 3,

Organizational Perspective, Top Management, and Interdepartmental Communication (Tables 5.11 and 5.12).

Overall, the trust provided by supervisors to employees (item 25), the subordinates's willingness to respond to downward communication (item 52), and to initiate accurate upward communication (item 56), were the communication practices with which employees of the three organizations were the most satisfied. On the other hand, information about government actions (item 12), information about the organization's financial standing (item 16), and the extent to which the "grapevine" was active (item 28) were the communication practices with which employees of the three organizations were the least satisfied (Tables 5.8 and 5.9).

2. The quality of the relationship that took place in the communication process was the most important dimension in the conceptualization of communication satisfaction for the Guatemalan supervisors and subordinates.

Research Question # 6b addressed the issue of the differences and similarities between supervisors and

subordinates on their conceptualizations of communication satisfaction.

Although the Guatemalan employees conceptualized communication satisfaction as a multidimensional construct, the quality of the relationship that took place in the communication between coworkers and between supervisors and employees was the main source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Most of the subordinates' and the supervisors' responses to the open question on how do you define communication satisfaction focused on issues related to Communication Climate (72% of subordinates' responses, and 57 of supervisors responses), Personal Feedback (16% of subordinates' responses, and 15% of supervisors' responses), and 3) Supervisor Communication (12 % of subordinates' responses and 11% of supervisors' responses). The issues most frequently included were: interchange of ideas, mutual understanding, honesty, clarity, advice, help, listening, trust, participation, constructive feedback, and problems being solved. All of these were characteristics that relate to the quality of the relationship. A prototype definition of communication satisfaction was, "Communication satisfaction occurs when

there is an interchange of ideas, honesty, trust, support, love, and mutual understanding."

A major theoretical implication of these findings was that, in terms of communication functions (Farace, Monge and Russell, 1977) in organizations, the maintenance function seemed to be the most important for Guatemalan employees. The production and innovation functions of communication were almost ignored in their conceptualization of communication satisfaction. This might reveal a very distinctive cultural characteristic that could contrast with the more production and goal oriented culture of the United States (Rhinesmith, 1977). The Guatemalan culture can be characterized as being more relationship oriented rather than objective and results oriented, as has been suggested by Rhinesmith (1977), Hofstede (1984), Ruch (1989), and Blubaugh and Varona (1990).

3. Guatemalan supervisors were significantly more satisfied than were subordinates with overall communication and with certain communication satisfaction factors.

Research Question # 5a addressed the differences and similarities between supervisors and subordinates for the ten communication satisfaction factors.

The Guatemalan supervisors rated their overall communication satisfaction at 5.22 whereas their subordinates placed it at 4.91 on the scale of 1 to 7. A Paired T-Test analysis revealed that this difference was statistically significant at the .02 level of confidence (Table 5.28). In addition, the supervisors were significantly more satisfied than were their subordinates with Organizational Perspective (.001), Personal Feedback (.04), Organizational Integration (.02), Supervisor Communication (.03), and Horizontal Communication (.001). (Table 5.28). This difference between the communication satisfaction levels of the supervisors and subordinates did not surface as stronger on the analysis of the qualitative results. Eighty-six percent of the supervisors surveyed rated their level of satisfaction as average (74%) or high (12%), while 84% of the subordinates surveyed rated their level of satisfaction as average (70%) or high (14%) (Table 4.2). Supervisors and subordinates also differed with regard to some of the most and the least satisfied items. In the category of most satisfied items, supervisors indicated more

satisfaction on the compatibility of the work unit and departmental information, whereas their subordinates were more satisfied with the information about job requirements and job progress. In the category of least satisfied items, supervisors manifested the least satisfaction with communication attitudes and a sense of teamwork, while subordinates were more displeased with information about the financial standing of the organization, benefits, and pay (Tables 5.25 and 5.26).

Despite these differences, both supervisors and subordinates agreed that Supervisor Communication and Organizational Integration were the two communication satisfaction factors with which they were the most satisfied. They also agreed that Organization Perspective was the communication satisfaction factor with which they were least satisfied (Table 5.27). Moreover, supervisors and subordinates agreed that the trust supervisors provided their employees was the communication practice with which they were most satisfied; and that the efficiency of informal communication and the information about organization's financial standing were the communication practices with which they were least satisfied (Table 5.25 and 5.26).

4. Both supervisors and subordinates acknowledged that issues related to Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Communication with Top Managers were the critical ones in fostering, inhibiting or improving communication satisfaction.

Research question 6b and 6c addressed the differences and similarities between supervisors and subordinates on factors that fostered or inhibited communication satisfaction, and suggestions for improving communication satisfaction.

When the results of the open question survey on these issues were compared, it was apparent that both supervisors and subordinates focused on issues related to Communication Climate, Supervisor Communication, and Communication with Top Managers (Tables 4.3, 4.4 and 4.10).

In the area of Communication Climate the main source of communication satisfaction was good interpersonal relationships and communication with clients, colleagues and supervisors. The major factors that inhibited communication satisfaction were lack of communication, lack of participation in decision making, and personnel with negative attitudes. The most needed actions to

improve communication satisfaction were workshops on human relations, motivation, and communication.

With regard to Communication with Superiors and Top Managers, the major sources of communication satisfaction were the superior's willingness to listen, to trust, and to accept new ideas. The main factors that inhibited communication satisfaction were lack of two-way communication between supervisors and employees, lack of trust, lack of openness to new ideas and suggestions, and delaying solutions to problems and needs. The suggested strategies to improve superiors' communication with their employees were that superiors needed to interact more frequently with their employees, listen to them, respect their suggestions, and provide direct feedback.

In terms of similarities and differences on perceptions with regard to the factors that fostered and/or inhibited subordinates' communication satisfaction, the supervisors' perceptions were very close to the employees' perceptions. In fact, Guatemalan employees and supervisors agreed that the communication issues related to Supervisor Communication, were the factors that greatly encouraged the employees satisfaction with their organizational communication practices (Table 4.3). They also agreed that the major

factors that restrained subordinates' satisfaction with their organizational communication practices were issues related to the categories of Communication Climate, and Supervisor Communication.

### Conclusions on Organizational Commitment

5. Even though the employees of the three organizations were very committed to their organizations, the school teachers were significantly more committed to their organizations than were employees of the other two organizations. Additionally, there were variations among the three organizations in their levels of commitment as measured by the different commitment factors and items.

Research Question # 1b addressed the differences and similarities in responses for the commitment composites and factors among the Guatemalan companies.

In general the Guatemalan employees rated their level of agreement with the commitment composites and factors, except for the Cook and Wall Loyalty factor, above the midrange on the 1 to 7 scale, where 1 was "strongly disagree" and 7 "strongly agree" (Tables 5.16 and 5.23). The mean of Global Commitment (CAQ 40) for the

entire sample was 5.31 in the 1 to 7 scale, where 1 was "very dissatisfied" and 7 was "very satisfied" (Table 5.23). These quantitative results were supported by the qualitative results. Most of the supervisors (69%) and subordinates (59%) said they were highly committed to their organizations (Table 4.2). Cook and Wall's Involvement and Identification factors, and Mowday, Porter and Steer's commitment composite were the three factors that emerged as having the strongest agreement for the three Guatemalan organizations. On the other hand, Cook and Wall's Loyalty factor emerged as having the lowest level of agreement (Table 5.16).

In terms of similarities and differences among the three organizations, the findings revealed that the school teachers (Organization 1) were overall significantly more committed, at the .01 level, to their organization than were the employees of Organization 2 (Hospital) and Organization 3 (Factory). The school teachers were also significantly more committed, more identified, and more involved with their organization than were the employees of the other two organizations, as measured by the C&W composite and factors (Table 5.17).

Overall, the three commitment items with which the Guatemalan employees had the strongest agreement were: 1) to know that their work had made a contribution to the good of the organization (C&W 9), 2) that they were making some effort, not just for themselves but for the organization as well (C&W 6); and 3) that the relationship with their supervisors influenced their job commitment (D&V 6). On the other hand, the commitment items with which they indicated the strongest disagreement were: 1) that they could be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar (MPS 7); 2) that their commitment to the organization caused them to refuse to take a job in another organization, even if it could have advanced their career (D&V 16); and 3) that they found it difficult to agree with the organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees (MPS 12).

In comparing the communication satisfaction levels with the commitment levels, the results revealed that the Guatemalan employees were significantly more committed to their organizations than satisfied with the communication practices. Paired T-Tests analyses between the Comsat Composite and Global Commitment demonstrated that, overall, the Guatemalan employees were significantly more

committed to their organizations than satisfied with the communication practices at the .0001 level of significance. The employees of Organization 2 (Hospital) were the only ones that were not significantly more committed than satisfied with communication (5.23). This finding was corroborated by the qualitative results that revealed that, overall, employees had higher levels of organizational commitment than communication satisfaction. In fact, only 14% of the supervisors and 12% of subordinates had high levels of communication satisfaction, and most of supervisors (74%) and subordinates (70%) had average levels of communication satisfaction, whereas 69% of the supervisors and 59% of the subordinates indicated high levels of commitment and 41% of the subordinates and 31% of supervisors reported average levels (Tables 4.2 and 4.11).

6. The Guatemalan supervisors and subordinates were similar in their levels of overall commitment to their organizations and in their ratings of the commitment composites, factors, and items.

Research Question # 5b addressed the differences and

similarities between supervisors and subordinates for the organizational commitment factors.

Supervisors rated their overall organizational commitment at 5.49 and subordinates at 5.27 on the 1 to 7 commitment scale (Table 5.32). In addition, supervisors and subordinates rated alike their levels of agreement with the different commitment composites and factors. A T-Test analysis of commitment factors by position did not show any significant difference between the supervisors and their subordinates (Table 5.31). These results were confirmed by the qualitative results. In fact, although more supervisors (69%) than subordinates (59%) said they were highly committed to their organizations, the Chi Square analyses demonstrated that this difference was not significant (Table 4.9). The Cook and Wall Involvement factor had the strongest agreement and the Cook and Wall Loyalty factor had the lowest agreement (Table 5.31).

The supervisors and subordinates were also very similar on their responses to the five strong agreement items and on the five strong disagreement items. Thus, both supervisors and subordinates indicated that they strongly agreed with the following statements: 1) "To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me" (C&W 9); 2) "I am

proud to tell others that I am part of this organization" (MPS 6); 3) "I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for" (MPS 2); and 4) "In my work I feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well" (C&W 6). On the other hand, the supervisors and subordinates also agreed with three of the seven "strong disagreement" commitment items, namely: 1) "I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar" (MPS 7); 2) "Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees" (MPS 12); and 3) "I would refuse a similar job in another organization even if it paid more" (D&V 4) (Tables 5.13 and 5.14).

With regard to the supervisors' perceptions of their subordinates' levels of commitment, there was significant difference, at the .01 level, between what the supervisors perceived and the actual level of commitment of the subordinates. Supervisors tended to minimize their subordinates levels of organizational commitment (Table 4.11).

7. Personal factors such as work ethic, mission commitment, and a desire of self actualization were

perceived as the most important motivators of organizational commitment. However, relational factors such as lack of communication, appreciation, and trust were perceived as the most important inhibitors of organizational commitment by Guatemalan employees.

Research question # 7a addressed the differences and similarities between supervisors and subordinates on the factors that fostered and inhibited organizational commitment. When the results of the open questions on these issues were compared, it was apparent that both supervisors and subordinates focused on issues related to: 1) Personal Motivators which included those themes in which the source of motivation originated in the individual, such as work ethic. 2) Organizational Motivators which encompassed those themes whose source of motivation was generated from organizational characteristics, such as job security, and job position. 3) Relational Motivators which referred to the categories that had as their main source of motivation relational aspects, such as trust and participation, and good communication/relationships.

In the category of factors that fostered organizational commitment, personal factors were by far

the greatest motivators. They accounted for 67% of subordinates' responses and 58% of supervisors' responses. The main factors reported in this category were: 1) a strong sense of responsibility and dedication to work (work ethic), 2) serving the people who benefit from what employees do in their organizations (mission commitment), and 3) the desire for self actualization and career advancement (personal needs, higher goals, and career commitment). Organizational factors were reported as the second most important category of organizational commitment motivators (with 22% of subordinates' responses and 32% of supervisors' responses). The topics most frequently mentioned in this category were: 1) a sense of loyalty to the organization, 2) job security, and 3) economic incentives. Finally, in third place was the Relational factors category (with 11% of subordinates' responses and 10% of supervisors' responses). The issues reported as motivators in this category were: 1) the trust provided by superiors, 2) good communication with supervisors and coworkers, and 3) positive feedback provided by supervisors and clients (Tables 4.10 and 4.11).

Moreover, in the question of what was important in the organization to be committed to (Table 4.16), the

subordinates and supervisors recognized that the mission of the organization was the most important aspect of the organization to be committed to with 53% of the subordinates responses and 34% of the supervisors responses. Job Security, Work Ethic, and Organizational Loyalty were also perceived as important.

From these results, it is apparent that a strong sense of mission characterized the Guatemalan employees. The major focus of their commitment was to serve the Guatemalan people by providing them with a good education, health, and food. This strong sense of mission was more evident in the responses of the school and hospital employees than in the responses of the factory employees. This might be explained by the different nature of the organizations. The school and the hospital were Catholic institutions with a management style that distinctly promoted religious motivation. A certain sense of mission was also present among the factory employees as a result of a recently implemented management strategy aimed to foster the idea of serving people through the production of food. To emphasize this goal an organizational creed and song had been created. These results also showed that there was among the Guatemalan employees a strong sense of job security. To have a job

and be able to keep it was of great importance for the Guatemalan employees. This was understandable in a country such as Guatemala where more than 45% are unemployed or underemployed. Finally, these results also showed that there were among the Guatemalan employees a strong sense of intrinsic motivation (work ethic) which accounted for their organizational commitment.

With regard to the factors that inhibited organizational commitment, relational factors were reported as the main influence that discouraged organizational commitment. They accounted for 35% of subordinates' responses and 40% of supervisors' responses. The main inhibitors reported in this category were: 1) lack of communication, 2) lack of appreciation or positive feedback, and 3) lack of trust. Organizational factors were reported as the second most important category of organizational commitment inhibitors (with 24% of subordinates' responses and 11% of supervisors' responses). The topics most frequently mentioned were: 1) low salaries, 2) lack of task definition, and 3) unequal treatment of the organization' people. Finally, in the third place were the personal factors (with 9% of the subordinates' responses and 17% of the supervisors' responses). The issues reported as

inhibitors in this category were: 1) lack of a work ethic, 2) lack of career commitment, and 3) lack of mission commitment (Tables 4.12 and 4.13).

Organizational factors, although important, did not surface as either a strong motivator or inhibitor of organizational commitment.

Despite these similarities, there were some differences in perceptions between the supervisors and employees as to what were the fostering and inhibiting factors of the subordinates' organizational commitment. In the category of fostering factors, the subordinates tended to emphasize more the personal motivators (67% of their responses against 58% of supervisors responses); whereas supervisors were more inclined to emphasize organizational factors (36% of their responses against 22% of subordinates' responses), and relational factors (22% of their responses against 11% of subordinates' responses). In the category of inhibiting factors, the only difference was that supervisors tended to emphasize more personal factors (17% of their responses against 9% of subordinates responses) (Table 4.12).

These findings support Reichers' (1985) multiple commitments perspective of organizational commitment. This new reconceptualization of organizational commitment

suggests that specific groups within the organization may serve as the foci for the multiple commitments that employees experience. This was true in general for the Guatemalan employees, and especially so for the teachers and for the hospital employees. To serve the people (students and ill children) who benefited from their services was mentioned as the most important factor fostering these employees' organizational commitment. In addition, these employees' relationships with other organizational groups such as supervisors and coworkers were cited as the main factors discouraging their organizational commitment. On the other hand, the multiple commitments perspective of organizational commitment also suggests that the organizational aspect of the construct should be included in the conceptualization of commitment. The Organizational factors, in fact, were mentioned by the Guatemalan employees as the second most important source of factors that motivated and inhibited organizational commitment.

8. Identification with the organization's mission, to give one's best in order to do a good job, and to perform some obligations in exchange for getting some economic and social benefits were the three most

important dimensions in the conceptualization of organizational commitment by the Guatemalan employees.

Research Question # 7b addressed the issue of the differences and similarities between supervisors and subordinates on their conceptualizations of organizational commitment.

The results of the open question on definition of organizational commitment revealed that both supervisors and subordinates conceptualized organizational commitment from two major perspectives: 1) the psychological perspective with 45% of the subordinates and supervisors' responses and 2) the work ethic perspective with 41% of subordinates' responses and 51% of supervisors' responses. A third perspective that emerged, although not strongly, was the exchange perspective (14% of subordinates' responses and 3% of supervisors' responses). No significant difference emerged between subordinates and supervisors.

In comparing this conceptualization of commitment to the conceptualizations reviewed in the literature (Chapter Two), it was apparent that psychological and exchange perspectives have been widely reported by several scholars (Mowday, Porter and Steer, 1982, 19-28).

The strength with which the work ethic dimension has emerged in the present study was, however, new. These findings indicate that the work ethic, the intrinsic responsibility that drives human beings to put their best effort into whatever they are doing, was an important dimension of organizational commitment for Guatemalan employees. This finding has a major theoretical implication because, on the one hand, it challenges the research trend that has treated the work ethic as a form of work commitment different from organizational commitment (Morrow, 1983). It also supports Reichers' (1985) multiple commitments perspective of organizational commitment which contends that the conceptualization of organizational commitment must include all of the actual commitments that the employee experiences, commitment to the job (work ethic) being one of them.

9. Motivational strategies, economic incentives, the improvement of communication and interpersonal relationships, and changes in some organization features were recognized as the best strategies to manage organizational commitment by the Guatemalan employees.

Research questions 7c and 8 addressed the issue of managing the employees's organizational commitment.

Several questions on the open question survey dealt with the management of organizational commitment. The responses to the open questions on suggestions for improving organizational commitment (Table 4.15), and on what managers and supervisors did to manage their employees' commitment (Tables 4.23 and 4.25) revealed that the most needed strategies for managing organizational commitment were: 1) motivational strategies such as making employees feel that they were a part of the organization, and making them aware of the importance of their work for themselves, for the organization, and for the people they were serving, and giving them moral support; 2) improving economic incentives; 3) improving communication and interpersonal relationships; and 4) changing some organizational features such as the actual structure of the organization, the work plan, and definition of jobs.

The Guatemalan employees also reported that meetings, individual talks, and written memos were the most common forms used for communicating what was important in their organizations (Table 4.17).

It is relevant to report, in comparing the supervisors and subordinates perceptions on this issues, that their perceptions were significantly different, at

the .01 level of confidence, as to the need of more motivation in order to encourage organizational commitment. Motivation was viewed by the subordinates as the most needed strategy to be implemented to improve organizational commitment (24% of their responses against 0% of supervisors' responses (Table 4.15). Another significant difference between the supervisors and subordinates was on their perceptions of what supervisors did to encourage their subordinates commitment to the organization. The supervisors (Table 4.19) reported almost exclusively (98% of their responses) that different ways of motivation were used by them in order to encourage their subordinates' commitment to the organization. Subordinates, however, reported motivational behaviors in 41% of their responses, and emphasized other negative behaviors that were not mentioned by supervisors, such as: 1) some forms of pressure (26% of the responses) like close control, reprimands, and salary reduction; 2) Firing them (18% of the responses); and 3) subordinates also reported that supervisors were doing very little or nothing (15% of the responses) to motivate low commitment employees.

## A Conclusion on the Relationship between Communication Satisfaction and Commitment

10. There was an explicit positive relationship between communication factors and employees' organizational commitment. The nature of this relationship, however, varied for the communication factors, and for the commitment composites and factors.

Overall, the correlation between the communication satisfaction composite and commitment composite for organization 3 (Factory) was positive and significant at the .01 level of significance (Table 5.19). The communication satisfaction factors, except for Subordinate Communication, had a relationship to Global Commitment (CAQ 40) that was positive and significant at the .01 level of confidence for the entire data set (Table 5.18).

The communication satisfaction factors, however, correlated differently with the commitment factors for Organization Three. First, the MPS commitment composite had the strongest correlation with the ten communication factors. Nine of these communication factors correlated at the .001 level of significance, and the other one at

the .01 level. Second, The Downs and Varona commitment composite also had a strong correlation with the ten communication factors (Seven communication factors correlated at the .001 level of significance, and 3 communication factors at the .01 level of significance). Third, Global Commitment (CAQ 40) correlated significantly with the seven communication satisfaction factors at the .05 level of confidence or above. Fourth, the Cook and Wall commitment composite had a significant correlation with the eight communication satisfaction factors, at the .01 level of significance for six of them, and at the .05 for two. The Cook and Wall theorized factors: Identification, Loyalty, and Involvement had the weakest correlation with the ten communication factors, Identification being the commitment factor that had the most significant correlations, and Loyalty the one that had only two significant correlations (Table 5.19).

In terms of the relationships between specific communication satisfaction factors and the commitment composites and factors, the correlation analyses showed the following: Overall, the strongest correlations appeared to be between Subordinate Communication and the commitment composites and factors. Specifically, correlations between Subordinate Communication and

commitment factors were: .70 \*\*\* for the D&V composite, .60\*\*\* for the MPS composite, .46 \*\* for the C&W's Identification factor, and .42 \* for the C&W composite. The second strongest correlation was between Organizational Integration and the commitment composites and factors. Specifically, the correlations between Organizational Integration and commitment composites and factors were .43\*\*\* for the MPS composite, .34\*\*\* for the D&V composite, .28\*\* for the C&W Identification factor, and .27\*\* for the C&W composite. The third strongest correlation was between Organizational Climate and the commitment composites and factors. Specifically, the correlations between Organizational Climate and commitment composites and factors were: .41\*\*\* for the MPS composite, .37\*\*\* for the D&V composite, and .23\*\* for the C&W Identification factor. The fourth strongest correlation was between Interdepartmental Communication and commitment composites and factors. Specifically, the correlations between Interdepartmental Communication and commitment composites and factors were: .41\*\*\* for the MPS composite, .31\*\*\* for the D&V composite, and .24\*\* for the C&W composite (Table 5.19).

A comparison of more satisfied employees with the communication practices and less satisfied showed that

the more satisfied employees were significantly more committed, at the .05 level of confidence or higher, to their organizations than the less satisfied (Table 5.21). In addition, the comparison of more committed employees and less committed employees on the communication satisfaction factors (Table 5.22) confirmed that the more committed employees were significantly more satisfied, at the .05 level of confidence or higher, with the communication practices than were the less committed employees. Organizational Perspective, Comsat Composite, Organizational Climate, and Horizontal Communication were the factors that had the highest levels of significant differences (.001 or more). These findings demonstrated that the relationship between more commitment and a higher degree of communication satisfaction was statistically significant. Consequently, it proved that the commitment and communication satisfaction constructs were interdependent.

The existence of a relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment was confirmed by the results of the qualitative analysis. A majority (66%) of the Guatemalan subordinates and supervisors surveyed believed that their satisfaction with organizational communication practices influenced

organizational commitment (Table 4.5). Both the subordinates and supervisors were similar in their beliefs that satisfaction with organizational communication practices influenced organizational commitment. More employees than supervisors, however, stated that they did not know if there was a relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is interesting to note some organizational differences in these results. More supervisors and subordinates in organization 2 (Hospital) than in organizations 1 (School) and 3 (Factory) denied the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. This might be explained by the fact that the hospital was a relatively new institution without a strong sense of organizational structure and communication.

When employees were asked to explain how communication satisfaction influenced organizational commitment (Table 4.6), they argued that communication satisfaction implied that the communication functions of production, and maintenance were being achieved which in return were going to influence organizational commitment. The supervisors and subordinates were, however, significantly different, at the .01 level, on their

perceptions with regard to the most important way in which communication satisfaction impacted organizational commitment. Supervisors thought that it was through achieving the production functions of communication (70%), such as improving productivity and performance; and employees thought that it was through achieving the maintenance functions of communication (51%), such as improving interpersonal relationships, participation, and motivation. These findings clearly indicate that the supervisors were more concerned with productivity than were their subordinates; and that the subordinates were more interested in relationships than were their supervisors.

Regression analyses also demonstrated the existence of a direct relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The communication satisfaction composite significantly predicted all of the commitment composites used in this study. Although there were a variety of the communication satisfaction factors that emerged by themselves as good predictors of organizational commitment composites and factors, Organizational Integration was the CAQ factor that displayed the most consistency as a significant predictor of commitment

composites and factors. This factor predicted 1) Mowday, Porter and Steer's commitment composite; 2) Cook and Wall's commitment composite; 3) Downs and Varona's commitment composite; and 4) Cook and Wall's Identification factor. The next factor that also displayed considerable consistency as a significant predictor of commitment composites and factors was Horizontal Communication. It predicted: 1) Cook and Wall's composite; 2) Cook and Wall's Loyalty factor; and 3) Global Commitment. The other CAQ factors that appeared as significant predictors of commitment composites and factors were: Media Quality, Supervisor Communication, Organizational Perspective, Communication Climate, and Interdepartmental Communication (Table 5.24).

### A Conclusion on Tenure

11. There was a positive and significant relationship between tenure and organizational commitment; employees with more tenure were significantly more committed to their organizations. Tenure, however, did not correlate significantly with communication satisfaction.

Research Question # 4 addressed the impact of job tenure on the communication satisfaction dimensions and on the organizational commitment dimensions for the Guatemalan employees.

Tenure demonstrated a significant, but moderate direct relationship (.24 \*\*\* and .36 \*\*\*) with global commitment for the entire sample and also for organization 3 (Table 5.34). The correlation between tenure and the other commitment composites and factors, however, were not significant, except for C&W Identification factor, and even this was low (.16\*) (Table 5.35). Tenure, however, did not demonstrate any significant direct relationship with the communication satisfaction factors for the entire sample, nor for organization 1 (School), or organization 2 (Hospital). Horizontal Communication was the only communication satisfaction factor that correlated significantly at the .05 level of significance with tenure for organization 3 (Factory) but the correlation was low (.17) (Table 5.38).

When tenure was compared with the communication satisfaction factors, however, some significant differences appeared between some of the communication satisfaction factors and tenure. In general, the tendency was that employees with less than 1 year and more than 6

years of tenure were more satisfied, than were employees with 1 to 5 years of tenure with the factors of Organizational Climate, Horizontal Communication, Top Management Communication, and Interdepartmental Communication (Table 5.36). When tenure was compared with the commitment composites and factors the significant differences that surfaced were on Global Commitment (CAQ 40) and on the D&V commitment composite, where employees with more than 6 years of tenure were significantly more committed to the organization and more committed to the aspects measured by Downs and Varona than were the employees with less than 1 year of tenure, 1 to 3 years of tenure, or 4 to 6 years of tenure (5.40).

### Conclusions on the Research Instruments

12. The Downs's CAQ, the Mowday, Porter, and Steers OCQ, and the Downs and Varona commitment scale were measures that displayed a satisfactory internal reliability with the Guatemalan sample. The Cook and Wall composite and theorized factors, however, did not achieve a satisfactory internal reliability in this study.

The Downs' Communication Audit Questionnaire (CAQ) was the research instrument that displayed the highest Cronbach Alpha (.97). The consistency on the intercorrelations of items was also satisfactory for all the Communication Satisfaction factors, the highest being for Top Management (.92) and the lowest for Horizontal Communication (.64). The Composite Commitment Questionnaire (CCQ), a composite of the MPS OCQ, the C&W OCI, and the D&V Commitment Questionnaire, demonstrated the next highest Cronbach Alpha (.85). The Mowday, Porter, and Steers Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) had a Cronbach Alpha of .76 and the Downs and Varona Commitment Scale had a Cronbach Alpha of .74. The Cook and Wall commitment composite and theorized factors, however, obtained the lowest Cronbach Alphas: .55 for the composite, .43 for the Involvement factor, .33 for the Identification factor, and only .09 for the Loyalty factor (Table 5.1). These low Cronbach Alphas that were obtained by the Cook and Wall composite and theorized factors in the sample used in this study raise a serious concern with the consistency of the intercorrelations of the items of the instrument as a whole and also for each of the factors, especially for the Loyalty factor.

These findings about the Cook and Wall commitment factors contrast with the findings of other studies in which the internal reliability of the instrument and its factors have proven to be very high (Barge and Schlueter, 1988; Potvin, 1991, and Downs A., 1991).

The research instruments used in this study proved to be valid and reliable measures of communication satisfaction and commitment for use in the Guatemalan culture, although some concerns must be given regarding to the Cook and Wall OCI. On the other hand, Guatemala has been greatly influenced by American ideas especially in the field of organizational management. Management courses and training both inside and outside of the University context have been patterned after American models. This influence has also been felt through economic relations, educational exchanges, and television.

13. The correlations between the commitment composites and factors used in this study were all significant but moderate. They interacted, however, differently with the communication satisfaction factors.

Research Question # 2 addressed the relationship between the Mowday, Porter, and Steers commitment composite and: a) the Cook and Wall commitment composite and factors, b) the Downs and Varona commitment composite, and c) the participants' Global Commitment for the Guatemalan sample.

The Mowday, Porter and Steers composite correlated at the .0001 level of confidence with the other commitment composites and factors, with a range from .30 to .53. The Mowday, Porter, and Steers composite also correlated at the .0001 level of confidence with the communication factors, except for Organizational Perspective (.001), with a range from .24 (Organizational Perspective) to .60 (Subordinate Communication). The D&V composite correlated at the .0001 level of significance with the other commitment composites and factors, with a range from .25 to .46. The D&V composite also correlated at the .001 level of significant or above with the communication satisfaction factors, with a range from .26 to .70. The C&W composites and factors correlated at the .0001 level of confidence among them, and with the other commitment composites, with a range from .46 to 75. The C&W composites and factors, however, had very low and few significant correlations with the communication

satisfaction factors. The Loyalty and the Involvement factors were the ones with the lowest correlations (Table 5.19 and 5.20).

These findings, which showed that the Cook and Wall OCI had a strong correlation with the other commitment composites and factors, demonstrated that the instrument had high convergent validity for this sample. This was also corroborated by the Downs A. (1991). However, this finding contradicts Barge and Schlueter's (1988) report which stated that the convergent validity of the instrument had been low.

14. The three factor solution for the Cook and Wall OCI did not emerge, as it had been theorized by its authors, from this sample. However, a three factor solution did surface but with a different structure of factors. A composite score of this instrument also proved to be useful.

The results of the factor analysis, across all the items of the Cook and Wall OCI for this sample, revealed that a three factor solution was appropriate but with a different structure from the one that originally had been theorized by the authors of the instrument. The first

factor, which could be labeled "Involvement", contained two of the items (6 and 9) of the theorized Involvement factor, and two more (1 and 5) from the theorized Identification factor. This factor accounted for 26.0 of the variance. The second factor, which could be named "Lack of Identification", contained three items (8,3 and 2) each of which came from one of the three theorized factors. This factor accounted for 14.9% of the variance. The third factor, called "Loyalty", retained two of the original items (7 and 4) of the theorized Loyalty factor and accounted for 12.1% of the variance (Table 5.5).

These findings seem to indicate that for the Guatemalan sample a three factor solution might be a possibility for the Cook and Wall OCI, but only with a different structure of the items loading into each factor. These outcomes seems to contradict the findings of the Potvin (1991) and Downs A. (1991) studies which had produced a two factor solution for the Cook and Wall OCI.

15. A two factor solution for the Mowday, Porter, Steers OCQ emerged as appropriate for the Guatemalan sample. The composite score of the OCQ, however, proved to be useful in this present study.

The factor analysis of Mowday, Porter, and Steers' Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) yielded a first factor, which could be called Organizational Identification, with 8 items (2,5,6,8,10,13,14 and 15) loading significantly on it and accounting for 28.9% of the variance. A second factor, named Organizational Loyalty, with five items (3,7,9,11 and 12) loading significantly on it, accounted for 12.0% of the variance. A third factor, with only one item (4) loading significantly on it accounted for 8% of the variance (Table 5.4).

The two factor solution for the MPS OCQ also surfaced in the Potvin (1991) study. For factor one, the loading of the items in her study was similar to the loading of the items in this study. The items loading in her study were numbers 1,4,5,10,13 and 14 which accounted for 45% of the variance. Five of these items (5,8,10,13, and 14) were common to the items loading in this study. For factor two, the loaded items of the two studies were different. The items loading in her study were numbers 3 and 9 and accounted 8.6% of the variance. These 2 items plus 3 additional ones loaded on factor two for this study. These factors could be used in further studies.

16. No consistent factor structure emerged from the factor analysis of the Downs and Varona commitment scale which indicated that each item of that scale assessed a different aspect of commitment.

Although a five-factor solution of the Downs and Varona commitment scale (Table 5.6) yielded four clusters of four items each, a thorough content analysis of the items that loaded significantly on each of these clusters revealed that those theoretical factors still remained multidimensional. The first cluster of four items (8,12,13 and 15), accounted for 25% of the variance, and mainly assessed the impact of organizational commitment on loyalty, and willingness to do extra work. A second cluster of three items (18,19 and 20), accounted for 8.8% of the variance, and evaluated how organizational commitment influenced communication and feedback. A third factor of four items (3,4,5 and 6), accounted for 6.8 of the variance, and measured how relationships with superiors and coworkers influenced commitment to the organization and commitment to the job. A fourth cluster of three items (7,14 and 16), accounted for 6.8% of the variance, and estimated the importance of personal advancement. These findings clearly indicated that the

Downs and Varona commitment questionnaire was not, by its very nature, a factor scale, on the contrary, it was a scale in which each item seemed to be assessing something different from the others. Therefore, none of the factor solutions were considered appropriate for the Downs and Varona commitment questionnaire.

### The Limitations of this Study and some Suggestions for Future Research

1. The findings of this study were the result of the quantitative and qualitative analyses that were used. The interpretation task, however, was made more difficult because the researcher did not have a more complete knowledge of the organizations that were studied. The only involvement the researcher had with the organizations was during the two or three days when the questionnaires and the open question surveys were conducted. Although some formal interviews were held with the General Managers of the organizations the information collected was not sufficient to make possible thorough interpretation of the findings. The researcher should be more involved in the organizational contexts being studied in order to make an accurate interpretation of

the findings. If this is not possible he or she will need the assistance of some one in each of the organizations who is well acquainted with their management. This was not possible, however, for this study since the researcher did the interpretation of the findings after he had returned to the U.S.A.

This study, on the other hand, is based on self-report data, and the results need to be understood with this in mind. The results reflected what the employees perceived about communication and commitment, and not necessarily what actually happened. So they may not be an accurate reflection of the actual behavior of the individuals studied. Therefore, the use of techniques such as direct observation and participation, could be employed in future research to determine what actually happens in organizations.

2. A combination of open question surveys and interviews is highly recommended when doing organizational research. In this study many of the different dimension of commitment were covered by using the self-administered open question survey. The open question survey provided rich data of a type that was not possible to collect with the questionnaires. Interviews, on the other hand, can be used to probe into some of the

findings that emerge during the interview process. They could also be used to verify the findings that came from different sources. The combination of open question surveys and interviews also provided the opportunity for the triangulation of data.

In terms of specific suggestions for further research, it is recommended to combine the demographic variables of tenure and age in the study of their impact on communication satisfaction and organizational commitment. This analysis allows a better understanding of the possible relationships that exist between both demographic variables and communication satisfaction and organizational commitment.

3. The limitation of using instruments of measurement made in a different culture needs to be considered. This is the second time the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has proved to be as useful a tool for organizational diagnosis in Guatemala as it has already proven to be in the U.S.A., Mexico, Nigeria, Germany and Australia. The Spanish version of the CSQ was previously used in another study in Guatemala by the researcher (Varona, 1988). This was the first time, however, that the commitment instruments were used to measure organizational commitment in Guatemala. Although

the adaptation of the instruments to the Guatemalan culture was done using the techniques of standardization that are available in this field of the research, the results proved that one of the instruments did not demonstrate an acceptable levels of reliability.

Therefore, the use of instruments developed in one culture must be carefully considered when conducting research in a different culture. The standardization of the instrument to each culture would be ideal.

4. The findings of this study are representative and valuable only for the three organizations that were investigated. It is important to take into consideration that these organizations were unique in their organizational mission, structure, communication channels, and management style. A larger sample of supervisors would have allowed for more accurate quantitative and qualitative results, and consequently for a more accurate interpretation. Therefore, the generalizability of these results is limited.

A broader study including a much larger sample utilizing all of the types of organizations present in Guatemala is recommended for subsequent investigations.

5. There is a real need for developing more valid and reliable measures of commitment, and additionally,

such measures should be capable of assessing the multidimensionality of organizational commitment. Based on the results of the this study, the multivariate commitments framework of organizational commitment suggested by Reichers (1985) seems to offer a solution for this need (Conclusion #8).

6. There is also a real need for investigating the Guatemalan culture. A description of the Guatemalan national character was an impossible task because of the lack of research to document such a general description. Without this documentation of the Guatemalan culture, the study of the impact of culture in the organizational context remains unattainable. More research is also needed to investigate the nature of organizational dimensions such as management and communication styles, superior/subordinate relationship, problem-solving style, the personal feedback, work ethic, the organizational loyalty.

## REFERENCES

- Alum, Carlos V. (1982). A case study of communication satisfaction in Nova de Monterrey. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Kansas.
- Alutto, J. A., Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alonso, R. C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. Social Forces, 51, 448-454.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational communication and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 1-14.
- Avery, B. E. (1977). The Relationship between communication and job satisfaction in government organization. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Kansas, 1977.
- Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Barge, J. Kevin, & Schlueter, David W. (1988). A critical evaluation of organizational commitment and identification. Management Communication Quarterly, 2(1), 116-133.
- Barnard, Chester I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bartol, R. M. (1979). Professionalism as a predictor of organizational commitment, role stress and turnover: A multidimensional approach. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 815-821.
- Bavelas, Alex, & Barrett, Dermont. (1951). An experimental approach to organizational communication. Personnel, 27.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32-40.
- Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). Formal organizations: A comparative approach. San Francisco: Chandler.

- Blubaugh, J. A., and Varona, F. (1991). A study of similarities and differences between Hispanic and American Teams. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Intercultural and International Communication Conference. Miami, Florida.
- Brislin, R. W., Lonner, W. J., & Thorndike, R. M. (1973). Cross-cultural research methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Buchanan, Bruce II. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of work managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Clampitt, P. G. (1983). Communication and productivity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Clampitt, P. G., & Girard, D. M. (1986). Communication satisfaction: A useful construct? Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Chicago.
- Clampitt, P. G., & Downs, Cal W. (1987). Communication satisfaction: A review of the literature. Unpublished paper, University of Kansas.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 39-52.
- Crino, Michael D., & White, Michael C. (1981). Satisfaction in communication: An examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. Psychological Reports, 49, 831-838.
- Cheney, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. Communication Monographs, 50, 342-360.
- Dornstein, M., & Matalon, Y. (1989). A comprehensive analysis of the predictors of organizational commitment: A study of voluntary army personnel in Israel. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34, 192-203.

- Downs, A. (1991). A case study of the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in two Australian organizations. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas.
- Downs, Cal W. (1988). Communication audits. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Downs, Cal W., Hazen, Michael D., & Quiggins, J. (1973). A theoretical analysis of communication satisfaction. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention. New York City.
- Downs, Cal W., & Hazen, Michael D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. Journal of Business Communication, 14(3), 63-74.
- Duke, P.O. (1981). Communication satisfaction of business education teachers in an urban school system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University.
- Eisenberg, E. M., Monge, P. R. & Miller, K. I. (1983). Involvement in communication networks as a predictor of organizational commitment. Human Communication Research, 10(2), 179-201.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York: The Free Press.
- Farace, R. V., Monge, P. R., and Russell, H. M. (1977). Communicating and organizing. New York: Random House.
- Farrell, K. R., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27, 78-95.
- Ferris, K. R., & Aranya, N. (1983). A comparison of two organizational commitment scales. Personnel Psychology, 36, 87-98.
- Fowler, Jr., F. J. (1988). Survey Research Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

- Glaser, B. G. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity. Advances in the methodology of grounded theory. Mill Valley, California: The Sociology Press.
- Gordon, H. (1979). Communication analysis of administrators in an academic organization. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles-I. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, 281-306.
- Greenbaum, Howard H. (1986). The measurement of organization wide communication: a comparison of three recognized instruments. Paper presented at the 36th Annual Convention. Chicago, Illinois.
- Hall, R. H. (1977). Organizations: Structure and process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hecht, M. L. (1978). Measures of communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4, (4), 350-368.
- Hofstede, Geert. (1980). Culture's consequences. Internal differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Housel, T. J., & Warren, E. D. (1977). The reduction of upward communication distortion. Journal of Business Communication, (Summer), 49-55.  
(Argyris' study was reported in this article)
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, (4), 555-573.
- Infopress Centroamericana (Ed.). (1991). Central America Report. Guatemala City. Issues of the 2, 23, and 30 of May.
- Johnson, J. David, & Tuttle, Frank. (1989). Problems in intercultural research. In M. K. Asante, & W. B. Gudykunst, Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication (pp 461-483). Newbury Park, C.A.: Sage Publications.

- Johnson, Otto (Ed.) (1991). The 1991 information please almanac. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Jones, J. W. (1981). Analysis of communication satisfaction in four rural school system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University.
- Kaid, L., & Wadsworth, A. (1989). Content analysis. In P. Emmert & L. L. (Eds). Measurement of Communication Behavior (pp 197-217). New York: Longman.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiely.
- Keisler, C. A., & Sakumura, J. (1966). A test of a model for commitment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 349-353.
- Kenny, D. A. (1987). Statistics for the social and behavioral sciences. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kio, J. B. A. (1979). A descriptive study of communication satisfaction, need satisfaction, and need importance index among Nigerian workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Koch, J. L., & Steers, R. M. (1978). Job attachment, satisfaction, and turnover among public sector employees. Journal of Vocational Behavior. 12, 119-128.
- Kom, P., Katerberg, R. & Hulin, C. (1979). Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 280-290.
- Larson, E., & Fukami, C. (1984). Relationships between worker behavior and commitment to the organization and union. Proceedings of the Academy of Management, 1984, 222-226.
- Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9(4), 297-308.

- Level, Dale A. (1959). A case study of human communication in an urban bank. Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University. Dissertation Abstracts, 20.
- Marsh, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Morris, J. H., & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. Academy of Management Journal, 24(3), 512-526.
- Morris, J. H., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 50-57.
- Morrow, Paula C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. Academy of Management Review, 8(3), 486-500.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 41(6), 467-482.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors, and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 231-248.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.
- Nicholson, J. H. (1980). Analysis of communication satisfaction in an urban school system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University.
- Pincus, J. D. (1984). The impact of communication satisfaction on job satisfaction and job performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

- Porter, L. W., Steers R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(5), 603-609.
- Porter, L. W., & Smith, F. J. (1970). The etiology of organizational commitment: A longitudinal study of initial stages of employee organization relationships. Unpublished manuscript.
- Potvin, T. C. (1991). Employee organizational commitment: An examination of its relationship to communication satisfaction and evaluation of questionnaires designed to measure the construct. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Kansas.
- Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Liang, T. K. (1989). Work values and organizational commitment: A study in the Asian context. Human Relations, 42(3), 275-288.
- Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Phua, J. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. Group & Organizational Studies, 15(1), 44-52.
- Randall, D. M. (1988). Multiple roles and organizational commitment. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9, 309-317.
- Redding, W. C. (1978). Communication within the organization: An interpretative review of theory and research. New York: Industrial Communication Council, Inc.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Rogers, Everett M., & Agarwala-Rogers, Rekha. (1976). Communication in organizations. New York: The Free Press.
- Ruch, William V. (1989). International handbook of corporate communication. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc.

- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the Control of Organizational Behavior and belief. In B. M Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.) New Directions in Organizational Behavior. Chicago: St. Clair.
- Sekaran, U. (1986). Mapping bank employee perceptions of organizational stimuli in two countries. Journal of Management, 12, 19-30.
- Sheldon, Mary E. (1971). Investments and Involvements as Mechanisms Producing Commitment to the Organization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, (2) 143-150.
- Staw, B. M., & Salancik, G. R. (Eds.). (1977). New Directions in Organizational Behavior. Chicago: St. Clair.Staw.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Stevens, J. M. (1976). Managerial commitment policy receptive, and policy implementation in public sector organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Stevens, J. M., Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1978). Assessing Personal, Role, and Organizational Predictors of Managerial Commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21(3), 380-396.
- Sudaman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1988). Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Thayer, Lee O. (1969). Communication and communication systems. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit: Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. Country Profile 1990-1991. United Kingdom: London
- Thiry, R. V. (1977). Relationship of communication satisfaction to need fulfillment among Kansas nurses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Kansas.

- Varona, F. (1988). A comparative study of communication satisfaction in two Guatemalan companies. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Kansas.
- Vroom, V. M. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.
- Wippich, B. (1983). An analysis of communication and job satisfaction in an educational setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Wippich, M. L. (1983). Communication satisfaction, communicator style, and perceived organizational effectiveness in an educational setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

APPENDIX A  
COMMUNICATION AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE (CAQ)

Items, Frequencies, Means and Rankings  
Entire Sample

Mean scores rank from 1=Very Dissatisfied to  
7=Very Satisfied

No. Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	Rk
4. Information about my progress in my job	5	19	4	22	49	149	54	5.49	4
5. Personal news	10	27	15	41	81	100	20	4.82	36
6. Information about organization policies and goals	13	24	11	31	67	96	42	5.01	23
7. Information about how my job compares with others	15	25	8	51	67	92	42	4.91	27
8. Information about how I am being judged	13	12	9	46	61	111	45	5.16	17
9. Recognition of my efforts	24	22	14	34	62	85	48	4.85	32
10. Information about my departmental policies and goals	13	19	8	31	71	106	48	5.15	18
11. Information about the requirements of my job	3	17	11	16	59	154	44	5.46	5
12. Information about government action affecting the organization	27	43	17	74	72	44	13	4.05	50
13. Information about changes in my organization	15	26	15	54	65	89	25	4.71	44

14. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled	13	29	20	24	82	97	35	4.88	31
15. Information about employee benefits and pay	17	42	26	15	80	88	32	4.63	46
16. Information about the organization's financial standing	26	41	20	58	48	62	34	4.32	48
17. Information about accomplishments and/or failures of the organization	20	21	9	43	61	101	38	4.90	28
18. Extent to which my superior know and understand problems faced by subordinates	14	28	18	35	80	93	30	4.80	38
19. Extent to which company communication motivates and stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting its goals	20	26	16	22	102	84	24	4.72	43
20. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me	17	23	10	14	50	121	68	5.28	11
21. Extent to which the people in our organization have great ability as communicators	11	28	22	25	90	101	22	4.82	34
22. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job related problems	16	22	9	10	52	128	69	5.36	9
23. Extent to which communication in the organization makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it	13	21	14	22	56	119	55	5.21	14

24.Extent to which the organization's communications are interesting and helpful	11	24	10	33	61	113	35	5.06	22
25.Extent to which my supervisor trusts me	6	16	5	13	23	142	96	5.79	1
26.Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job	11	25	17	10	69	121	48	5.17	15
27.Extent to which conflicts are handled through proper communication channels	16	34	21	35	73	90	23	4.63	47
28.Extent to which the grapevine is active	26	45	18	62	73	50	10	4.06	49
29.Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas	8	24	10	25	58	123	48	5.23	13
30.Extent to which horizontal communication with other employees is accurate and free-flowing	9	22	12	20	47	145	43	5.28	10
31.Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies	4	15	18	26	67	125	36	5.25	12
32.Extent to which my work group is compatible	14	9	14	24	40	141	54	5.38	7
33.Extent to which our meetings are well organized	21	25	27	23	59	98	32	4.74	41
34.Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right	12	28	17	15	46	134	41	5.11	20

35.Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise	7	18	20	26	59	125	31	5.13	19
36.Extent to which attitudes toward communication in the organization are basically healthy	10	22	20	31	73	109	23	4.92	26
37.Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate	13	29	10	45	89	81	18	4.69	45
38.Extent to which the amount of communication in the organization is about right	15	29	26	21	84	91	25	4.72	42
39.How would you rate your productivity?	2	7	149	36	77	23	16	4.83	--
40.How would you rate your level of commitment to your current work organization?	1	1	2	117	21	81	70	5.31	--
42.Extent to which top management communicates openly and honestly with organization members	21	25	13	26	68	103	40	4.90	29
43.Extent to which top management cares about organization members	19	33	12	22	86	85	41	4.81	37
44.Extent to which top management listens to members and welcomes their ideas	19	37	14	24	76	90	37	4.74	40
45.Extent to which top management communicates in a timely way to keep members informed	12	30	11	25	76	15	25	4.93	25

46.Extent to which top management is believable in its communication with members	9	29	15	28	64	113	32	4.98	24
47.Extent to which members communicate between departments to solve problems	15	30	15	25	77	102	26	4.82	35
48.Extent to which the amount of interdepartmental communication is about right	13	32	12	30	84	92	24	4.78	39
49.Extent to which there is a sense of teamwork across Divisions or work units	8	25	21	33	70	106	22	4.88	30
50.Extent to which managers communicate with one another	9	20	11	49	47	102	45	5.08	21
51.Extent to which priorities between my department and other department are in agreement	15	26	11	40	71	103	25	4.83	33
52.Extent to which my subordinates are responsive to downward directive communication	1	4	0	1	15	25	11	5.52	3
53.Extent to which my subordinates anticipate my needs for information	2	2	2	1	14	27	9	5.45	6
54.Extent to which I <u>do not</u> have a communication overload	0	5	2	5	14	23	5	5.16	16
55.Extent to which my subordinates are receptive to evaluation, suggestions, and criticism	2	4	1	0	15	27	8	5.36	8

56.Extent to which my  
subordinates feel  
responsible for  
initiating accurate  
upward communication

	2	2	2	2	7	32	9	5.53	2
1. Job Satisfaction	12	6	8	4	74	130	65	5.58	--

Rk= Rank

APPENDIX B

COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRES  
Items, Frequencies, Means and Rankings  
Entire Sample

Mean scores rank from 1=Strongly disagree  
to 7=Strongly agree

No.	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	Rk
<u>MOWDAY, PORTER, AND</u>										
<u>STEERS'S OCQ</u>										
1.	I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.	6	4	1	11	31	105	143	6.13	6
2.	I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.	4	3	4	7	30	107	145	6.19	5
3.	I feel very little loyalty to this organization.	20	45	26	23	13	53	110	4.94	29
4.	I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.	37	44	19	18	28	87	66	4.60	34
5.	I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	5	10	8	30	39	124	75	5.61	22
6.	I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	1	4	2	10	27	106	149	6.25	3
7.	I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.	54	105	36	24	18	29	29	3.16	44

8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	12	12	15	12	49	97	98	5.56	24
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.	19	28	27	35	22	99	60	4.89	30
10. I am extremely glad I chose this organization to work for, over others that I was considering at the time I joined.	2	6	4	18	26	121	119	6.03	10
11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization.	28	64	42	25	24	66	48	4.15	40
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.	25	69	43	46	23	56	29	3.88	42
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.	17	15	8	27	30	109	87	5.43	25
14. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations to work for.	11	22	18	30	61	78	75	5.17	27
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.	8	14	9	23	8	69	167	5.96	11

COOK AND WALL'S OCI

1. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for.	1	2	5	14	28	108	141	6.19	4
---	---	---	---	----	----	-----	-----	------	---

2. I sometimes feel like leaving this employment for good.	23	39	41	23	26	53	84	4.67	33
3. I am not willing to put myself out just help the organization.	19	55	20	22	20	70	84	4.77	31
4. Even if the firm were not doing too well financially I would be reluctant to change to another employer.	38	47	24	35	43	73	24	4.10	41
5. I feel myself to be part of the organization.	5	9	2	11	20	121	125	6.05	9
6. In my work I feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well.	5	3	4	5	17	108	157	6.27	2
7. The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not seriously make me think of changing my job.	31	39	35	25	42	76	40	4.37	37
8. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff.	25	68	7	14	16	74	90	4.73	32
9. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me.	5	5	0	5	8	101	170	6.36	1

DOWNES AND VARONA'S COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I am more committed to my own career than to this organization.	38	48	24	40	30	56	53	4.23	38
2. Rewarding results is more important than following procedures.	26	35	22	30	40	89	39	4.58	35

3. Communication from Top management influences the level of my commitment. 10 14 8 18 33 126 83 5.60 23

4. The friendliness and support of other employees in my work unit make me committed to this organization. 12 14 4 18 31 132 88 5.64 20

5. The longer I work for this organization, the more committed I am to it. 7 13 5 10 23 121 118 5.90 14

6. My relationship with my supervisor contributes to my job commitment. 10 17 8 20 23 126 91 5.61 21

7. It is more important to me to work in a job to experience job challenge and personal growth than to receive higher pay. 18 25 21 14 56 95 65 5.07 28

8. An important goal for me is to increase my status. 8 7 5 14 25 115 116 5.93 12

9. Pride in working for this organization does not influence the quality of my work. 44 49 10 27 20 95 49 4.44 36

10. I will not let people downplay the quality of my work. 16 14 5 10 11 94 145 5.87 16

My commitment to this organization causes me to:

11. Keep organizational interest in mind when I make decisions about my work. 7 13 2 22 32 121 95 5.74 18

12. Feel great loyalty to the organization and want to maintain membership with it.	5	2	3	4	33	126	122	6.13	7
13. Support top management and decision about the goals and values of the organization.	3	6	13	20	48	119	83	5.71	19
14. Refuse a similar job in another organization even if it paid more.	41	48	25	26	44	63	44	4.19	39
15. Do extra work in order to make the organization more effective.	2	6	2	9	30	134	106	6.06	8
16. Refuse to take a job in another organization even if it would advance my career.	60	41	30	28	40	59	30	3.84	43
17. Take risks in order to improve results.	4	10	6	8	28	135	101	5.92	13
18. Communicate information openly to others.	22	13	11	26	30	112	71	5.27	26
19. Concentrate on achieving goals.	2	6	5	28	30	131	88	5.83	17
20. Seek feedback and suggestions from others to improve my work.	3	10	7	14	18	144	88	5.88	15

APPENDIX C

OPEN QUESTION SURVEY

SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS' FORM

I. Communication Satisfaction

1. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the major factors that foster your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

3. What are the major factors that inhibit your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?  
supervisors

4. Do you think that your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization have any impact on your organizational commitment?.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, say how.

5. How do you define Communication Satisfaction?

6. What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve communication?

7. How would you rate your subordinates level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

8. What are the major factors that foster your subordinates' level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

9. What are the major factors that inhibit your subordinate's level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

## II. Organizational Commitment

1. How would you rate your level of commitment to this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the major factors that foster your organizational commitment?

3. What are the major factors that inhibit commitment in your organization?

4. How do you define Organizational Commitment?

5. What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve organizational commitment?

6. How would you rate your subordinates' level of commitment to this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

7. What are the major factors that foster your subordinates' level of organizational commitment?

8. What are the major factors that inhibit your subordinates' organizational commitment?

## III. Managing Organizational Commitment

1. What is important to you in this organization to be committed to?

2. How do you communicate to your employees what you believe it is important for the organization to be committed to?.

3. What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with low level of organizational commitment?.

4. What do you do with low committed employees?

5. What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with high levels of organizational commitment?

6. What do top managers do to foster their employees' permanent commitment?

# SUBORDINATES' FORM

## I. Communication Satisfaction

1. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the major factors that foster your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?

3. What are the major factors that inhibit your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization?  
supervisors

4. Do you think that your satisfaction with the communication practices in this organization have any impact on your organizational commitment?.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, say how.

5. How do you define Communication Satisfaction?

6. What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve communication?

## II. Organizational Commitment

1. How would you rate your level of commitment to this organization?

a) High \_\_\_\_\_ b) Average \_\_\_\_\_ c) Low \_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the major factors that foster your organizational commitment?

3. What are the major factors that inhibit commitment in your organization?

4. How do you define Organizational Commitment?

5. What would you like to see done in this organization in order to improve organizational commitment?

### III. Managing Organizational Commitment

1. What is important to you in this organization to be committed to?

2. How do supervisors and top managers communicate to their employees what they believe it is important for the organization to be committed to?.

3. What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with low level of organizational commitment?.

4. What do supervisors and top managers do with low committed employees?

5. What are the typical behaviors displayed by employees with high levels of organizational commitment?

6. What do top managers do to foster their employees' permanent commitment?

APPENDIX D

SPANISH VERSION OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Cuestionario de Auditoría de la Comunicación

Cal Downs: Copyright, 1973, 1989  
Federico Varona: Versión en Español

=====  
**INTRODUCCION:** La mayoría de nosotros asumimos que la calidad y cantidad de comunicación influye en nuestro nivel de satisfacción en el trabajo, en la productividad y en nuestro nivel de compromiso. A través de este estudio, esperamos descubrir su grado de satisfacción con la comunicación, y las sugerencias que Ud. propone para mejorarla. Le agradecemos mucho el tiempo que dedique a contestar este cuestionario.

- Nota:** 1. Este cuestionario puede responderse en 20 o 30 minutos.  
2. Sus respuestas son estrictamente confidenciales, por lo que le suplicamos que sea lo más sincero posible.  
3. No escriba su nombre.
- =====

**A. Responda a las siguientes preguntas por favor: (Marque su respuesta con una X en el espacio correspondiente)**

a) ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva trabajando en esta Organización?

Menos de 1 año \_\_\_\_\_

1 - 3 años \_\_\_\_\_

4 - 6 años \_\_\_\_\_

Más de 6 años \_\_\_\_\_

b) ¿Cuál es su posición?:

Supervisor (coordinador) \_\_\_\_\_

No supervisor \_\_\_\_\_

c) ¿En qué departamento trabaja?: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Responda a las siguientes preguntas por favor: (Marque su respuesta con una X en el espacio correspondiente)

1. ¿Cuál es su nivel de satisfacción en relación con su trabajo? (seleccione solamente una respuesta)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Muy insatisfecho         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Más o menos satisfecho |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Insatisfecho             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Satisfecho             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Más o menos insatisfecho | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Muy satisfecho         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Indiferente              |  |

2. En los últimos 6 meses, ¿qué ha sucedido con su nivel de satisfacción en el trabajo? (seleccione solamente una respuesta)

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Ha aumentado    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Permanece igual |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Ha disminuido   |

3. Si la comunicación relacionada con su trabajo pudiera cambiarse para ayudarle a sentirse más satisfecho, ¿qué cambiaría?

C. A continuación aparecen varios tipos de información que normalmente se relacionan con el trabajo de una persona. Por favor, indique cuál es su nivel de satisfacción en relación con la cantidad y/o calidad de cada tipo de información. (Marque con un círculo el número que corresponda mejor a su respuesta).

Escala:

1=Muy Insatisfecho, 2=Insatisfecho, 3=Poco Insatisfecho, 4=Indiferente, 5=Poco Satisfecho, 6=Satisfecho; 7=Muy Satisfecho.

4. Información sobre el progreso que estoy realizando en mi trabajo.            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. Información sobre acontecimientos personales de la gente de la organización.            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. Información sobre las políticas y objetivos de la organización.            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. Información sobre cómo se compara mi trabajo con el de otros.            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. Información sobre cómo me ven en esta organización.            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. Reconocimiento a mis esfuerzos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Información sobre las políticas y objetivos de mi departamento.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Información sobre las exigencias de mi trabajo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Información sobre las acciones del gobierno que afectan a la organización.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Información sobre los cambios en la organización.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Información sobre cómo se están resolviendo los problemas relacionados con mi trabajo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Información sobre prestaciones y salarios.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Información sobre la situación financiera de la organización.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Información sobre los éxitos y/o fracasos de la organización.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>D. Por favor indique cuán satisfecho está con lo siguiente:</b>							
18. El grado en que mis superiores conocen y entienden los problemas que enfrentan sus subalternos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. El grado en que la comunicación en la organización motiva, estimula y entusiasma para lograr sus objetivos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. El grado en que mi supervisor me escucha y me pone atención.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. El grado de habilidad que tiene la gente de nuestra organización para comunicarse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. El grado en que mi supervisor me ayuda a resolver los problemas relacionados con el trabajo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

23. El grado en que la comunicación en la organización me ayuda a identificarme y a sentirme parte importante de ella.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. El grado en que las publicaciones de la empresa son interesantes y útiles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. El grado en que mi supervisor confía en mi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. El grado en que recibo a tiempo la información necesaria para hacer mi trabajo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. El grado en el que los conflictos son tratados apropiadamente a través de los debidos canales de comunicación.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. El grado en que la comunicación informal es eficiente. (a través de rumores).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. El grado en que mi supervisor está abierto a nuevas ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. El grado en que la comunicación con otros empleados es libre y exacta.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. El grado en que las prácticas de comunicación se adaptan en caso de emergencia.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. El grado en que en mi grupo de trabajo es compatible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. El grado en que las sesiones de trabajo están bien organizadas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. El grado en que la cantidad de supervisión que recibo es apropiada.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. El grado en que las directivas escritas y los informes son claros y concisos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

36. El grado en que las actitudes hacia la comunicación en la organización son positivas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. El grado en que la comunicación informal es activa y exacta. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. El grado en que la cantidad de comunicación en la organización es suficiente. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. ¿Cómo evalúa su productividad en su trabajo? (seleccione solamente una respuesta)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Muy baja         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Ligeramente alta |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Baja             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Alta             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Ligeramente baja | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Muy alta         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Normal           |  |

40. ¿Cómo calificaría Ud. su nivel de compromiso con esta empresa? (seleccione solamente una respuesta)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Muy bajo         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Ligeramente alto |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Bajo             | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Alto             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Ligeramente bajo | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Muy alto         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Normal           |  |

41. Si la comunicación relacionada con su trabajo pudiera cambiarse de alguna forma para ayudarlo a sentirse más comprometido con la organization, ¿qué cambiaría?

E. Por favor indique cuán satisfecho está con: (Marque con un círculo el número que corresponda mejor a su respuesta).

42. El grado en que la gerencia se comunica abierta y honestamente con los miembros de la organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. El grado en que la gerencia se preocupa por los miembros de la organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. El grado en que la gerencia escucha y recibe bien las sugerencias de los miembros de la organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. El grado en que la gerencia se comunica periódicamente con sus subalternos para mantenerles informados. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46. El grado en que la comunicación de la gerencia con sus subalternos es confiable. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. El grado en que los miembros de los departamentos se comunican para resolver problemas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
48. El grado en que la comunicación entre los departamentos es apropiada. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49. El grado en que existe un sentido de trabajo en equipo entre las divisiones o unidades de trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
50. El grado en que los gerentes se comunican entre sí. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
51. El grado en que coinciden las prioridades de mi departamento con las de otros departamentos. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- F. ATENCION: Conteste las 5 siguientes preguntas solamente si Ud. es un gerente o supervisor.**  
Indique su nivel de satisfacción con:
52. El grado en que mis subalternos responden a la comunicación que viene de los niveles superiores. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
53. El grado en que mis subalternos me dan con anticipación la información que necesito. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
54. El grado en que no tengo exceso de información. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
55. El grado en que mis subalternos aceptan evaluaciones, sugerencias y críticas. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
56. El grado en que mis subalternos se sienten responsables para iniciar una comunicación confiable con sus superiores. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

# Cuestionarios de Compromiso con la Organización

Monday, Steers, and Porters, 1979  
Cook and Wall, 1980 /Cal Downs, 1990  
Federico Varona: Versión en Español

=====  
**INTRODUCCION:** La importancia que tiene el compromiso con la organización en la que trabajamos está siendo resaltada hoy por muchos expertos. Varios estudios han demostrado que el grado de compromiso con la organización influye en nuestro nivel de satisfacción y en la calidad y cantidad de nuestro trabajo. A través de este estudio, esperamos descubrir su grado de compromiso con su organización. Le agradecemos mucho el tiempo que dedique a contestar este cuestionario.

- Nota:** 1. Este cuestionario puede responderse en 20 o 30 minutos.  
2. Sus respuestas son estrictamente confidenciales, por lo que le suplicamos que sea lo más sincero posible.  
3. No escriba su nombre.

=====  
**A. Responda a las siguientes preguntas por favor: (Marque su respuesta con una X en el espacio correspondiente)**

1. ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva trabajando en esta Organización?  
Menos de 1 año \_\_\_\_\_  
1 - 3 años \_\_\_\_\_  
4 - 6 años \_\_\_\_\_  
Más de 6 años \_\_\_\_\_
2. ¿Cuál es su posición?:  
Supervisor (coordinador) \_\_\_\_\_  
No supervisor \_\_\_\_\_
3. ¿En qué Departamento trabaja?: \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Por favor indique hasta qué punto está Ud. de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones acerca de su organización. (Marque con un círculo el número que corresponda mejor a su respuesta)**

### Escala:

1=Totalment en desacuerdo, 2=En desacuerdo; 3=Ligeramente en desacuerdo; 4=Indiferente; 5=Ligeramente de acuerdo, 6=De acuerdo; 7=Totalment de acuerdo.

MOWDAY, PORTER, AND STEERS'S OCQ

1. Estoy dispuesto a hacer cualquier esfuerzo que esté más allá de lo normal, para contribuir al éxito de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. A mis amigos siempre les hablo bien de esta organización y se la presento como una gran organización con la que vale la pena trabajar. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Siento muy poca lealtad hacia esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Estaría casi dispuesto a aceptar que se me asignara cualquier tipo de trabajo para poder seguir en esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. He encontrado que mis valores y los valores de esta organización son muy similares. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Estoy orgulloso de poder decir que soy parte de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Podría perfectamente estar trabajando en una organización diferente siempre que el tipo de trabajo fuera el mismo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Esta organización me motiva realmente a poner lo mejor de mí mismo en la manera como ejecuto mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Un cambio muy pequeño en las presentes circunstancias de mi trabajo sería suficiente para que dejara esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Estoy sumamente contento de haber elegido esta organización en lugar de las otras que estuve considerando como otra posibilidad cuando tomé mi decisión. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. No es mucho lo que se gana con el hecho de permanecer en esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Frecuentemente me resulta difícil estar de acuerdo con las políticas de esta organización en asuntos importantes relacionados con sus empleados. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. El destino de esta organización realmente me preocupa. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. Para mi esta es la mejor de todas las organizaciones para trabajar. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Haber decidido trabajar con esta organización fue definitivamente un error de mi parte. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

COOK AND WALL'S OCI

1. Me siento completamente orgulloso de poder decir a la gente para quien estoy trabajando. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Algunas veces siento ganas de salirme definitivamente de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. No estoy dispuesto a molestarte para ayudar a esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Aún en el caso en que esta organización no estuviera bien financieramente, me resistiría a cambiarla por otra. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Me siento parte de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. Siento que me estoy esforzando en mi trabajo no solamente para mi propio beneficio sino también para el beneficio de la organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. La oferta de un poco más de dinero por parte de otra organización no me haría considerar seriamente la posibilidad de cambiar mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. No recomendaría a un buen amigo que formara parte de nuestro grupo de trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Saber que mi trabajo ha contribuido al bien de la organización es algo que me agradaría. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

DOWNES AND VARONA'S COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Estoy más comprometido con mi profesión que con esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Es más importante premiar resultados que seguir procedimientos. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. La comunicación que recibo de mis jefes influye en mi nivel de compromiso. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. La amistad y el apoyo de otros empleados en mi trabajo hace que me sienta más comprometido con esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Cuanto más tiempo llevo trabajando por esta organización, más comprometido me siento con ella. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. La relación que tengo con mi supervisor influye en mi compromiso en el trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Para mi es más importante tener un trabajo en el que gano experiencia y desarrollo personal que recibir un buen salario. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Para mi un objetivo importante en mi trabajo es mejorar mi posición en él. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. El orgullo que siento de trabajar para esta organización no influye en la de mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. No estoy dispuesto a permitir que la gente desacredite la calidad de mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C. Porque me siento comprometido con esta organización:

11. Tengo en cuenta los intereses de la organización cuando tomo decisiones acerca de mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Siento gran lealtad hacia esta organización y quiero seguir siendo parte de ella. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Apoyo las decisiones que mis jefes toman acerca de los objetivos y valores de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Rechazaría un trabajo similar en otra organización aunque el pago fuera mejor. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Hago un esfuerzo extra para hacer que esta organización sea más eficiente. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Rechazaría un trabajo en otra organización incluso si ello supusiera un avance en mi profesión. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Estoy dispuesto a arriesgarme para mejorar los resultados de mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Comunico abiertamente información a otros. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Me concentro en el logro de los objetivos importantes de esta organización. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. Busco feedback y sugerencias de otros para mejorar mi trabajo. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Cuestionario de Preguntas Abiertas Para Gerentes y Supervisores

I. Satisfacción con la comunicación

1. ¿Cómo calificaría su nivel de satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación de esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ b) Normal \_\_\_\_\_ c) Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

2. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

4. ¿Piensa Ud. que su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación tiene algún impacto en su nivel de compromiso con esta organización?

Si \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ No se \_\_\_\_\_

Si su respuesta es sí, diga cómo.

5. ¿Cómo define Ud. SATISFACCION CON LA COMUNICACION?

6. ¿Qué le gustaría que se hiciera en esta organización para mejorar la comunicación?

7. ¿Cómo calificaría el nivel de satisfacción de sus subalternos con las prácticas de comunicación de esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ b) Normal \_\_\_\_\_ c) Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

8. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan la satisfacción de sus subalternos con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

9. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden la satisfacción de sus subalternos con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

## II. Compromiso con la Organización

1. ¿Cómo calificaría su nivel de compromiso con esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ b) Normal \_\_\_\_\_ c) Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

2. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan su compromiso con esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden su compromiso con esta organización?

4. ¿Cómo define Ud. COMPROSIMO CON LA ORGANIZACION?

5. ¿Qué le gustaría que se hiciera en esta organización para sentirse más comprometido con ella?

6. ¿Cómo calificaría Ud. el nivel de compromiso de sus subalternos con esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ Normal \_\_\_\_\_ Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

7. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan el compromiso de sus subalternos con esta organización?

8. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden el compromiso de sus subalternos con esta organización?

## III. Como Estimular el Compromiso con la Organización

1. ¿Qué es lo más importante en esta organización con lo que vale la pena comprometerse?

2. ¿Cómo comunica Ud. a sus subalternos lo que es importante en esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son algunos de los comportamientos típicos de los subalternos que tiene un nivel bajo de compromiso con la organización?

4. ¿Qué hace Ud. con los subalternos que tienen un nivel bajo de compromiso con la organización?

5. ¿Cuáles son algunos de los comportamientos típicos de los subalternos que tiene un nivel alto de compromiso con la organización?

6. ¿Qué hace Ud. para fomentar el compromiso permanente de sus empleados con la organización?

## Cuestionario de Preguntas Abiertas Para Empleados

### I. Satisfacción con la Comunicación

1. ¿Cómo calificaría su nivel de satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación de esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ Normal \_\_\_\_\_ Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

2. Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación en esta organización?

4. ¿Piensa Ud. que su satisfacción con las prácticas de comunicación tiene algún impacto en su nivel de compromiso con esta organización?

Si \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ No se \_\_\_\_\_

Si su respuesta es sí, diga cómo.

5. ¿Cómo define Ud. SATISFACCION CON LA COMUNICACION?

6. ¿Qué le gustaría que se hiciera en esta organización para mejorar la comunicación?

### II. Compromiso con la Organización

1. ¿Cómo calificaría su nivel de compromiso con esta organización?

a) Alto \_\_\_\_\_ Normal \_\_\_\_\_ Bajo \_\_\_\_\_

2. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que fomentan su compromiso con esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son los principales factores que impiden su compromiso con esta organización?

4. ¿Cómo define Ud. COMPROMISO CON LA ORGANIZACION?

5. ¿Qué le gustaría que se hiciera en esta organización para mejorar el compromiso de sus empleados?

### III. Como Estimular el Compromiso con la Organización

1. ¿Cuál es lo más importante en esta organización con lo que vale la pena comprometerse?

2. ¿Cómo comunican los gerentes y supervisores a sus empleados lo que es importante en esta organización?

3. ¿Cuáles son algunos de los comportamientos típicos de los empleados que tiene un nivel bajo de compromiso con la organización?

4. ¿Qué hacen los gerentes y supervisores con los empleados que tienen un nivel bajo de compromiso con la organización?

5. ¿Cuáles son algunos de los comportamientos típicos de los empleados que tiene un nivel alto de compromiso con la organización?

6. ¿Qué hace la gerencia para fomentar el compromiso permanente de sus empleados con la organización?