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Abstract

Managers spend seventy-five to eighty percent of their time communicating interpersonally. Ironically, communication skills are often listed as a major weakness of today's managers. The decision-making component of the managerial task requires the abilities to gather and analyze necessary information, consult with and involve the expertise of peers and subordinates in the decision-making process, and implement the final decisions through the aid of those effected by them. Communication, therefore, is the prerequisite for sound decisions and effective management. A strong and effective organizational communication system allows the "receiver" to express his needs and thoughts to the "sender."

Renis Likert, echoed by numerous writers, considered communication a central key force in the decisional participation process. The hypothesis of this study was that the more effective the system of organizational communication is, the more involved the managers in middle- and lower-levels of the hierarchy will get. Communication effectiveness was measured through four components: Upward communication, downward communication, content of communication, and sources of information. The impact of these
components on the degree of decisional participation among the middle- and lower-level managers in Saudi Arabian governmental agencies was measured and analyzed. A multiple regression analysis was performed to assess this causal relationship between the four components of organizational communication and managers' decisional participation in strategic as well as operational decisions. The results indicated no significant relationship among the variables. Except for upward communication, the other three components of the organizational communication system did not seem to have a direct significant effect on the managers' reported participation in Saudi Arabia. The exploratory research suggested several implications for future research.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Management is a complex, many faceted and dynamic process which involves the study of various aspects of the changing political, economical and social environment and its effects on the organization and its people. Management also involves substantial knowledge of the technological changes that affect both its short-run planning and the design of control on current results, and its long-range planning and the design of control on future accomplishments. Further, management involves practicing the basic managerial processes of organizing, staffing, and controlling as well as planning and decision-making. The decision-making component requires the abilities of information gathering and analysis, consultation, negotiation, and risk-taking. In addition, management involves accomplishing the work through the efforts of human beings. This component requires the ability to communicate as well as an understanding of psychological and sociological issues.

Thus, the truly professional manager requires competence in the academic fields of psychology, sociology,
economics, mathematics, communication, and political science as well as in managerial processes and techniques. Recognition of the inherent complexity of management will help managers understand and appreciate the challenges associated with managerial responsibilities, while at the same time realizing that no one manager ever completely masters the skills required to perform the managerial job alone. Acceptance of this fact encourages managers in all types of organizations to try to overcome what is probably the greatest weakness of today's business and government executives -- the inability to be truly open to suggestions (especially those which may include some criticism) and accept assistance (Powers and Powers, 1983; Kanter, 1982). Subordinate participation is becoming a truism of today's organizations.

With the great increase in research and development and the introduction of more complex forms of mathematics, statistics, and computers, it is not uncommon for subordinates to know more about an important matter than the chief, who alone can no longer necessarily make the best decision based on the best technical facts (Preston and Post, 1974; Kelly and Khozan, 1980; and Sashkin, 1984). In an increasingly complex organization, problems often emerge where no one individual has all the facts and information required to solve the problems alone. To acquire all the
relevant information bearing on a decision, it is becoming increasingly necessary to receive input from experts from several different fields at different levels of an organization (Anthony, 1978).

The Importance of Organizational Communication

An organization is viewed as a maze of communication channels through which flow information, personal influence, decisions, power, and solutions to problems - the major activities of an organization. Numerous books and articles have glorified communication in organizations (Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins, 1977; Allen, 1979; O'Connell, 1979; Hunt, 1980; McPhee and Tompkins, 1985). The conclusions typically reached by the different investigations can be summarized in one statement: "Without communication, organizations could not exist."

People who work in organizations recognize the importance of communication in their everyday lives. They know that good communication skills may not guarantee success, of course, but poor communication skills certainly guarantee failure. To understand the centrality of communication to effective organizations, the role communication plays in an organization's life must be understood.

During the past two decades, several studies have revealed that managers spend the major portion of their
working time communicating. Early studies (Dubin and Spray, 1964; Kelly, 1964; Lawler, et al., 1968) report that approximately two-thirds of a manager's time is spent communicating with superiors and subordinates. Mintzberg (1975) in a later study found that managers spend approximately 78 percent of their time communicating by verbal means alone. Obviously a task which occupies this much of a professional manager's time is essential to his/her job. Therefore, the focal role communication plays within all organizational systems is one of "information exchange" (McPhee and Tompkins, 1985).

All members of the organization must possess adequate information to function productively on a daily basis. Sufficient information must be exchanged between members of the organization so their goals become integrated. Information exchange is seen in many forms that range from work related information (i.e., instructions, suggestions, job descriptions, complaints, rules, and regulations), to non-work related information (i.e., organizational current events that are typically provided through bulletin boards, newsletters, department meetings, etc.).

Information exchange also takes various directions. Andrews and Baird (1986) explain that information flows downward through the organizational hierarchy, forming a downward communication channel through which employees
tasks and activities are instructed, directed, monitored, and evaluated. Information which flows upward through the organizational hierarchy forms the communication channels through which reports, feedback, suggestions, opinion surveys, and grievances are transmitted. Finally, information flowing between units or departments at the same organizational level forms the horizontal communication channels through which cooperation and effectiveness are promoted and improved. Therefore, as a focal role of communication, information exchange - if transmitted clearly, sufficiently, and appropriately - ultimately determines the effectiveness and success of a particular organization.

**Importance of Organizational Communication to Decision-Making**

Another central and perhaps the most powerful role communication plays in an organization is related directly to the decision-making process (Tompkins and Cheney, 1985). Dawe and Lord (1968) describe management as the process of converting information into action. They declare that this conversion process is called "Decision-Making." In his book *Administrative Behavior*, Simon (1976) emphasized the centrality of communication to decision-making. He stated that it is necessary to communicate the plan to the individuals who are to carry it out. Pascale (1978) also asserts that all managers are confronted with
the task of acquiring information both externally from the environment and internally from the organization itself; analyzing and transmitting that information through a communications process; and finally utilizing it in decision-making. It is evident that communication is an essential component both in the period prior to the decision and the period after the decision has been made. If the organization has a strong and effective communication system, adequate information needed for decisions can be obtained and exchanged more efficiently. Also, a strong communication system within an organization can effectively transmit and convey decisions for more rapid implementation throughout the entire organization. Shapiro (1984) emphasized this point by stating, "Decisions have no effects nor any real existence unless they are recognized and understood by those who must put them into effect."

**Importance of Organizational Communication to Decisional Participation**

A strong and effective communication system allows the "receiver" to influence the "sender" (Hedebro, 1982). Lack of influence on the part of the receiver, explains Hedebro, is a problem of significant ramifications on organizational effectiveness. He states:

"Participation is an important ingredient in the recipe for sound decisions....it means that decisions are not taken until those immediately
concerned have had a chance to express their views and opinions on the matter. Otherwise, the implement-
mentation of a centrally made decision may run into difficulties due to the inadequacies of the deci-
sion, or because the people affected by the decision have no insight into the problem at hand.

Likert (1961), states that participation is useful for establishing organizational objectives by integrating the needs and desires of all the members functionally re-
lated to the organization. He recognizes that when employ-
ing the participation approach in the process of decision-
making, a high level of reciprocal influence is likely to occur. As a result, a high level of total coordinated in-
fluence will be achieved. Likert further emphasized the importance of the communication role in transmitting all the relevant information important for the organizational decisions and actions from one part of the organization to another, creating a communication system Likert describes as a "highly effective social system for interaction and mutual influence."

Several years later numerous writers echoed Likert's assertions by considering communication a central key force in the decisional participation process (Steiner, 1972; Hackman and Morris, 1975; Gouran and Hirokawa, 1983; McGrath, 1984; and Poole, et al., 1985). Therefore, a man-
ger who chooses to employ the participative approach by
involving his subordinates in the decision-making process is required to be a good communicator (Anthony, 1978).

The participative (democratic) manager must provide subordinates with accurate, timely, useful, and relevant information that is geared toward improving the final decisions. Such information should be formulated clearly and transmitted or communicated through reliable channels of communication. The quality of information which managers receive and generate, as well as that sent to and shared with subordinates through effective and reliable systems of organizational communication, thus become a critical aspect of decisional participation (Anthony, 1978).

**Organizational Communication and Job Satisfaction**

If the organizational communication system is to work well, the information must not only be well-developed, it must also be well-communicated. The free flow of information through adequate channels of communication provides the basis for more effective decisions and promotes high member satisfaction (Likert, 1961; Lowin, 1968; Patchen, 1970; Miller, 1980; Hawley, 1982; Kanter, 1982; and Sashkin, 1984). Goldheber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak (1978), in their article "Organizational Communication: State of the Art", indicate that organizational
communication relationships and the amount of information received are actually the best predictors of job satisfaction.

Open and effective communication between managers and subordinates is an essential element for an effective organizational climate. Likert and Seashore (1963) found a need for individuals to view their manager-subordinate interaction as supportive and as developing and sustaining their sense of personal worth and importance. Furthermore, Jablin (1979), Levine (1980), and Pancrazio and Pancrazio (1983), have all linked the effectiveness of organizational communication to employee performance, satisfaction, and morale.

Benford (1981) researched factors relating to employee job satisfaction and increased productivity. He concludes that: "From the organization's viewpoint, successful communication by the supervisor increased productivity. From the employee's viewpoint, successful communication by the supervisor increased job satisfaction." As a result of maintaining a high level of satisfaction and a positive superior-subordinate relationship, a high level of mutual influence tends to encourage the free flow of information and its use in decision-making. At the same time, mutual influence and joint decision-making create a necessary basis for integrating the contributions and interests
of all membership levels, and for coordinating action in implementing decisions.

**Why Investigation of Organizational Communication Is Necessary**

The decision-making process requires much more than simply collecting facts. Because it is a process based on the subjective realities or perceptions of the people involved, it is a communication process that should involve all those who generate the needed facts, those who have to implement them, and those who have to ultimately live with them (Allen, 1979). Thus, it is established that communication systems are central to the decision-making process; this is an accepted fact in the organizational communication literature.

Ironically, communication skills are consistently listed as a major weakness of today's managers. Livingston (1971) states, "The one thing that each and every manager depends on, that sorts the successes from the failures, is the ability to communicate with other people. This is the skill that is indispensable to management; but it is one that no management program (I know of) attempts to teach." Mintzberg (1973), along with others, (i.e., Brickner, 1974; Ellis, 1976; and Srivastua, 1983) noted that the training of today's managers does not emphasize communication skills. "Management schools, by and large, have been more
effective at training technocrats to deal with structured problems than managers to deal with unstructured ones" (Mintzberg, 1973). Allen (1979) states, "While there is a great deal of talk about communication in organizations, usually little is done to see that barriers are removed from the process."

We have established that the key prerequisite for successful participation is communication. Therefore, lack of effective communication logically leads to a lack of participation. This happens because the lack of effective communication leads to a significant decrease in the flow of information necessary for making and implementing organizational decisions. Buchele (1977) indicates that decisions are only as good as the information on which they are based. Therefore, a quality decision is dependent on the accuracy of the information utilized in making that decision. Any deficiency in the quality and quantity of information is reflected by the quality of the resultant decision.

The Need For Research

In a critical evaluation of the conceptual dimensions of the organizational participation literature, Dachler and Wilpert (1978) state:

Although research on participation has accumulated a considerable collection of empirical data,
one observes neither a systematic, incremental, development in the understanding of participation as a social phenomenon, nor fundamental shifts in the conceptualization of participation. Instead, our analyses have repeatedly shown knowledge about participation to be fragmentary, contradictory, and limited to a relatively few psychological and sociological preconditions and consequences of participation.

Although there is an abundance of research on the subject of decisional participation, it has been weakened by conceptual and methodological imperfections and inconclusive data (Lowin, 1968). Even though the benefits and advantages of decisional participation are clear as shown by countless studies, there are many areas within this phenomenon which are not clear.

In nearly all participation studies, the objective has been to test whether or not decisional participation improves employee satisfaction and performance. The positive results are often interpreted in terms of "the more participation, the better" without providing any conceptual justification (Yukl, 1981). According to Dachler and Wilpert (1978), research has been centered on decision-making, yet too often has ignored certain aspects essential to its process. Most studies are not very specific about the types of decisions in which subordinates should participate, or the range, degree, scope, complexity and importance of the decision (Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; Locke and Schwieger, 1979).
Another often ignored aspect of decisional participation is that the decision-making process is sequential. It includes a series of stages through which a choice among alternatives is made (March and Simon, 1958; and Tansik, et al., 1980). Therefore, the participation literature, with a few exceptions, (i.e., Heller, 1971; Alutto and Belasco, 1972; and Vroom and Yetton, 1973), does indeed need a systematic framework to specify the stage at which participation should begin (Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; and Locke and Schwieger, 1979).

The literature makes a distinction between direct decisional participation (the immediate personal involvement of the subordinate in the decision-making process), and indirect decisional participation (the mediated involvement of subordinates through representatives and unions). The aspect of indirect decisional participation has been researched to a greater extent than that of direct decisional participation.

This paper will focus only on the direct dimension of participation. This dimension is emphasized by almost all schools of thought (i.e., human relations and human resources), and by various theoretical approaches (i.e., social, economic, and political theories) as the ideal type of participation (Scott, 1981).
The literature regarding participation also lacks a clear and direct framework in which to define the relationship between organizational communication systems per se, and the degree of employee participation in the decision-making process. Communication is implicitly mentioned in almost all participation research as an essential strategy and a necessary condition for implementing and operating a participative system (i.e., Carlson, 1951; Burns, 1954; Landeberger, 1961; Kelly, 1964; and Stinchcombe, 1974). Without exception, studies recommend strengthening the organizational communication system as a crucial factor for achieving an efficient and effective participation system (Locke and Schwieger, 1979; Kelly and Khozan, 1980; Kanter, 1982; Hawley, 1982; Powers and Powers, 1983; Hinckley, 1984; Locke, Schwieger, and Latham, 1984).

When stressed in the participative literature, communication is always mentioned implicitly in connection with leadership styles or with organizational structure (i.e., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969; Vroom, 1970; Vroom and Yetton, 1973; and Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971), but almost never explicitly treated as a separate variable. Hence, it is normally seen as either a means to facilitating participation effectiveness or an outcome of a successful participation system (Rosenfeld and Smith, 1967; Lammers, 1967; Lowin, 1968; Sashkin, 1976; Locke and
Schwieiger, 1979; Hawley, 1982; and Powers and Powers, 1983). With a few exceptions (i.e., Abegglen, 1958; Yoshino, 1968; and Pascale, 1978), it is rarely treated as a variable which may or may not have a direct effect on the employees' degree of participation and range of involvement in various decision types.

Unlike organizational communication, the study of information as the basic fuel for effective decisions is not explicitly denied in the participation literature (Dawe and Lord, 1968; Buchele, 1977; and Hawley, 1982). However, with a few exceptions (Lowin, 1968; Miles and Ritchie, 1971; and Vroom and Yetton, 1973), the idea of sharing quality information with employees at all levels of the organization to enable them to make effective decisions has not yet been fully explored.

Generally speaking, the participation literature does indeed cut across some micro- and macro-issues of organizational analyses ranging from individual motivation through leadership styles, and from group dynamics to the social contexts in which organizations exist. However, the literature still has not attempted to integrate these micro- and macro-issues due to the obvious absence of the requisite conceptual tools (Lowin, 1969; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; and Locke and Schieger, 1979).
In terms of the social context of the organization, it has been recognized that the social characteristics from which a society's value and belief system emerge are likely to have an impact on the structure, purpose, and process of its participation system (Indik, 1965; Hulin and Blood, 1968; Argyris, 1969; Abegglen, 1973; Nord, 1974; Singer, 1974; Tannenbaum, et al., 1974; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; and Yukl, 1981). However, the lack of the conceptual as well as the methodological tools with which to study the social aspects of the organization has led participation research to primarily emphasize individual and psychological questions more than contextual questions (Pugh, 1966 and Weick, 1969). Therefore there is still little knowledge available regarding the following questions about organizational social context and its effect on the participation system: (1) What are the specific social factors that directly interact with and affect the participation system? (2) Is it possible to conceptually define those factors? (3) Can these factors be subject to operational measurements? (Heller and Wilpert, 1977; and Dachler and Wilpert, 1978).

Within the realm of cross-cultural research, numerous attempts to systematically study the relationship between social factors and the design of the participation system were unfortunately limited by their focus on
structural and technical problems, rather than on human im­
plications (March and Mannari, 1973; Lammers and Hickson, 1979; and Adler, 1983). Due to the limited methodological applicability to all contexts regardless of cross-cultural differences, the results of such a roster of studies can only emphasize the facts that participation is a worldwide phenomenon and that societal differences must be recog­
nized.

Almost all experiments designed to provide a sys­
tematic framework that can be "generally" applied to all contexts have failed (Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; and Warner, 1984). This result is clearly seen in cross­
cultural studies on Third World countries where the socio­
political conditions are tremendously different than those seen in highly industrialized societies. Traditional cul­
tural structures and values governing most of the Third World countries have significant, yet different affects on participation (concept and practices). While these differ­ences have long been accepted, there is still a need for systematic analysis and evaluation of the social factors and their impact on participation (Lowin, 1968).

Studies of work councils in Zambia, rural and in­
dustrial cooperation programs in Tanzania, the work commit­
tees in India (Seible and Damachi, 1982), and the self­
management experiment in Algeria (Clegg, 1971), have mostly
offered formal descriptions of national characteristics. There has been little analysis of the participation system and very little evaluation of the workers' degree of influence over the decision-making processes (Warner, 1984). In his book Organizations and Experiments, Warner (1984) suggests that the best way to evaluate the cultural affects on participation programs in certain developing countries is to run a broad study of the cultural characteristics of a single country on a comprehensive scale.

Statement of the Contribution

This thesis will not attempt to offer the needed framework with which to integrate the fragmented research of participation. It will attempt, however, to go beyond the relatively narrow focus of the literature on certain relevant issues. Following Warner's (1984) suggestion, this thesis will investigate the social phenomenon of "direct decisional participation" within the social context of a single country (Saudi Arabia). The phenomenon under investigation will be directly related to the relevant issue of "organizational communication", which is believed to have a significant impact on the effectiveness of the decisional participation system.

By presenting a rigorous treatment of both topics ("organizational communication" and "direct decisional
participation"), this research will help build literature to support the argument that a direct participation system, when employed through a strong and effective formal organizational communication system, will increase the subordinates' degree of involvement in important organizational decisions.

By considering certain aspects strongly related to the topic of "decisional participation", such as the types of decisions in which employees often get involved, and the degree and range of their involvement, the stage of the decision-making process at which they get involved, this study hopes to fill the gaps found in the participation literature.

The main impetus for this study developed from the fact that there is a great shortage of cross-cultural studies (especially in Third World countries) concerned with examining certain aspects of human behavior, such as organizational communication in the tradition of Burns (1954), and decisional participation in the tradition of Vroom and Yetton (1973). The comprehensive treatment of the cultural characteristics of a developing country such as Saudi Arabia, with its traditional and highly conservative society which is currently undergoing perhaps the most ambitious development program in modern history, will hopefully
generate a substantial body of literature for use in future comparative studies.

In addition, investigating an important and controversial issue such as decisional participation (which has gained a vast interest in the "Western World") in relation to another equally important issue, "organizational communication", (that has rarely been explored cross-culturally), will immensely help those interested in examining theories and ideas which have originated in the Industrial World, to test their applicability and affects in a cross-cultural context.

Finally, even though this thesis may raise more questions than it answers, this investigation will help clarify the ambiguity and opposing views concerning the issue of direct decisional participation and its dependence on organizational communication systems for existence.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior to detailing the model to be tested in this study, a representative selection of the literature must first be reviewed. The literature to be examined in the first section of this chapter attempts to explain organizational communication or the central variable of the present research. The second section will discuss the concept of decisional participation as the dependent variable in this study, followed by the third section which will briefly look into the concept of participation in the public sector. The fourth and final section of this chapter will explore the impact of Saudi Arabian cultural characteristics on the bureaucratic system, focusing on the practice of participative decision-making within the Saudi Arabian social context.

Organizational Communication

Introduction

Pigors (1949:80) cited a manager who published an article in Supervision as early as 1945 in which he announced that the foreman's job is essentially a selling job which requires a great deal of communication in order to
"win the cooperation of his workers." In the following years, many writers started to emphasize the communication factor and its importance in the workplace (Corson, 1946; Powlison, 1947; Sexton and Staudt, 1957).

In his highly influential article "Explaining the Facts to Employees", Keith Powlison (1947) stated the advantage of explaining "the facts" and helping the employees grasp "the truth" about their organization from the allocation of resources to the making of projects. According to Redding (1985), the hidden assumption in this and other similar articles was that management is in possession of "the fact" and "the truth" while the employees, by and large, are not. Hence, Redding deduced that when employees learn the facts, they come to understand the problems facing management, cooperate as loyal members, and perform harder and better. This new ideology - the informed worker is a productive worker - was the beginning of a steadily swelling stream of publications in the 1940s and the 1950s (Redding, 1985). Most of these publications offered managers various advice and techniques to improve their managerial communication (i.e., Roethlisberger, 1945/1948; Mussman, 1947; Baker, 1948; Peters, 1949, Kelley, 1951; Funk and Becker, 1952; Pelz, 1952; Planty and Machaver, 1952; Redfield, 1953; Weiss, 1956; Cohen, 1958; French, et al., 1958; Lawrence, 1958).
Ideas from researchers such as Chester Barnard, Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Rensis Likert, James March, Douglas McGregor, and many others, have contributed to the establishment of a corpus of theory and research in organizational communication (Jablin, 1980; Redding, 1985; Andrews and Baird, 1986; Goldhaber, 1986). The powerful influence of human-relations and human resources theories has contributed much to the development of the field of organizational communication (Krepp, 1986).

Despite the various avenues of exploration of these schools of thought (i.e., human relations, human interaction, information theory, interpersonal communication, etc.), organizational communication research has primarily been conducted in a closed system keeping the macro level analysis (environmental forces) at a minimum (Redding, 1972 and 1985). Consequently, the 1980s have hosted a dramatic change in the focus of the study of organizational communication (Redding, 1985). Works such as Putnam and Pacanowsky's (1983) Communication and Organizations, and Driskill and Goldstein's (1986) "Uncertainty: Theory and Practice in Organizational Communication" offer new models and new directions for future research derived from the newest anthropological, phenomenological, cultural, and societal approaches.
In short, even though the emerging discipline of organizational communication is not yet fully identified (Wofford, et al., 1977) the field has and continues to progress in defining some kind of identity (Redding, 1985) which will certainly provide researchers with clearer direction for future development.

The current state of knowledge in this area, however, is still relatively fragmented (Klauss and Bass, 1982; Rogers, 1978). One reason might be the fact that communication is a substantive issue in a variety of disciplines where the learning from within each discipline is not yet fully cross-referenced (Cherry, 1966; Thayer, 1967). Another reason might be the ambiguity surrounding the term itself. Thayer (1967:70), in his article "Communication and organizational theory" stated, "Communication may or may not be a single phenomenon; but certainly there is no universally accepted 'concept' of communication."

What does organizational communication really mean?

Definition of the Concept

There are probably as many different definitions of the term 'communication' as there are managers and practitioners in the field. Some writers tend to define it in a technical fashion by equating it with media and/or hardware (i.e., Shannon and Weaver, 1949). Others limit the meaning
to describe a system for transmitting information in one linear direction in terms of a Sender and Receiver (i.e., Redding and Sanborn, 1964; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Thayer, 1968; Lesikar, 1972).

Greenbaum (1974), on the other hand, defined the concept in terms of its purpose, operational procedures, and structure. The purpose, as explained by Greenbaum, is to facilitate the achievement of organizational goals. The operational procedures involve the utilization of the communication network related to organizational goals and policies, and their implementation through suitable communication activities. Finally, the structural elements include the organizational unit, the communication network, and the communication policies and activities. In other words, Greenbaum defined the objectives of communication networks based on the overall goals and objectives of the organization.

Another popular definition suggested by Carl (1968) views organizational communication as an internal system or network that enables data and information to flow more freely and directly through an organizational hierarchy. Witkin and Stephens (1972) define organizational communication as ranging from the interdependencies and interactions among and within subsystems through the act of communication which serves the purposes of the organization. Haney
(1973) sees the concept as a process of coordination by which a number of interdependent people are related.

To clarify the ambiguity and confusion surrounding the concept of organizational communication, several writers have attempted to develop their own taxonomies. Carter (1972), for instance, wrote about theories and organizational communication, barriers to organizational communication, and direction and media of organizational communication. Voos (1967) also divided the field into the following concepts: decision-making; persuasion; networks and feedback; and upward, downward, and horizontal communication. Knapp (1969) and Falcione and Greenbaum (1976) have also developed a taxonomy for the following abstracts: interpersonal and intergroup communication; individual-organization interaction; characteristics of communicators and receivers; channels of information flows; and the total internal-external systems of communication inside the organization.

Foltz (1981) has recently suggested a more comprehensive definition which will be adapted by the present study because it tends to account for individuals as the center of the communication process, and it emphasizes the sharing and free exchange of information among organizational members as the focal purpose of the communication process. It also encompasses the interpersonal
relationships of people and their attitudes and feelings within an organizational structure. Foltz (1981:5) stated: "Organizational communication is the exchange of information, ideas, opinions, and feelings up, down, and across the organizational lines for the purpose of supporting organizational objectives and policies, and for meeting the employee's needs." Foltz further added that as it becomes obviously apparent that communication activities have a strong impact on overall organizational effectiveness, the importance of communication in organizations will continue to grow. The importance of communication for organizations and managers is the subject of the following discussion.

Centrality of Communication to Managers and Organizations

Recognition of communication as the mediator of influence on members' behavior in the organization has been clear since the 1930s. Barnard (1938:91) suggested: "In the exhaustive theory of organization, communication would occupy a central place because the structure, extensiveness, and scope of organization are almost entirely determined by communication techniques." Communication thus is "the very essence" of organizations (Katz and Kahn, 1966:223).

Philip Lewis (1975:3) in his book Organizational Communications: The Essence of Effective Management,
stated: "Communication is the essence of managerial procedures...it is the focal point of executive action...it is central to the control and survival of organizations, and it is a requisite to effective management. If there is one activity which describe the function of a manager, it would be communication." Hence, recognition of communication as the central function of the manager cannot be denied.

Several studies during the past two decades have revealed that managers spend a major portion of their working time communicating. Mintzberg (1975) found that managers spend approximately 78 percent of their time communicating by verbal means alone. A task that occupies such a big part of a manager's time must be central to his or her job. Therefore, competence in this area has been ranked as an essential skill by managers and executives themselves. Murray (1976), for example, asked a sample of public administrators at the state and local level to rank eight skills they felt managers in the public service need to perform effectively. Communication skills were ranked number one by the majority of respondents. In fact, 40% of the respondents ranked communication skills as the first or second most needed skill by managers.

Similar results have also been reported in the private sector (Bricker, 1974). Bennett and Olney (1986), for example, conducted a study of executives in a selected
sample of 500 companies throughout the United States regarding the importance of communication skills for today's manager. The general consensus of the executives was that effective communication skills are essential factors for the manager's success in today's organizations.

Foltz (1981) emphasized organizational communication as the single vital link in the chain of events comprising the process of management. He indicated that it is the one factor that makes an organization viable, successful, effective, and enduring.

One prominent view of organizational communication is that if communication is bad, an organization is likely to have problems, and if it is good an organization's performance and overall effectiveness will also be good (Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton, and Porter, 1973). This thinking seems to derive from Likert (1967) who presented communication as an intervening variable affected by such causal variables as leadership behavior, organizational climate, and structure, and effecting such variables as job satisfaction, productivity, and profits. Writers such as Seashore and Bowers (1970); and Dennis, Richetto, and Wiermann (1974), have presented enough evidence to support Likert's Theory.

Hence, an organization is viewed as a maze of communication channels through which flow information,
personal influence and power, decisions, and solutions to problems (Allen, 1979). People who work in organizations recognize the importance of communication in their everyday lives. They know that an effective communication system may not guarantee success, but it is a prerequisite for its occurrence. To understand the centrality of communication to effective organizations and successful managers, the role communication plays in an organization's life must be understood.

The Function of Communication in the Organization

Communication within organizations performs a variety of functions at both the organizational and the individual levels. At the organizational level, "Information Exchange" is probably the most important function of communication. It occupies a central role within the organization (Foltz, 1981; McPhee and Tompkins, 1985). Since all organizations, in order to survive, must effect and respond to the changes in the environment (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978), such response would not be possible without the possession of the required relevant information (Andrews and Baird, 1986). Thus, "communication - the exchange of information and the transmission of meaning - is the very essence of a social system or an organization" (Katz and
Kahn, 1966:223). It can contribute highly to an organization's survival.

Sufficient information must also be exchanged among all members of the organization to integrate the goals of the organization with those of its members, and to coordinate the attainment of such goals. Similarly, all members within the organization need to possess and exchange adequate information to productively perform their daily tasks. Therefore, the smooth, timely, and undistorted flow of information should be one of all organizations' important goals (Andrews and Baird, 1986).

Organization decision-making requires a variety of communication activities (Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins, 1977). Even under the most conservative view of management, communication plays a significant role in decision-making because people at the top of the hierarchy depend on those at the lower levels for information that must be employed in making a decision. Dawe and Lord (1968) described management as the process of converting information into action. They called this conversion process "Decision-making."

Maier (1962) has also shown that when making a decision, four important phases must be considered: definition of the problem, analysis of the problem, development of alternatives, and selection of a solution. He noted
that communication is vital for each phase to guarantee the success of the final decision. Maier (1962) and Bareland (1959) have indicated that consensus of the phrasing of the problem, collecting available information from existing records and/or from newly-generated data, assembling, weighing, and arranging information, and evaluating and assessing the information using open channels of communication is basically what decision-making is all about.

Furthermore, Simon (1976) in his book *Administrative Behavior* emphasized the role communication plays in the decision-making process. He stated that it is necessary to communicate the decision effectively to those who are to carry it out. Pascale (1978) also indicated that all managers are required by virtue of their jobs to acquire information both internally and externally, analyze and transmit that information through a communication process, and finally utilize it in decision-making.

It is evident, then, that communication plays an essential role both prior to and after the decision has been made. Simon and Guetzkow (1966:245) argued that communication in a decision-making organization is two-fold. They stated: "Communication must flow to the decision center to provide the basis for decision, and the decision must be communicated from the decision center in order to influence other members of the organizations whose
cooperation must be secured to carry out the decision."
In other words, decision-making is based upon messages from
all levels of the organization to formulate a decision, and
messages to all levels of the organization to implement a
decision. Therefore, if the organization has a strong and
effective communication system, adequate information needed
for decisions can be obtained and exchanged more effec-
tively. By the same token, a strong organizational commu-
nication system can effectively transmit and convey deci-
sions for more rapid implementation throughout the entire
organization.

Communication also plays another role at the orga-
nizational level. This role is directly related to super-
vision and direction of organizational members. Hunt
(1980:164) stated in this regard, "Communicating with supe-
riors and subordinates is the MOST important job that a
leader in an organization must do." Communication in this
context reflects the manager's obligation to transmit as
well as receive information to and from all levels of the
organization. Thus, supervision, direction, and coordina-
tion as primary tasks of organizational leadership are ac-
tivated through communication.

Other aspects of the organization in which communi-
cation also takes a significant part are the establishment
of a positive organization climate (James and Jones, 1974;
Sanford, Hunt, and Bracey, 1976), and the accomplishment of both employee orientation and training programs (Hunt, 1980). As to the former construct, Poole (1985:79) stated: "...the term 'organizational climate' is important for organizational and communication theory, because it represents the linkage between the organizational situation and members' cognitions, feelings, and behaviors." Hunt and Lee (1976) further indicated that climates are created by the behavior of managers, their superiors, subordinates, and their peers which is all to a great extent determined by the communication behavior of the leader toward his or her group. Redding (1972) also asserts that climates develop in response to internal communication. Because there is an interesting circular relationship between organizational climate and organizational communication, communication behaviors lead to the development of climates and determine its nature (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974; Hunt and Lee, 1976). Hunt and Lee (1976) explained that if management's communication demonstrates concern and respect for organization members, the climate will reflect that concern; and if management's communication shows lack of concern and disrespect for members, the climate will also reflect that disrespect.

Generally speaking, where managers are perceived to be open and responsive, willing to interact, sensitive to
employees' emotions, skilled in communication, and trustworthy, the communication climate is perceived to be favorable. Positive perceptions of overall climate are thus related to members' feelings of involvement, their ability to influence the organization, and their overall satisfaction with the system (Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak, 1978).

Hence, according to Poole (1985) communication is the medium for accomplishing most of the organizational functions and tasks. For example, for an innovative climate to exist, a communication of new ideas and an exchange of necessary information is in order. Thus, in a real sense, the whole concept of climate is bound up with communication (Poole, 1985:81). For a detailed discussion of the multidimensional attributes of organizational climate (i.e., openness, trust, information adequacy, source credibility) and the impact of organizational communication activities on the interaction of all variables, see Jablin (1980).

The latter construct of the organization - orientation and training - also requires high communication skills. Hunt (1980) explained that people master their jobs by either reading about it or by learning about it under someone's direction, which involves a variety of communication techniques. Orientation and socialization of
organizational members is also a communication activity that either brings people up-to-date with what is going on, or internalizes their objectives to match those of the organization (Hunt, 1980). In short, communication is the vehicle through which all functions of the organization operate.

Besides playing a central role at the organizational level, communication is also a required element that has a significant effect on the individual's level of job satisfaction, commitment, and involvement. Likert (1961; Lowin (1968); Patchen (1970); Miller (1980); Hawley (1982); and Sashkin (1984) all agree that the free flow of information through adequate channels of communication not only provides the basis for more effective decisions, but it also promotes member satisfaction. In fact, members' communication relationships and the amount of information exchanged among them are the best indicators of individuals' job satisfaction (Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak, 1978). Several researchers have linked communication climate with employee job satisfaction (i.e., Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Johanesson, 1971; Jablin, 1979; Levine, 1980; Pancrazio and Pancrazio, 1983). In a study conducted by Benford (1981) to investigate the factors that directly relate to employee job satisfaction and increased productivity, successful communication from the employee's point
of view was found to be significantly correlated with his or her job satisfaction, and the quality of the superior-subordinate relationship.

Further, Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) and Muchinsky (1977) reported significant relationships among certain dimensions of communication in organizations and measures of job satisfaction, commitment and organizational climate. Other evidence from studies of decision-making (i.e., Connolly, 1977; Porat and Haas, 1969) suggests that isolation from or participation in the organizational communication network is expected to negatively or positively (respectively) affect the individual's performance. Roberts and O'Reilly (1979) conducted a study to examine a set of variables (demographic and motivational) possibly associated with the individuals' role in the communication network in formal organizations (The U.S. Navy). They noted significant differences in the levels of job satisfaction, commitment, and performance between occupants of different roles in the communication system. Their positive findings suggest that those who have a central and active role in the communication network are more satisfied with their jobs, more committed to their organizations, and excel more in performance. Because of the lack of necessary information needed to guide their actions, those who occupy a peripheral position in the network and who, in effect, have
an inactive role in the communication system, were found to be less satisfied, and to perform less well than the first group.

As for an individual's involvement in organizational activities and his/her contribution to their accomplishment, a communication system that is described by Likert (1961) as a "highly effective social system for interaction and mutual influence" must be present. Allowing the individual to get involved and participate in all sorts of organizational tasks and activities requires the transmission and exchange of accurate, timely, useful, and relevant information (Anthony, 1978). Such information should be clearly formulated and freely communicated through reliable channels of communication.

Other studies have also linked communication isolation and lack of information to structural alienation, showing that the lack of communication and transfer of information is directly related to feelings of alienation (Hagedorn and Labovitz, 1968; Miller, 1975). Moreover, Brown (1969) conducted a study to test a set of hypotheses concerning correlating members' identification with their organizations with the degree of members' involvement in the organization. He found that individuals' identification with their organization is positively related to the average degree to which they perceive the environment as
one which provides opportunity for personal achievements and which connects them to the internal social structure through a positive communication climate and accessibility of needed information.

Likert and Seashore (1963) also found that the individual has an urgent need to view his manager-subordinate interaction as open and supportive in order to develop and sustain his/her personal worth and importance, and to maintain his/her sense of belonging and commitment to the organizational goals. The values that stress the positive potential of individuals can be validated by the communication that occurs in organizations. The individual needs to know where he/she stands and their importance in the organization (Faules, 1976). In other words, individuals need to be validated and communication is the means of fulfilling that need. Katz and Kahn (1970:98) pointed out: "...the understanding of one's role and how it relates to other roles is a good bridge to involvement in organizational goals setting." Hence, if an individual receives reliable information and understands how his/her role is related to the organizational objectives, it becomes easier for them to identify with and commit to the organizational mission. Both Hunt (1980) and Miller and Monge (1986) have also indicated that when the individual is informed about the overall objectives of the organization, and can see
their own short- and long-term benefits of working hard, they will tend to support and commit themselves to the organization’s goals. Therefore, communication must be present to create the necessary basis for integrating all members of the organization, and encouraging their contribution and involvement in organizational functions at all levels.

According to Allen (1979), an individual’s position within the organizational communication system, does indeed determine his or her contributions, power, influence, and overall acceptance of and satisfaction with the organization’s objectives. Communication is intended to specify, coordinate, and structure both external and internal environments of the organization in terms of the behaviors expected of the organization and its participants (Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins, 1977).

Since communication is undeniably the foundation of any organization, the nature of its important process, and some of its characteristics will be the focus of the following discussion.

The Process of Communication: Its Nature and Purpose

In his book The Process of Communication, David Berlo (1960) introduced the notion that communication is a dynamic and interactive process. He indicated that what
once was labeled a one-way, linear, and static model is now seen as an ongoing, ever-changing, and continuous process. The current thinking of communication researchers and theorists defines communication as a "transactional process" (Davis, 1972; Pace and Boren, 1973; Wilmot and Wenburg, 1973). This definition implies that communication is a reciprocal process in which a sender and a receiver mutually affect one another as they send and receive messages (Wilmot and Wenburg, 1973).

In addition to being a transactional process, communication is also a rule-based process (Shimanoff, 1980). It is said that people's communication activities reflect and reinforce their values, beliefs, and attitudes. These activities, help maintain a symbolic and habitual pattern in their communication transactions, indicating that certain "rules" and "norms" are in effect (Farace, Monge, and Russell, 1977). Shall (1983) defined these communication rules as tacit understandings among the communicators of the appropriate ways to interact in given role situations. Tompkins (1984) defined one set of rules that govern people's communication behavior in organizations as the "Hierarchical Rules". These rules tend to translate the organizational high-level policies, define the degree of members' obedience to the organizational hierarchy, and enforce solidarity and cohesion (Tompkins, 1984). In other
words, hierarchical rules are characterized by information transmission concerned with the network of the formal authority and control aspects of organizations (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1979). In effect, hierarchical rules are the determinants of the roles which individuals play within the organizational communication system (Allen, 1979; Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins, 1977).

In their article "Some Correlations of Communication Roles in Organizations," Roberts and O'Reilly (1979: 43) stated, "an individual's role in his organization can be defined in terms of who he regularly talks to and about what sort of matters." One can look at an organizational structure in terms of certain communication exchange activities such as: who talks with whom and who reports to whom; the number of people one communicates with, what and how much information each individual usually receives; who is usually isolated from the information flow; and who is perceived to have more access to effective information. Analyzed in this way, it becomes apparent that this organizational "structure" does indeed result from all sorts of communication activities (Allen, 1979). Even though this insightful approach to the relationship between structure and communication is largely neglected, a few writers have shown interest in this direction (i.e., Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971; Allen and Gerstberger, 1973; Rogers and
Agarwala-Rogers, 1976; McPhee, 1983 and 1985). Rogers and Agarwala-Rogers (1976) in their book Communication in Organizations have emphasized that communication processes may determine structures. The authors explained that in certain instances, communication needs (personal as well as task-related) "cause" individuals to establish certain communication patterns which over time become more formalized and structured regardless of the previously existing structure. McPhee (1985:160 and 164) thus stated: "Structure is fundamentally communicational" because "it is the matrix of rules and resources that people draw on to enable (but also constrain) actions." That is why structure can be found by examining the regularities that make human interactions meaningful and consequential in organizations.

In short, whether communication is the cause or the consequence of the organizational structure, every organization must have a corresponding communication structure. In this regard, Hage, Aiken, and Marrett (1971:862) noted: "The internal structure of an organization should have an important relationship to the form of coordination, and hence, to the way in which communications are designed." The relationship between the various dimensions of both internal organizational structure and communication structure, how each affects the other, and how they have been treated in the literature will be examined next.
Organizational Structure and Communication Structure:
Review of the Literature

According to McPhee (1985:150) structure "is a defining characteristic of an organization - it is what brings about or makes possible that quality of atmosphere, that sustained routine which distinguishes work in an organization from activities in a group, or society, and so forth." But structure alone does not make the organization, which is a collective of people working and interacting within the structure. Structure, therefore, is also seen as a defining condition of organizational communication. This is also defined by McPhee (1985:150) as: "Communication that is shaped by, and shapes, task processes and formal structure in the organization." Through its attributes, the formal structure of an organization reflects the formal designation of the hierarchy-of-power relationship within the organization. These structural attributes include the organizational span of control, the chain of command, the levels of organizational hierarchy, the degree of formalization of organizational rules and procedures, the extent to which authority is delegated, and the formal description of organizational positions and their responsibilities (Kreps, 1986). As previously mentioned, the formal planned structure dictates (or is dictated by) the formal channels of communication which designate who is to
communicate with whom, how, and what they are to communicate about. Therefore, it is not surprising to find managers and management theorists who suggest that the structure of an organization is fundamentally related to the communication system found in that organization. Chester Barnard (1968) suggested that the structure and the scope of the organization are almost entirely determined by communication techniques. Wofford, Gerloff, and Cummins (1977:65) also indicated that as a result of organizational structuration interdependent subunits are created that need to be linked. This linking activity is a function largely dependent on communication.

The effects of organizational and communication structures have been the subject of much laboratory investigation (Klauss and Bass, 1982). This line of research has looked into various kinds of structures, ranging from simple routine activities to more complex problems and situations. Findings of this type of research share a common agreement in that a centralized tall structure having a very narrow span of control and a restricted chain of command was found to have communication restricted to a one-way flow between a person at the top and others at the bottom of the hierarchy. This is in contrast to decentralized, unrestricted, more relaxed structures, where communication was found to be unrestrictedly traveling through all
channels. Everyone could communicate freely with everyone else, which increased the employees' overall job satisfaction and morale (Bavelas and Barrett, 1951; Leavitt, 1951; Shaw, 1964; Lawson, 1965). The conclusion usually reached by this kind of research is that creating a structure that increases communication flows is likely to enhance satisfaction as well as improve job performance.

In addition to these laboratory studies, a number of field studies have also been conducted to explore the relationship between structure and communication (Burns, 1954; Burns and Stalker, 1961; Read, 1962; Athanassiades, 1973; Level and Johnson, 1978). Burns and Stalker (1961) in particular identified a mechanistic organizational structure where interactions among positions are fixed and unchanging, communication patterns are characterized by restricted vertical channels, and decisions are centralized at the top levels. In contrast, communication patterns in an organic organizational structure featuring interactions among positions which are less rigid and more flexible, were characterized by relaxed lateral channels flowing in every direction within the organization. In studying the effects of the overall organizational structure on the quality and nature of vertical communication, Wilensky (1967) noted that the nature of hierarchical structure
(number of levels, shape of hierarchy, etc.) affects the flow of information.

Complexity of organizational structures has been found positively correlating with the intensity of communication in a study done by Hage, Aiken, and Marrett (1971) to explore the relationship between organizational structure and the concomitant communication. This study examined the relationship between three aspects of organizational structure—formalization of role, decentralization of decision-making, and complexity—and the formal and informal communication systems. The major findings of the study are that when the formalization of roles increases, the total volume of communication decreases; when the centralization of decision-making increases, the total volume of vertical communication increases. Conversely, when the decentralization of decision-making increases, the total volume of communication (vertical, horizontal, and lateral) increases (Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971).

Several studies in this area of research have largely concentrated on examining the effects of different patterns of interaction, as determinants of the communication network, on the formal organizational structure (i.e., Shaw, 1964; Haas, and Drabek, 1973; Monge, Edwards, and Kirste, 1978). In this context, Haas and Drabek (1973) provided a model that allows for further understanding of
formal structure as it concerns communication. Structure, according to this model, refers to the patterns of behavior within a communication network. The authors described the patterns of certain observable behaviors such as communication, decision-making, and conflict in the organization as its "performance structure" or the "structure of behavior." The authors further noted that because all of these patterns of behavior are permanent actions within the organization, they tend to determine the shape and nature of the formal organizational structure as reflected by the "performance structure."

Numerous studies have considered other properties of the formal organizational structure in relation to communication. Such properties include: (1) Centralization and decentralization of the decision-making processes, (2) the distribution of power throughout the organizational hierarchy and the concomitant hierarchical differentiation of status and authority within the organization, and (3) the overall superior—subordinate relationship. An increasing attention has been given to the first property—the distribution of decision-making power as a central aspect of organizational structure. A large portion of this work has been designed to predict the consequences of centralization and/or decentralization in organizations (i.e., Likert, 1961; Hage and Aiken, 1967; Aiken and Hage, 1968; Pugh, et
al., 1968; Meyer, 1972; White and Ruh, 1973; Chiled, 1973; Rossel, 1970; Vroom and Yetton, 1973, Pascale, 1978). In most of this research centralization and decentralization is conceptualized as the degree to which strategic and policy-setting decision-making is dispersed throughout the organization. Tansik, et al. (1980:88) stated:

Centralization and decentralization are labels applied to indicate the degree to which authority is dispersed throughout an organization where the greater the centralization, the greater the amount of decision-making authority at the top of the organizational structure; and the greater the decentralization, the greater the authority at lower levels of the organizational structure.

Kreps (1986) also indicated that centralized organizations, as opposed to decentralized organizations, have relatively few power and decision points. Decentralization, he added, "is often advantageous for complex organizations because it relieves the extreme internal organizational communication responsibilities of top management, spreading communication and decision-making responsibility among middle and lower level managers."

Strong support has emerged for the contention that structural attributes of organizations, such as configuration and degrees of centralization and/or decentralization, heavily influence organizational decision-making as well as some process characteristics such as communication patterns (Hall, 1972; Bacharach and Aiken, 1976 and 1977). Lawrence
and Lorsch (1969) studied the flow of communication and its relation to decision-making in plastic and food container industries. They found that firms characterized by "more extensive patterns of hierarchical influence" had little upward communication and limited influence from lower and middle levels of management. They further stressed the importance of the upward flow of communication as well as the downward flow for effective implementation of decisions. Vroom (1970) also examined autocratic and participative decisions and found that the participative approach to managerial decision-making, even though requiring a greater investment of time, it produces greater acceptance of decisions and increases the probability that the decisions would be efficiently executed.

Furthermore, Hage, Aiken, and Marrett (1971) attempted to weave together various aspects of organizational structure and the process of internal communication into a single theoretical model. The authors developed a number of hypotheses relating certain variables such as complexity, formalization, and centralization to communication rates. Results of the study supported the hypotheses suggesting that the greater the degree of centralization, the less the rate of communication; and the greater the degree of centralization, the higher the proportion of vertical communication. The authors further deduced that as the
centralization of power becomes greater, and consequently the right to make decisions becomes a property of the executives, the degree of participation in decision-making by lower level management becomes less. This, in turn, inhibits communication in the organization.

Another study by Penley (1977) examined the relationship between formal and informal communication and three aspects of organizational structure - formalization of role, decentralization of decision-making, and complexity. Findings yielded strong support for the relationship between all three measures of the normative structure and communication. Results of the study proved that as the formalization of roles increased, the total volume of communication decreased, and as decentralization of decision-making increased, the total volume of horizontal communication increased.

Another aspect of the organization on which communication has an effect is the distribution of power throughout the organizational hierarchy and the concomitant hierarchical differentiation of status and authority within the organization. Since the standard pyramidal shape of most organizations suggests that the most important decisions are usually made by top management, decision makers will naturally require information both to define problems and to generate alternatives. It seems obvious that the
possession of such relevant and important information is very much limited to the decision makers. As noted by Kreps (1986:203): "In organizations, information is powerful; whoever possesses relevant organizational information and is willing to barter that information can gain and exercise power within the organization." Goldhaber (1986:6) stated: "Communication is essential to an organization. Information is vital to effective communication. Persons who control information control power." Those in the high-ranking positions have considerable access and control over key information and, thus, possess power (Blair, Roberts, and McKechnie, 1985).

This power dimension is a direct outcome of what Blau and Scott (1963) termed "The hierarchy of authority" which by its virtues "gives some people power and authority over other people" (Hunt, 1980:51). Power may also be derived from hierarchical communication systems. Three factors which help determine how power is used are how information flows vertically, horizontally, and laterally; the degree of managerial ability to handle vast amounts of information; and the degree of managerial sharing of information with subordinates (Blair, et al., 1985). Therefore, while the traditional models view communication as a means through which power is obtained, managed and publicized (Pettigrew, 1972; Butler, et al., 1977; Kipnis, 1976;
Bacharach and Baratz, 1962; Baratz, 1970), modern models view the communication processes as the substance of power relationships (Conrad, 1983). Power in the new models is viewed as a complex process that is carried out by members of the organization who construct a comprehensive view of the amount and type of influence each member possesses. These constructs are formed, shared, and validate through communication (Conrad and Ryan, 1985).

Since most of the studies of power focus on hierarchical power (Blair, et al., 1985), one's position in the organization structure determines one's ability to wield power and influence, and affects the amount of information one possesses. Roberts and O'Reilly (1979) stated that power interactions are characterized by the transmission of information through the formal organizational control system. Sutton and Porter (1968) and Davis (1953) found that those people who know a piece of relevant information are likely to be higher in the organizational hierarchy than are nonknowers. This finding suggested that communication may be more frequent among personnel in high than in low status positions. Bacharach and Aiken (1977) have examined structural constraints on the frequency of communication among departmental heads and their subordinates in 44 local government bureaucracies. They found that structural constraints such as the size and shape of the hierarchy,
decentralization of decision-making, and the organizational span of control are strong predictors of the frequency and intensity of communication. The authors concluded that the hierarchical level (organizational position) influences the nature and content of communication.

All in all, the bulk of the studies concerned with the effects between hierarchical power and communication suggest that hierarchical authority interferes with communication where accurate information is prevented from reaching lower level managers to protect the power dimension enjoyed by the higher level managers. By the same token, information in an authoritative hierarchy is also withheld from higher-level managers by those at lower levels to protect the chances for upward movements anticipated by the lower-level managers (Blau and Scott, 1963). Therefore, hierarchical differentiation of status, particularly when formally institutionalized, appears to reduce social interaction and social support among organizational members. A field study conducted by Wessen (1958) on a large hospital's personnel found that social interactions typically followed the status lines and was inhibited by status boundaries. Doctors only interacted with doctors and nurses with nurses, and so on.

A study by Lesniak (1981) provided more evidence to support the effects of a person's position within the
organizational network. The author found that subordinates with a close vertical communication relationship with their superiors can realize significant and tangible benefits. Such "inner-circle" members (termed "cadre members" by Lesniak) were found to be better informed, more involved with decisions dealing with policy and managerial problems, and generally more satisfied with the overall organizational climate than those subordinates located within the "outer-circle" (termed "hired hands" by Lesniak). The latter groups were less informed, less involved, received information of a lesser quality, and asked for clarification of unclear job instructions.

In short, two major conclusions can be drawn from the studies cited above: (1) differentiation of hierarchical power and status, particularly when formally established, not only determines the person's legitimate power and influence, but also affects his/her access to information (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959; Emerson, 1962; Wiio, Goldhaber, and Yates, 1980); and (2) organizational power and status differentiation is directly connected with superior-subordinate communication. In fact, the hierarchical position is often used as a predictor variable that has been found to have a considerable effect on communication openness (Jablin, 1982).
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In studies of superior-subordinate communication, researchers have focused on two dimensions of influence: the first is the effects of the superior's influence and power in the hierarchy on his/her relationship with subordinates, and the second is the transmission of influence by the subordinates to their superior. House, Filley, and Gujarati (1971) for example, reported that the interaction between the superior's hierarchical influence and his relationship toward his subordinate varies according to the hierarchical distance between them. The authors noted that when a superior is too high in the hierarchy, dysfunctional consequences may emerge in relation to subordinate willingness to openly communicate with the superior. They argued:

Where supervisors are seen to have such high influence, it is likely that there will be greater status separation between them and their subordinates, and that such status differentiation will result in a restriction of upward information flow, less willingness on the part of subordinates to approach superiors, and less satisfaction with the social climate of the work unit.

In a related study, Jones, James, and Bruni (1975) found that subordinates' confidence and trust in a superior is positively related to the superior's ability to diminish the formality created by the rigid hierarchy and his success in interaction with lower level managers. Finally, O'Reilly and Roberts (1974) and Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) found the aspects of the superior's downward influence and
the subordinate's upward communication distortion to have some limited degree of correlation.

In summary, the preceding review of literature regarding the relationship between internal formal structure organizational and its internal formal communication structure yields the following results. First, organizational structure is fundamentally related to its corresponding communication structure. Second, certain characteristics of the organization structure such as shape, size, and complexity are related to the intensity of its communication activities. Lastly, certain properties of the organizational structure such as: (a) centralization/decentralization of the decision-making process and the degree of employees' participation in communication; (b) the distribution of position power and the hierarchical status differentiation; and (c) the superior-subordinate relationships, are related to the direction, content, and accuracy of communication. As the organization centrality of the decision-making process increases, the distribution of power becomes highly unequal across all levels of the organization because of the lack of information availability. This in effect reflects on the degree of hierarchical status differentiation which will tend to increase as a result of the high degree of centralization and unequal distribution of power. The result is a dysfunctional formal and
rigid system of communication will emerge where filtered information regarding task activities only is transferred through vertical channels of communication.

**Sociocultural Impact on Organizational Communication: The Case of Saudi Arabia**

According to Hofstede (1982) culture is a set of learned values that have become crystallized in the minds of the people through institutions common to all members of a certain nation. Such institutions include a governmental system, a legal system, an educational system, patterns of religious practices, family structure, literature, and even industrial relations. All of these institutions reflect the value and belief systems held by members of a certain society. Since organizations are run collectively by people who share the same value and belief systems, the cultural patterns prevailing within its social environment can affect the organization (Lammers and Hickson, 1979). Thus organizational structure is shaped by cultural norms and values which set the standards for the organizational shape and behavior. Hence, organizations do reflect external cultures in which they exist as a result of the behavior of the organizational members in addition to the officially instituted design of the organization. Lammers and Hickson (1979:403) stated: "Both rank-and-file members and dominant elites perform their roles and relate to one
another in ways which stem from values, norms, and roles 'imported from the outside'."

One orientation of the cultural approach views culture as a process largely defined by the communication practices organizational members use to create a subjective interpretation of their lives within the organization (Sypher, Applegate, and Sypher, 1985). A similar view expressed by Hall and Whyte (1966:572) stated: "The communication pattern of a given society is part of its total culture pattern and can only be understood in that context."

In both views, communication and culture are regarded primarily as predictors of organizational performance (Sypher, et al., 1985). Therefore, the effectiveness of both the managerial and communication processes will be influenced by the social structure within which they occur. Social structure, according to Wofford, et al. (1977), includes variables such as the status system, the relationship of roles, the interaction relationships, and the social influence patterns. The differences in these variables among different nations and societies are expressed through a different set of values and behaviors. These social variables are considered fundamental factors which occur in any human society. The discussion to follow will apply these social structure variables to the Saudi Arabian culture, and examine its impact on organizational communication.
Karlene Roberts (1970:335) in her article "On Looking At An Elephant" stated: "A critical topic, when considering the behavior of individuals in organizations, in communication, yet cross-cultural communication studies actually done in organizations are nonexistent." The present paper will try to bridge this gap by introducing an investigation of the effect of organizational communication in a country rarely studied by social and behavioral scientists.

Influence of Islam

Saudi Arabia is an Islamic state in which religion plays an important role in political, social, educational, and economic affairs. Islamic values and traditions influence behavioral attitudes toward the conduct of all aspects of life. Islamic law is not simply a system of legal rules and administration. It extends beyond the scope of Western law to structure all human conducts—morale, ethical, social, and legal.

The Social Structure (Customs and Values)

The family is the center of the social structure, and family loyalty overshadows all other obligations. Individual members participate in major family decisions, but the final determination is always left to the father or head of the family (Kay, 1982).
Many Saudi Arabian families have Bedouin origins and a large segment of the population exhibits some characteristics of the Bedouin ethos. Among these are a tradition of a strong respect for elders and those in authority, tribal loyalty, pride and self-respect, and reputation. The conservative life-style based on the teaching of the Islamic doctrine results in a well-defined set of rules and regulations to govern and regulate the general conduct of members (Mikdashi, 1984). Therefore, the restricted social standards leave no room for mistakes or misconducts. Risking a deal, making the wrong decision, selecting a bad choice, or failing to live up to one's responsibilities may call for harsh punishment and ultimately result in loss of face.

The highest social status is accorded to members of the Royal Family and its branches, and a small number of wealthy merchants who have achieved the life-style of the upper class. The lower class consists of Bedouin, herders, and semi- or unskilled workers (Niblock, 1982).

A middle class is slowly emerging and its growth is closely associated with the nation's massive and vast transformation from a traditional herding-based economy to a modern one based on oil. Entry into the new middle class rests almost entirely on acquiring an advanced secular
education, as well as family name and tribal affiliations (Heller and Safran, 1985).

Prestige is very important in the choice of occupation. A Saudi will accept considerably lower wages for a job if it is considered socially prestigious.

Finally, the nomadic background of the Bedouin produces a socially and culturally isolated people who are slow to relate to organized systems and technological developments (Szyliowicz, 1973).

The Government Structure

The government of Saudi Arabia plays a major role in running the country both from a cultural and political standpoint. The importance of political leadership in an Islamic state is to protect as well as guarantee the correct application of Islamic rules and regulations as they are mentioned in the Holy Book (Koran). The Koran gives the notion of government a crucial consideration. In Islamic belief, the political leader is also the "Imam" or religious leader of the people. Saudi Arabia has perhaps the most traditional Islamic system of government, and this integration of political and religious leadership has a significant impact on the regulatory environment for the management of business (Nyrop, 1977). The legal framework
for business and administration reflects the government's concern for social and religious values.

The Organization of Government

Saudi Arabia is a monarchy under the rule of the Al-Saud family. The members of the Royal Family occupy many of the key positions in government, so there is a unity of leadership. Power is highly centralized, and few government officials have the authority to exercise it. This poses certain problems for the business environment such as tall and rigid organizational charts with power focused at the top, a low degree of participation in the decision-making process, poor and distorted communication channels as a result of the multiple levels of the hierarchy, and an inflexible bureaucratic process (Othman, 1979).

Ever since the Saudi government assumed the responsibility for recycling the petro-dollar, it became the focal point for all business activities in the country (Keller, 1978). The Saudi private sector is very small, underdeveloped, and mostly owned and run by a few families. Hence, the government is the main employer and has to carry social as well as economic responsibilities.

By applying the social structural variables to the Saudi Arabian Society, one can infer that the status system of ascribing a social position is mostly based on kinship
and some personal characteristics such as age, sex, and education (Al-Awaji, 1971). In accordance with Wofford, et al. (1977), high-status managers in Saudi organizations generally communicate with those at the same social (or organizational) level, and the content of their organizational communication often consists of important information and exchange of opinions regarding policy issues. The hierarchical lines which cause the status differentiation also creates some ambiguity regarding the various levels within an organization (Wofford, et al., 1977). Therefore, an interaction between members from different status levels causes discomfort in the communication process. Hence, these effects of status upon communication among managers and their superiors and subordinates are pervasive (Blau and Scott, 1963; Wessen, 1958).

Due to the rigid structure of the organization that reflects the Saudi Arabian social structure, interaction relationships among members are influenced by both the status and role structure in the work situation. Kuty (1979:311) stated: "Hierarchical structure manifests a greater differentiation in status and roles in general and furthermore tends to cut off communication." Therefore, communication occurs more often among those closer by their geographical location.
The distribution of power among organizational members is also based on their hierarchical status differentiation. The higher the position on the organizational chart, the more power will be exercised. In his monumental study, Hofstede (1980) attempted to demonstrate the strong influence of sociocultural variables on authority and power distribution in a multinational company in 40 countries including Saudi Arabia. He examined that influence in light of four dimensions: (1) large or small power distance [which is a measure of the interpersonal power or influence between a less powerful individual (A) and a more powerful individual (B) within the same loosely or tightly knitted social system that evokes this degree of inequality in power (Hofstede 1980:98)]; (2) strong or weak uncertainty avoidance [which is a measure of the norm for tolerance (or intolerance) of ambiguity related to unclear goals and imperfectly understood decisions (Hofstede, 1980:156)]; (3) individualism versus collectivism (which is a measure of the closeness of the relationship between one person and other people (Hofstede, 1982:59)); and (4) masculinity versus femininity (which is a measure of the more dominant sex role pattern among the vast majority in a society (Hofstede, 1980:277)]. The results showed that Saudi Arabia has very wide vertical power distances, strong tolerance for uncertainty, low concern for individualism, and
high masculine self-concept. Hofstede summarized that such characteristics reflect a highly authoritative or autocratic style of leadership. Such authoritative leadership style indicates a high concentration of power at the top level of the organization, and an extreme degree of centralized decisions made by those at the top and passed down to lower levels in the form of orders, rules, regulations, and procedures to be followed.

In short, each of the elements of the Saudi social structure is closely related to their organizational structure, and is reflected in communication processes and activities as well. Hence, organizational communication serves to influence the development of the social structure and it is significantly influenced by it (Wofford, et al., 1977).

**Decisional Participation**

The concept of participation and employees' involvement is by no means new. Since the appearance of the works of Frederick Tylor and Frank Gilbert at the turn of the century, management has taken a more active role in involving subordinates in the decision-making process. Throughout this period, the idea of participation came and went and reappeared in different versions as the style of management changed from autocratic, to benevolent, to consultative, and finally to participative. So the concept,
per se, has not changed over time. What has changed, however, is the way it has been practiced and the context in which it has been applied.

In the last decade, a dramatic change in the corporate climate regarding implementing the concept of participation has once again begun to flourish (Kelly and Khozan, 1980). Several factors, such as the rate of change, the rapid increase in complexity, the breakdown in command authority, and the growing need for job satisfaction among middle managers have affected the organization and its members (McConkey, 1980). As a result, a broad and sweeping departure from the traditional era of blind faith in one's superiors into the new era of group synergy, has unveiled a high level of desire to participate in the managerial process (Raymond, 1986). In a 1982 article in the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin, Cleveland identified this departure as a part of a "macro-transition in the American Life." He stated, "We are moving from doctrines of centralized power to notions of decentralization, devolution, separation, and a broadened participation." This shift was referred to by Charles Reich (1971) as "the greening of America," by Alvin Toffler (1980) as "the participating democracy," and was seen by Alan Raymond (1986) as a functioning of "the new organic corporation."
The "third wave" managers are beginning to realize that corporations cannot exist without the hearts, minds, and energy of their people, and are therefore seriously considering the concept of participation as a highly effective and rewarding vehicle for utilizing the talents of organizational members. "Participation", as Lee Preston and James Post (1974) concluded in their article "The Third Managerial Revolution", "is the only workable mode of organizational guidance in post-industrial society...".

The following section will thoroughly review literature and analyze the concept of decisional participation as the dependent variable of the present study. However, prior to presenting this review and analysis, a brief review of the decision-making theory as an integral part of management theory and practice will be presented to shed some light on the nature of the decision-making process.

**Decision-Making Theory**

In today's organizations decision-making is one of the most important functions performed by managers. Included in a manager's responsibilities are decision-making processes such as planning, organizing, coordinating, problem-solving, job assignments, and determination of pay increases.
Until the recent emergence of decision-making as an integral part of management theory, decision-making had primarily been treated in the traditional literature under the planning function. Management in the 1950s was oriented toward human relations and leadership theories, rather more than toward decision-making theories. Until that time, decision-making had almost no literature (McDonald, 1955).

Organizations gained orientation to decision-making theories from the behavioral sciences which provided discussion of decision-making theories through a human relations emphasis on participative leadership (Greenwood, 1969). In 1959, Gore and Silander published the first comprehensive survey of decision-making research. Their findings indicated that almost half of the writers on the subject were psychologists who studied individual and group factors in decision-making processes. The remainder of the studies dealt mainly with decision-making methods which were derived from the fields of mathematics and statistics (Gore and Silander, 1959). During the 1960s, traditional theory of management underwent a period of transition during which it became oriented more toward decision-making theory, process, methods and techniques (Wasserman and Silander, 1964). While the 1960s reflected a transitional period for decision-making theory, the 1970s witnessed a
revolutionary period. During this time the theories regarding the decision-making process became more organized and highly systematic.

The open systems concept provided new methodologies for a more systematic way of defining and evaluating the alternatives. Decision-making theory had generally achieved remarkable improvements in the selection procedure -- the "choice" among alternatives (Bridge and Dodds, 1975). With the information explosion and the advanced quantitative techniques which characterize the 1980s, decision-making theory now seems to embrace the scientific methodologies with their application to all types of organizational decisions (Donaldson and Lorsch, 1983; and O'Reilly, 1983).

Types of Decisions

As decision-making theory developed, many distinctions between the different decision types have emerged. Management texts refer to those decision types in various ways. Parsons (1960), for instance, distinguishes between: 1) policy decisions -- decisions concerning what goals are to be pursued and how they are to be attained; and 2) allocative decisions -- lower level decisions regarding the allocation of responsibilities among personnel.
In his book *Strategy and Structure*, Chandler (1962) differentiates between the entrepreneurial decisions which are concerned with the external allocation of resources and with long-term planning, and the operational decisions which relate to the proper use of the allocated resources over a shorter time frame.

In light of Simon's (1945) traditional classification, two types of decisions are distinguished: 1) programmed decisions, which refer to the "strategic", complex, nonroutine decisions which generate a variety of informational needs, and 2) unprogrammed decisions, which refer to the "operational", technical, repetitive, routine decisions which occur with regularity and require standard operating procedures.

Finally, Cook and Russell (1980) explain that, whereas strategic decisions involve the establishment of long-term organizational goals and objectives, operational decisions are generally concerned with efficiency of performance and deal with a wide range of daily activities from scheduling day-to-day work to the pricing of products.

Approaches to Decision-Making Processes

Although many writers have considered various aspects of organizational decisions, there is a continuing
line of thought inaugurated by Herbert A. Simon and his colleagues Richard Cyert, James March, and Charles Lindblom which emphasizes that analysis of decisions (regardless of type) is the key to understanding organizational management processes (Pettigrew, 1973). Whether it is rational, relational, or quantitative, managerial decision-making is a complex process that occurs within a dynamic organizational behavior system. Managers exercise their decision authority within a formal organizational structure in which all responsibilities are hierarchically related (Greenwood, 1969).

This decision authority is usually legitimized through the establishment of defined lines of authority and responsibility between the managed and the managers within the organizational structure. Management's authority is usually defined in the managerial job description to accurately explain managers-subordinates relationships regarding various tasks, responsibilities, and standards of job performance. As Crozier and Friedberg (1980) denote, for every defined authority there is a corresponding responsibility in the management system; thus, responsibility is seen as the counterpart of authority. Hence, the organizational decision authority is the manager's legitimate responsibility.
The post-World-War-II increase of organizational functions and structures caused the organization to grow tremendously in size, tasks, authority (i.e., span of control), and responsibility. As a result, delegation of responsibility and decision-making authority to lower levels of the organizational structure has become a necessity in order to meet the demands of change. Therefore, employee participation in the decision-making process, becomes an inherent consequence of the developing organization.

Some management theorists believe that participatory decision-making is too risky. Democracy within the organization is seen as too cumbersome and inefficient. These theorists favor the benevolent autocratic managers who prefer to make unilateral decisions without consulting their subordinates in the hierarchy. Since losing power entails loss of ability to give orders that will be followed, benevolent autocrats are usually reluctant to share any of their organizational responsibilities or delegate any of their decision-making authority. Authoritarian managers believe that such a loss of power will reduce their importance.

Contrary to this, a number of managers agree that subordinate participation in the decision-making process is concerned with more than simply the employee's desire to participate. Issues such as effective resolution of
problems, the employee's occupational and personal development, and fulfilling overall organizational needs are also of great interest. Research of decisional participation has revealed numerous advantages and benefits that stem from applying the participatory approach to the organizational decision-making process.

**Definition of the Concept**

The concept of participation in decision-making by individuals or groups has been an area of interest for numerous writers. Its political as well as academic implications are manifold. However, the literature lacks not only a clear-cut operational definition of the concept, but also a precise set of hypotheses regarding its dynamics (Schregle, 1970; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; Locke and Schweiger, 1979; Yukl, 1981). Since there is little consensus to its exact meaning, the concept of participation in decision-making had an assortment of meanings and variations attributed to it. The term has been defined by various writers in connection with other terms such as decentralization, joint decision-making, power sharing, and democratic management. The idea of participation in the decision-making process has originated from the classical contrasts between managerial styles of leadership (Singer, 1974).
A vast number of organizational theorists of the "human relations" and the "human resources" schools have made reference to the concept "participation in decision-making" in their comparisons of different managerial approaches. Examples of such approaches are: "The Scanlon Plan" (Leisure, 1958); "Theory Y" (McGregor, 1960); "Employee-Centered Supervision" (Likert, 1961); "9.9 Managerial Style" (Blake and Mouton, 1964); "System 4" (Likert, 1967); "Industrial Democracy" (Blumberg, 1968); "Job Enrichment" (Jenkins, 1973); and most recently, "The Vertical Linking Program" (Hawley, 1982). A profusion of available definitions associate the concept of participative decision-making with various elements such as ego involvement (Allport, 1945), feelings of obligation (Schultz, 1951); workplace democracy (Strauss and Rosentein, 1970); delegation (McGregor, 1960; Lowin, 1968; Sorcher, 1971; Sashkin, 1976); group decision-making (Davis, 1967); and the majority of definitions associate it with power sharing (Lammers, 1967 and Tannenbaum, 1974).

The variation of meanings given to the term "participative decision-making" could be demonstrated by some of the definitions offered by different writers. Vroom (1960), for example, defines participation in terms of the amount of influence an employee exerts on organizational decisions. He distinguishes between what he calls
"psychological participation" (the amount of influence an individual perceives he has on decision-making), and "objective participation" (the amount of influence an individual actually has over decision-making). Vroom further explains that both the amount of actual participation and the opportunity to participate depend on factors such as the decision type, the societal norms and values, and personality variations of the individuals. Vroom's assertions were later fortified by several studies (Fleishman, 1965; Alutto and Belasco, 1972; and Patchen, 1970).

Lammers (1967) states that "participation in decision-making is the totality of various forms of upward exertions of power by subordinates in organizations as are perceived to be legitimate by themselves and their superiors". Pateman (1970) saw that "participation in decision-making is the modification, to a greater or lesser degree, of the orthodox authority structure where decision-making is the prerogative of management in which workers play no part." Lowen's definition simply states that "participation in decision-making is a mode of organizational operations in which decisions are arrived at by the very persons who are to execute them." Similarly, Locke, Schweiger, and Latham (1986) indicate that "joint decision-making, either by a manager and one employee or a manager and a group of employees, is simply a managerial
technique that can actually lead to lower employee satisfaction." Finally, Kanter (1982) defined the "process" of participation as "...task oriented rituals of high involvement and transformation."

The prevailing confusion in this area is based upon the vague and undifferentiated conceptualization of the term "participative decision-making" or "decisional participation". In an effort to outline a broad framework for participation, Dachler and Wilpert (1978) criticized vague conceptual dimensions of participative decision-making by stating:

Participation literature includes a plethora of undefined terms, and characteristically lacks explicitly stated theoretical frameworks. ...different value systems imply different definitions of the participation, so that the term has a variety of meanings across investigators...

Another source of confusion surrounding the concept of participation is its "purpose" (Miles and Ritchie, 1971; and Sashkin, 1976). The ongoing controversial debate between those who view the process of participation as a "Panacea" and those who view it as a "humanistic philosophy" often implies that it is not only the quality and the quantity of participation that is important, but also the purpose behind it. Also, the research on participative decision-making lacks systematic efforts to measure the effects of some contingencies such as personal,
organizational, and contextual components which may help or hinder the concept (Sashkin, 1976).

Because participation is a misunderstood concept, it is often equated with permissiveness and frequently seen as a sign of weakness in the management system. Managers often tend to regard participation as a shift in the power and control structures that have long benefitted them. As a result, several managers fear that participation may blur the distinction between themselves and their employees. Others fear it may diminish their power and control over subordinates (Ewing, 1971; Kantie, 1982; Weisbord, 1984; and Hinckley, 1984).

Likert (1961) has detailed some of the (frequently unjustified) fears supervisors have regarding the loss of their influence and effectiveness if there is participation of subordinates. Robert Buchele (1977) recognized that some managers share a fear that participative management leads to "softness", lack of discipline, and sacrifice of performance and productivity, in favor of shallow happiness. However, this fear has been proven groundless in many situations.

Contrary to expectations, participation between managers and subordinates does not necessarily mean managers will have less authority. As Anthony (1978) explains in his book, Participation Management, "when managers and
subordinates share authority, a 'synergistic' effect will increase the total authority and power level of the group as a whole." In his article "Choosing Between Directive and Participative Management," Richard Hamlin (1986) concludes "the elegance in participative management is that we can multiply our power and influence by empowering and enriching the working lives of others."

Due to the lack of a precise and generally accepted definition of the concept of participation, this study will adopt Massarik's definition as the most descriptive of the processes without being overly "extensive." Massarik, like many others, discusses participative management in connection with subordinate participation in the decision-making process. According to Massarik (1983), the concept of participative management may be defined as "persons at subordinate levels of an organization's hierarchy take part, in varying degrees, in making decisions regarding the organization and their work jointly with persons at superior levels of the hierarchy." This definition proposes a participative framework that integrates decisions among superiors and subordinates by shifting the focus of the decision-making process downwards.

This thesis takes the position that changes in the decision-making focus must be considered in terms of the structural sources of networks which comprise the formal
organizational communication system. The degree to which subordinates participate in the decision-making process depends upon the effectiveness of the organizational communication system in transmitting the information needed for decisions to the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy.

Because close examination of issues provides further understanding and clarity, the following section will take a closer look into the nature of decisional participation by exploring its principles, types, techniques, range, content, and domain in an effort to clear some of the confusion.

The Principle of Decisional Participation

There is a desire for participation arising in the world today (Powers and Powers, 1983). Cleveland (1982) identifies this phenomenon as a part of a "macrotransitional" period in life. He states that people are moving from patterns of centralized power to notions of decentralization and participation. The principal factor underlying this increasing desire for decisional participation is that "a feeling of 'worthwhileness' and 'belonging' tends to develop from participation in the decision-making by integrating the abilities of individuals with the organizational objectives" (Davis, 1951).
Types of Decisional Participation

The most common types of decisional participation mentioned in the literature are those regarding direct and indirect participation (Lammers, 1967; Bolweg, 1975; Locke and Schweger, 1979; and Warner, 1984). Direct participation refers to the situation in which subordinates have the power to make decisions regarding their own work, and an influence over top management decisions. Indirect participation refers to a situation where subordinates have representatives to voice their opinions and influence management (i.e., workers' directors, consultative councils, higher level committees, and industrial unionism).

Lammers (1967) defined direct participation in decision-making as "the degree to which subordinates can and do influence in a direct way the decision made by their superior managers." Experiments (Jenkins, 1973 and Hansson, 1974) show that the direct form of participation which has developed as an organizational alternative is viable from both the manager's and the subordinate's perspective. These and other experiments tend to emphasize the fact that subordinates (workers) are capable of organizing themselves to a larger degree than was traditionally expected (Jones and Svejnar, 1982).

Indirect participation is often referred to as the "European-style participation" because it has been
emphasized more in European countries and studies than in American research. Miller and Form (1964) state that "joint consultation had developed and flourished in the United States during World War II but have disappeared since." The function of indirect participation is not necessarily to motivate the workers but to protect their interests by pressuring top management, via their representative, to take the worker's point of view into account when making decisions that have potential impact on their jobs (Bolweg, 1976). Indirect participation, is an aspect of the organizational policy system in which procedures are formalized by law, and outside agencies (government or unions) have the power to influence its process (Lammers, 1973 and Warner, 1984).

Direct forms of participation, by comparison, have virtually no legal nor formal implications. Rather, they are usually advocated through a greater organizational autonomy, and therefore often seen as being connected with the manager's leadership style. Whether participation is carried out directly or indirectly, there is little doubt that the distribution of organizational power will expand throughout the organization and thereby mitigate the conflict of power interests between the managers and their subordinates (Lammers, 1973).
The present study will consider only the direct type of participation under which managers open up the decision-making processes to subordinates for their input. Because the country under investigation (Saudi Arabia) does not in any way apply or practice this concept of indirect participation (nor its techniques), this aspect of decisional participation will be completely eliminated, regardless of its prolific and extensive research. (For an in depth treatment of this subject see Sturmthal, 1964; Miller and Form, 1964; Lammer, 1967; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978; Mason, 1982; Otter, 1983; and Brannen, 1983).

Techniques of Decisional Participation

In an exhaustive review of the decisional participation literature, Lowin (1968) concludes that studies in organizations generally support the participative decision-making hypothesis, with a few exceptions (i.e., Katz, et al., 1951). Although critical of the methodologies employed by the experimental studies in organizations, Lowin (1968) also indicated that the available data (up to that point in time) were quite suggestive. A similar conclusion was reached in a more recent review by Locke and Schweiger (1979). Regardless of the authors' personal ideological biases against participative decision-making (they seem to believe that the idea of participation
is based on socialistic views) their review provides the most thorough literature review of what is known about the effectiveness of participatory decision-making to date (Sashkin, 1984). They strongly support the thesis that "decisional participation usually leads to higher satisfaction but not necessarily to higher productivity more than authoritarian styles."

Based on the evidence supporting this approach, a wide acceptance of individual involvement has led to significant changes in work structure to create more room for employee contributions. To integrate the fragmented tasks imposed on employees by traditional schools (i.e., Taylorism, Theory X, etc.), organizations often employ a number of direct decisional participation techniques. These may include job enlargement, job enrichment, job redesign, and the most common method of restructuring the work organization, best known as "OD": organizational development (Miles, 1975). Other direct participative techniques usually discussed in the literature are: management by objectives (Hunt, 1972 and Miles, 1975); the semi-autonomous work groups with considerable emphasis on quality control circles (Hayes, 1981; Bocker and Overgard, 1982); and delegation of functions to subordinates (Terry, 1972; Lammers, 1973; and Trewatha and Newport, 1978).
Because decisional participation normally implies the idea of "sharing with others" through "a joint consultation process" to reach "a joint decision", some writers chose to exclude delegation of functions and job enrichment as two forms of participative decision-making techniques because they do not involve the idea of direct sharing between managers and subordinates (Susman, 1976; Locke and Schwieger, 1979; Yukl, 1981, and Hinckley, 1984). As for delegation, Susman (1976) cautions those writers who tend to merge the terms "delegation" and "participation", while failing to make the distinction between them. Other writers such as Locke and Schwieger (1979) argue that "...the process of delegation involves assigning specific responsibilities to subordinates to be carried out by subordinates in absence of their managers. Thus participation does not logically imply delegation." Along the same line of argument, Yukl (1981) claims that delegation and direct participation techniques are two separate issues and differ in many important ways, and therefore should be distinguished from one another. Hinckley (1984) more recently stated that "real participation requires one person to join with others in pooling information to reach a decision." Thus, the participation process should be seen as an interaction between two or more individuals to jointly discuss the information and reach a conclusion.
As for job enrichment, Locke and Shwieger (1979) argue that whereas decisional participation is a "method" for reaching decisions, job enrichment is a structured task for giving subordinates additional challenges and more interesting jobs. Yukl (1981), on the other hand, states that "delegation is a form of job enrichment whereby subordinates are given more responsibilities to make their jobs more challenging and more meaningful." Regardless of the validity of the above stated arguments, this study will not exclude any of the participative techniques. Each technique or method which involves direct participation, either by the individual or the group, will be included. Be it delegation of authority, consultation with subordinates, or decisions made jointly with subordinates.

Range, Content, and Domain of Decisional Participation

Some important dimensions of decisional participation should always be taken into account when considering participation. Range (or degree) of participation is the first dimension of decisional participation discussed.

Vroom and Yetton (1973); Bernstein (1976); Locke and Schwieger (1979); Otter (1983); and Hinckely (1984) note that between full and minimal lies a multitude of various degrees of participation. The standard continuum often seen in the literature ranges from no participation
on one end to full participation on the other end, with various degrees of consultation inbetween. Bernstein (1976) defines the range of participation as "the amount of influence subordinates have over any decision." His spectrum of participation ranges on a column that begins with consultation (co-influence), to joint management (co-determination), and finally to full control (self-management) on the upper end of the spectrum.

In an effort to settle an ongoing debate over quantity versus quality participation, Miles and Ritchie (1971) refer to range as the "Quantity Theory of Participation". This theory implies that some participation is better than none, and that more is better than a little.

The second dimension of decisional participation is its content. This refers to the nature and type of decisions over which subordinates exercise influence. Hinckley (1984) refers to this dimension as "upward participation". He further explains that most organizations divide work tasks into structuring activities and processing activities. Structured activities require strategic decisions often made by higher-level management, while processing activities often have lesser value, and therefore involve standard operational procedures with routine decisions being made by personnel at lower levels of the hierarchy. Hence, "upward participation" describes the extent
to which employees are involved with managers in work considered to be primarily the manager's responsibility.

Locke and Schwieger (1979) indicate that the dimension of content is dependent on the type of decisions being made. The authors define four broad types of decisions: routine, task, work conditions, and policies. As mentioned previously, this study will only focus on routine decisions (property of the rank-and-file) and policy decisions (property of the management).

The last dimension of decisional participation is domain. This dimension involves some controversy. The domain or scope of participation reflects on the "stages" or "steps" which managers usually follow to systematically make their decisions. These stages, as often mentioned in management texts, are: (1) problem recognition; (2) development of alternatives; (3) determination of possible effects; and (4) weighing the decision (Tansik, et al., 1980).

Many managers only include their subordinates in the first, and maybe the second stage of this process, yet claim to be democratic and advocate the participative approach. Although Vroom (1969) and Wood (1973) note that it is beneficial to include workers at some stages of the decisional process more than others, many writers argue that decisional participation is an interactive process through
which a joint decision with others is reached (Locke and Schwieger, 1979; Yukl, 1981; and Hinckley, 1984). Thus, consulting and/or debriefing subordinates without reaching a joint decision with them does not represent participation in the sharing sense of the word.

Thus far, reference has been made to the direct participation of subordinates in decision-making as being a desirable, effective, and advantageous action to be seriously considered by organizations. The questions to be answered in the following part of this section are: How does decisional participation affect the employee's performance and effectiveness? What are the advantages of implementing and applying the participative decision-making approach?

**Historical and Current Developments of the Concept**

Twenty-five years ago, Likert recognized that meeting the demands created by complex technologies and much larger and diverse organizations required the creation of complex systems of organizing human efforts. Likert (1961) proposed such a system (the newer management system) to accommodate the continuous developments in the field of management. This system was based on a systematic integration of the principles and practices used by what he categorized as the high-producing managers. The general focus of Likert's "new system" is on "the principle of supportive
relationships." This principle is briefly stated as follows:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must ensure, in all interactions and all relationships, that each member views the organization as a supportive unit that strives to build and maintain his sense of personal worth and importance (Likert, 1961).

Several years later Likert (1967) perfected his new system and presented the most comprehensive research-based, and clearly stated theoretical position. He assembled and integrated impressive evidence supporting the effectiveness of "system 4" -- or participative management (Sashkin, 1974 and 1984). The general pattern in Likert's new system of management is characterized by a high level of sensitivity to other's talents and skills, permitting effective participation in decision-making and problem-solving. Participation is used to establish organizational objectives which satisfactorily integrate the overall goals of the organization with the needs and desires of all its members. Full adoption of Likert's new system results in the following improvements: 1) a high level of reciprocal and coordinated influence develops via an effective system of communication; 2) the free flow of relevant information from one part of the organization to another aids in the transfer of important facts for each decision and action; and 3) the leadership of the organization develops an
effective social system for interaction and mutual influence (Mozina, Jerovsek, Tannenbaum, and Likert, 1967).

An important approach employed by Likert's new system is the widespread use of participation in the work place to obtain full benefits from the technical as well as the human resources of the organization. Coupled with various reinforcing theories of motivation, the concept of participation in this new pattern of management has the potential of being applied to all aspects of the job (i.e., setting goals and budgets, controlling costs, organizing tasks, and making decisions.) (Likert, 1961).

This emphasis on the human factor is certainly not new. Similar findings and emphasis from various previous studies (Dubin, 1965; Argyris, 1957; March and Simon, 1958; Vroom and Mann, 1960; McGregor, 1960), have shown that subordinates react favorably to experiences which they feel are supportive and contribute to their sense of importance and personal worth. These findings were also supported by substantial research on personality development (i.e., Rogers, 1951; Argyris, 1957; Vroom, 1960; Cartwright and Zander, 1960) which state that each individual needs appreciation, recognition, influence, a feeling of accomplishment, and a feeling that people who are important to him/her do indeed believe in him/her, trust him/her, and respect his/her abilities.
From this beginning, the concept of employee participation and involvement in decision-making and policy setting processes has grown into a full-fledged approach affecting the direction of organization theories (Powell and Schlacter, 1971).

The past fifty years of active research has demonstrated that when participative management is properly applied, there is effective improvement in performance and productivity. More than a decade ago Lee Preston and James Post (1974) labelled participation as "the third managerial revolution." Their argument hinged on the view that participative management is the only way an organization can cope effectively with environmental changes; by effectively utilizing its employees' abilities. A similar more recent argument was presented by Marshall Sashkin (1984). He argues that "participative management is not merely effective in terms of performance, productivity, and other output measures of organizational effectiveness, but also that participation management is a moral and ethical imperative." A great deal has been said about the postwar effects which participation has brought to the workplace and its members. As a result, countless experiments and research have been conducted over the years to prove the alleged advantages of the concept of participation. As previously mentioned, this study will only focus on one type
of decisional participation -- the direct involvement of subordinates with their superiors in the decision-making process. Therefore, this review will exclude the research on indirect types of participation.

Regarding leadership style and its effect on participation, a number of studies on autocratic and democratic styles have been stimulated by the pioneering experiments of Lewin, Lippitt, and White in 1938. The majority of these studies have demonstrated that employees working under democratic supervisors are more likely to have higher morale and higher productivity than those working under autocratic supervisors (Weschler, Kahane and Tannenbaum, 1952; Baumgartel, 1956; and Vroom, 1960).

From Anderson's (1959) comparative studies of authoritarian versus autocratic styles of leadership to Stogdill's (1974) comprehensive review of the general participative leadership literature, most studies demonstrate positive and beneficial results linking participative (democratic) leadership with higher morale and higher quality decisions (Lanzetta and Roby, 1960; Vroom, 1960; Kidd and Christy, 1961; Shaw and Blum, 1966; Heller and Yukl, 1969; Maier and Sashkin, 1971; Vroom and Yetton, 1973).

Building upon earlier approaches to leadership behaviors (i.e., Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1958; and Maier, 1962), Vroom and Yetton (1973) based their model on the
analysis of how a leader's decision behavior affects the decision quality and the subordinate acceptance of the decision. They explain that a high quality decision is one in which the best available alternative is chosen. Therefore, when decision quality is important and subordinates have relevant information to contribute to the decision, a decision procedure that provides for subordinate input will lead to better quality decisions by choosing the best alternative. Vroom and Yetton state that as a result of applying such participative procedures, the degree of subordinate acceptance and commitment to implementation of the decision will increase remarkably. When subordinates have considerable influence in the decision-making process, they tend to perceive the decision as their own and are more motivated in assuring that the decision is implemented successfully. Hence, according to Vroom and Yetton (1973), the effectiveness of a decision depends upon a number of factors such as leader's skill, time pressure, subordinate development, etc.; but most importantly it depends upon the decision quality and subordinate acceptance. Although Vroom and Yetton's model suggests more than one feasible decision procedure to be followed according to the type of decision to be made, they emphasized that subordinate contribution, when needed, will yield maximum results regarding the decision's quality and acceptance. The results of
one validation study by Vroom and Jago (1978) were found to be generally supportive of the model.

Maier and Sashkin (1971) studied the effects of a democratic versus an autocratic leadership style on the quality of the decision. They found improvement in decision quality under democratic leadership that encourages all members to share and integrate their views, knowledge, and ideas. This in turn promotes the problem-solving style and ultimately improves the quality of the final decision.

Participation is consistent with the needs of a mature subordinate for autonomy, achievement, self-identity and psychological growth. For this type of employee, a high degree of participation makes the job more interesting and satisfying. Autocratic leadership, however, tends to frustrate subordinates, causing isolation, resentment, and dissatisfaction as a result of participation deprivation (McGregor, 1960; Sashkin, 1984). Alutto and Acito (1974) studied the effect of the autocratic system on employee satisfaction and found a significant negative correlation between perceived participation-deprivation and overall job satisfaction.

A major component of research on leadership by Bass (1981) yielded massive evidence supporting the effects of decisional participation reached with a participative style. It also demonstrated the positive connections
between decisional participation and workers' satisfaction.

By thoroughly reviewing the participation literature, it is noted that much of the research consists of: correlational field experiments by which causality cannot be determined (Locke and Schwieger, 1979), and many laboratory experiments (i.e., Lanzetta and Roby, 1960; Kidd and Christy, 1961; Shaw and Blum, 1966) which have limited results that cannot be readily generalized to actual situations (Dachler and Wilpert, 1978). Although they suffer from a variety of limitations for the most part, these field experiments are considered the best studies that have been conducted in the field (Locke and Schwieger, 1979; Yukl, 1981).

The most widely-referenced field experiment cited in the literature is that conducted by Coch and French (1948) at the original Harwood Manufacturing Company. This study clearly illustrated the potentials of participation for increasing performance, morale, and satisfaction in the work place. Coch and French divided the work force into three groups: 1) no participation control group; 2) indirect (representative) participation group; and 3) direct total participation group. After comparing the groups' rates of productivity and satisfaction, the results were: 1) the no participation group showed an immediate decline in productivity; 2) the indirect (representative) group
also had an immediate decline in productivity, but returned to its original level after one week; and 3) the total participation group had a brief decline in productivity as a reaction to the change, returned to its initial level within a few days, and later exceeded that level. Thus, indirect and direct participation result in improved performance and an overall increase in employee satisfaction. Whereas the autocratic procedure created more resistance to change, dissatisfaction, hostility, and withdrawal; the participatory procedure resulted in higher identification with decisions and an increase in the level of motivation to implement the decisions (Blumberg, 1968; Lowin, 1968; Ivancevich, 1977; and Locke and Schwieger, 1979).

This study was the forerunner of much subsequent work explaining why participation and employee involvement can improve satisfaction and performance. The present review will detail some of the manifold research that has yielded strong positive correlations between employee decisional participation and job satisfaction.

A study conducted by Miles and Ritchie (1971) revealed that managers who perceived themselves as being consulted more by their superiors scored higher on the satisfaction scale than those who considered themselves consulted less or not involved. Research conducted by Runyon (1973), also yielded positive results that supported
his thesis, showing significant correlation between employees' perceived degree of decision participation and their level of satisfaction.

Carroll and Tosi (1977), using a questionnaire as a tool of research to measure the effects of decisional participation, found a marginal correlation between decisional participation and employee level of performance. The effects of employee perceived participation, in addition to employee performance were also measured by Lischeron and Wall (1974). Their survey of 127 workers was conducted in local government departments. A significant relationship was found between the degree of employee perceived participation and overall satisfaction. Lischeron and Walls reported that workers who were less satisfied expressed a great desire to participate.

A study conducted by Alutto and Blasco (1972) indicated similar findings. The study results showed that depriving subordinates from actively participating in the decision-making process results in a perception of top administrative officials exercising high decision control without employee influence. This created a high level of conflict resulting in employee dissatisfaction. The research further demonstrated that these dissatisfied individuals professed a high desire for future participation to be attained through restructuring the control system within
the organization and encouraging greater participation by lower level subordinates.

Driscoll (1978) studied the usefulness of participation in decision-making in predicting job satisfaction. He measured the congruence between the desired and perceived participation among 109 faculty members in a small liberal arts college in upstate New York. His findings strongly support his hypothesis that participation in decision-making predicts the specific attitude and satisfaction with one's work and with the organization as a whole.

Several years ago a point of dispute arose as to whether participation should be measured objectively or as perceived by participants for a better indication of organizational effectiveness (March and Simon, 1958, and Tannenbaum and Smith, 1964). March and Simon argued, "provided the objective-perceptual dichotomy is relevant, the perception of individual's participation is equivalent in many respects to actual participation." Lowin (1968) however, stated that neither measure is perfect because "neither is able to top all the simultaneously cooperating mechanisms." The present analysis, in agreement with the former position, denotes that there is probably a correlation between perceptual and objective decisional participation measures where a complete absence of actual individual
participation will probably be recognized and perceived as such, and vice versa. Therefore, the degree of participation in this investigation is measured in terms of perceptual decisional participation.

In his article, "When Planning For Others", Bass (1970) states that participation leads to greater understanding of the objectives involved in a particular decision and of the action plans developed to achieve the objectives. This understanding results from consulting over the issues with the employees, thus making it easier for them to accept and implement the decisions made.

Falcione (1974) examined the effect of consulting with subordinates and their acceptance of the decisions made in a large industrial organization. He utilized a consultative type of participation in which the employees had an opportunity to understand the issues and offer an opinion; but had no say in the final decision. The result was a positive correlation between consulting with the employees on certain decisions and their acceptance of and satisfaction with the decisions made.

A few studies have investigated decision-making behaviors among managers in relation to communication style as a facilitator of better decisions. Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) for example, found that effective upward communications and influence from middle and lower level managers
tend to increase the quality of decisions and their implementation.

In a cross-cultural comparison between the Japanese and the American approaches to decision-making behaviors, Abegglen (1958) reported that the Japanese extensive lateral and hierarchical communication led to their higher reliance on consultative decision-making than their American counterparts. Yoshino (1968), ten years later echoed Abegglen's study. He noted that the Japanese emphasis on consultative decision-making approach resulted in a high degree of immersion in communication processes which increased their ability to quickly and easily communicate up and down the hierarchy. In a later comparative study Pascale (1978) found that because of the high face-to-face communication as the dominant medium of exchange of information and problem-solving, in the Japanese culture, communication has a significant impact on the high quality and implementation of their decisions.

In studying the effects of a participatively-developed versus autocratically-instituted job-enrichment program, Seeborg (1978) collected data using the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). He compared various aspects of job satisfaction in relation to motivation and found that members in the group enriched by participation were more
satisfied than those in the group enriched unilaterally by the supervisor.

More recent approaches to decisional participation are variously associated with Japanese management styles. Ouchi (1981), in his book *Theory Z*, observed that the Japanese participative approach to decision-making is the strongest single characteristic of Japanese organizations.

In a comparative study conducted by Maguire and Pascale (1978), a variety of empirical measures were used to identify the differences between the decision-making processes employed by managers working in Japanese and American companies. This data reveals that Japanese managers rely more heavily on consultative decision-making processes than do their American counterparts. Schuler (1977) studied a group of employees at various levels of a large manufacturing firm's hierarchy. His resulting conclusion shows that participation in managerial decision-making is positively related to performance regardless of hierarchial position.

In regard to organizational structure, Nightingale (1981) examined the effects of work and expanded employee participation in decision-making on employee outcome in 20 organizations. Data suggested that significant worker control over decision-making does lead to positive outcomes. It was further concluded that, regardless of position,
enhanced employee participation in decision-making and improved work itself are significantly related to employee productivity. John Hawley (1982) presented a new program called "Vertical Linking", in which a cross-section involvement of employees at all levels of the organization participate in decision-making and problem-solving. The model yields positive results that can lead to significant improvement in organizational performance as well as improved morale and motivation.

Bistline (1980), and Hamlin and Garrison (1986), have enumerated various positive outcomes when applying the decisional participation approach (i.e., better decisions, higher productivity, improved morale and satisfaction, better communication, and providing encouragement and support). The results of the studies reviewed thus far lend considerable support for some of the "classical" works of participation literature regarding the efficacy of decisional participation as a motivator and a satisfier. For example, the values and benefits of decisional participation have been widely illustrated by the most renowned experiment in the social sciences field - "The Hawthorne Experiments" (White and Lippitt, 1960; Blumberg, 1968; and Kahn, 1975). The most relevant conclusion is the significant increase in productivity following the introduction of the new management style. The evidence for the
effect of incentives on productivity is attributed to the new consultative management style (Lawler, 1975).

The positive results obtained from McCormick's (1938) idea of introducing the "Junior Boards" of young executives also reveals the benefits and values of employing the consultative management approach. Higher motivation and morale are a direct result of McCormick's multiple management (or participative management).

Another popular work cited in the literature is "The Scanlon Plan". This plan consists of two major elements: 1) a participative system, and 2) an equity system. The plan has proven effective in increasing employee efficiency, productivity, and income (Forst, Wakeley, and Ruh, 1974). Similarly, the original Harwood study conducted by Coch and French (1948) illustrates the potentials of participation for increasing performance, morale, and satisfaction in the work place (Blumberg, 1968).

Finally, the values of decisional participation have been clearly reflected in the popular and influential work by Likert (1961 and 1967). Participation is the basis on which Likert's "System 4" is founded. The remarkable increase in efficiency and the dramatic decrease in conflict, according to Likert, is due to the application of decisional participation.
It is undeniable that these studies lend strong support to the participation hypothesis. However, research conducted regarding decisional participation does not always translate into actual workplace reality. Results of many field experiments (i.e., Lischeron and Wall, 1974; Latham and Yukl, 1976; Ivancevich, 1977; and Latham, Mitchell, and Dossitt, 1978) found that participation is not successful in all situations. Studies conducted by Misumi (1959), Sales (1966), Sadler (1970), Patchen (1970), and Malone (1975) present clear examples of situations in which decisional participation opportunities lead to either no significant improvements or negative results. Powell and Schlechter (1971) describe studies in which productivity either did not improve as the amount of decisional participation increased, or productivity decreased. The authors conclude that "while participative management techniques may produce more involved, happy workers, it does not necessarily achieve productivity results for the organization." It is also concluded that the managers must frequently choose between maintaining high morale or high productivity, but not always achieve both simultaneously.

Locke, Schweiger, and Latham (1986) list a few conditions under which nonparticipative decisions are more preferable. Time pressure, employee preference and capability to work alone, and subordinate's clear lack of
expertise on subjects essential to making certain decisions, create some of the situations in which employee participation may degrade rather than improve the quality of the decision made. In his book *High Output Management*, Grove (1983) concludes that employee participation is useful only under some circumstances. He cited the key requirement for employee participation in the decision-making process as the employee displaying expertise in the area in which the decision is being made.

In her defense of the participation approach, Kanter (1982) explained that the reason why decisional participation does not work under all circumstances is because managers often fail to manage participation. Kanter further offered managers and technicians valuable advice in effectively dealing with the dilemmas of managing participation.

In conclusion, 50 years of active research clearly, strongly and consistently demonstrates the effectiveness decisional participation when properly applied. Any variation in observed effectiveness of participation in organizations results primarily from ill-managed and ill-designed application of the program, either by the managers, the consultants, or the employees who lack the skills necessary to participate in the decision-making process (Sashkin, 1984; Kanter, 1982).
In his article "Participative Management Is An Ethical Imperative," Marshal Sashkin (1984) wrote: "...it is ethically unjustifiable to manage nonparticipa-tively...."

Hence, participation is a truism in today's modern organization. As the modern organization becomes more complex, employees will experience more participation in significant decisions. This fact requires wide recognition and acceptance by all managers of today's modern organizations.

**Decisional Participation in the Public Sector**

When agriculture lost a considerable part of its labor to industry as a result of the industrialization process, the public sector became the dominant economic sector in most modern societies (Von Otter, 1983). Frederick Mosher (1978) describes the post-industrial society as being a "services society". Because the prime beneficiary group of public services is "society" itself (Anthony, 1978), governmental organizations lack the key device of success - "profit". Therefore, the public sector differs fundamentally from the private sector; the distinction between them is one of values (Meyer, 1982). Thus, the public sector stands as a representative of the social values and relationships that extend from families, friends, and
neighborhoods to the entire society (Von Otter, 1983). Consequently governments, as head of the services sector, acquire a major role in policy and decision-making processes. In most government agencies there are some major decision centers in existence, but these centers are usually located far up in the organizational hierarchy. Thus, heavy centralization, little delegation, rigid routine, vigorous rule making, and high impersonalization of job descriptions tend to be some of the dominant characteristics of most governmental organizations (Buchele, 1977; Anthony, 1978).

The current dissatisfaction with the performance of public bureaucracies has created a demand for reform and change, with participative administration at its center as a remedy for the traditional, unresponsive system (Wilcox, 1969). The concept of participation in the public sector is by no means a novel idea. Its central tenets are embedded within the realm of political democracy (Mosher, 1982). Its conceptual substance proposes that administrative effectiveness is enhanced by increasing the participation of the members at all levels of the administration in decisions affecting their work and their lives (Likert, 1967). Such participation increases the quality of organizational decisions by decentralizing and relocating them to those points in the organization where the real expertise and
best information are located. Moreover, participative doc­
trine recognizes the potentially mature personalities
within the organization by enlarging their scope and real­
izing their full potential (Kaufman, 1978; Mosher, 1967,
1978; and Reiss and Bordua, 1967).

The participation hypothesis has not gone unno­
ticed in the public sector. The records are repleted of
instances in which one or another public administration or­
ganization has embraced the doctrine and/or experimented
with its implementation (i.e., Reich, 1962; and Redford,
1969). But the majority of such implementations represent
valid examples of the indirect "representative" form of
participation (i.e., Baum, 1961; Schneider, 1964; Gilb,
1966; Thompson, 1967; Burton, 1979; Geiger, 1979; Mosher,
1982; and Otter, 1983). As far as the direct form of par­
ticipation is concerned, the public administration theory
and practice has provided little support. In his article
"Development of the Theory of Democratic Administration",
Dwight Waldo (1952) clearly states that "the orthodox pub­
lic administration ideology has held tenaciously to a value
orientation which conceives democracy as a political prin­
ciple external to the professional field of administration
and alien to the administrative process itself."

Some supporters of the concept, however, are con­
vinced of the efficacy demonstrated by participation in
public organizations (Bennis and Slater, 1968; Mosher, 1978; Kaufman, 1973; Buchele, 1977; and Brannen, 1983). In his article "Managerial Revolution in the State Department" Alfred Marrow (1966) states that the U.S. Department of State has achieved remarkable results with their participative leadership methods. Sandra Schoenberg (1973) also reports positive results applying her new typology of leadership styles to public organizations.

Other supporters of participative administrations advocate their necessity as the solution to the disenchantment with the gap between policy and delivery. Warren Bennis and Philip Slater (1968) argue that traditional autocratic leadership is peculiarly lacking in quality and flexibility which are essential factors for survival in an era of rapid social and technological changes. Fifteen years later, Marshal Sashkin (1984) echoed the same line of argument when he stated that the concept of participation is an ethical imperative.

A study by Buchanan (1974) compared some typical government managers to their business counterparts. One conclusion reached was that government managers have less favorable attitudes toward and less commitment to their organizations. Buchanan strongly recommended that more effort should be exerted in establishing manager contribution
and recognition, in order to increase their overall sense of belonging.

Generally speaking, there is little empirical research to either validate or invalidate the claims made for participation in public administration (Meade, 1971). Although increasing, the number of public organizations in which solid research has been done, remains a small part of the total participation literature that deals with the indirect form of participation in the public sector, or that deals with both forms in the private industrial sector.

To conclude, the traditional public sector bureaucratic structure, with its narrow span of control and its complicated hierarchical chain of command, has received heavy criticism from the public administration literature (Simon, 1976). It has been argued that the rigid multi-level structures in the public sector are simply too cumbersome for today's rapid pace of change (Buchele, 1977). It has also been stated that bureaucratic channels of communication are too frustrating to the modern, well-educated government employee (Bennis, 1966 and Mosher, 1982). For these reasons, it is imperative for the old structure to evolve into a more "adaptive", "consultative", and "participative" system.
Decisional Participation in the Saudi Arabian Public Sector

During the last two decades much has been written on the impact of sociocultural influences on management practices and effectiveness. The massive data generated from cross-cultural studies during that period are fraught with evidence that the attitudes, beliefs, values, and need hierarchies are vastly different in different societies (Ornati, 1955; Kerr, et al., 1960; Farmer and Richman, 1965; Zurcher, Meadow, and Zurcher, 1965; Haire, et al., 1966; Sirotta and Greenwood, 1971; Hofstede, 1980; and Negandhi, 1984). The interrelationship between environments and organizations has led many researchers to suggest that administrative practices are culture bound. For instance, Ajijeruke and Boddewyn (1970) replicated Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter's (1966) earlier study and documented the association between environment and administrative practices. The authors conducted a survey of 14 countries from three continents using eight socioeconomic indices of culture. They concluded that culture is a significant determinant of managerial attitudes and practices.

Furthermore, the environmental impact on administrative practices has also encouraged researchers to highlight the existing differences between developing and industrialized countries. Siffin's (1976) review of public administration in developing countries classified the
public administration practices exported from the United States in terms of its tool orientation (process), structure orientation (organization), value orientation (rationale), and contextual orientation (resources and government structures). He noted that fundamental cultural differences prohibit the transfer of Western models of administration to developing countries. According to Montgomery (1972), developing countries generally have highly centralized governments that lack both local autonomy and delegation of authority. Mills (1979) and Villanueva (1979) also indicated that all developing countries have large public sectors heavily dominated by formalism, ritualism, and elitism. The expressed goals are often vague, the organization of work is diffuse, and the organization-individual relationship is permanent (Inzerilli, 1978). As a result of the inadequate infrastructure (Bjur, 1975), and the low levels of education in management (Iboko, 1976) that characterize most developing countries today, a rigid bureaucracy that is deeply rooted in traditions of centralization and formalities has evolved where decisions are determined by status rather than mission (Helmich and Papageorge, 1976 and Sinha, 1979). Consequently, the need for participation in decision-making concomitant to the emerging middle class in most developing countries is frustrated by the chaotic development of administrative practice (Haire, et al.,

As a developing country, Saudi Arabia faces most of the problems that other developing countries do except for lack of capital. It endorses similar ambitious development plans, and certainly faces similar administrative obstacles. Unfortunately the abundance of capital in Saudi Arabia has not provided the magic cure for its administrative illness. In general, the country suffers from the same dilemmas created by the widening gap between expectations and achievements (Othman, 1979). The ills commonly cited by practitioners include a lack of worker motivation and commitment (Chackerian and Shadukhi, 1983), overconcentration of authority at the top of administrative hierarchies due to the tall organizational charts, very poor and distorted channels of communication due to the many levels of the organizational hierarchy, and a low degree of participation in the decision-making process at the lower levels of the managerial ladder (Diyab, 1978). Also, mismatches between position requirements and employee qualifications often occur as a result of the common practice of nepotism (Fathaly and Chackerian, 1982). Most of these administrative problems have been recognized and mentioned in the Second Development Plan 1975-1980 (1976, p. 571):
The rapid increase in the budgetary allocation for economic and social development over the period of the first year plan has severely strained the capacity of the government administrative system which was already encumbered by over centralization and not enough delegation of managerial, financial, and personnel authorities to executive levels.

Despite the fact that the Saudi bureaucracy faces the same shortcomings faced by other developing countries' bureaucracies, its tradition differs in terms of history. Osama Othman (1979) noted that the administrative machinery in Saudi Arabia is fairly new. Until the mid 1940s there was no clear structure of bureaucracy known for the Saudi government. Only four ministries existed at that time to deal with some traditional tasks of governments (i.e., Defense, Finance, Interior, Foreign Affairs) via a few hundred civil servants without any clear rules or regulations for recruitment, promotion, or even classification (Othman, 1979). Until 1950 the Civil Service Sector, resembling many of its counterparts in other developing countries, suffered from the concentration of power at the top and incompetence at the lower levels. The King decided all matters of national importance while his ministers served largely as royal advisors (Huyette, 1985). They, in turn, ran their ministries individually, delegating very little responsibilities and authorities to their deputies but nothing to the middle level managers, who at the time
lacked the basic skills to work effectively (Al-Salman and Robertson, 1982; and Huyette, 1985).

When oil production quickened in the following decade and introduced a major new source of revenue, the bureaucracy grew rapidly to provide continuously expanding public services. According to the Saudi Arabian Third Development Plan (1980-1985) "the direct government civilian employment has more than trebled during the past two decades. As of now, the government is not only the single largest employer in the kingdom, but it also absorbs the vast majority of trained new labor force entrants each year" (p. 37). This fact presents the main reason for specifically choosing to focus on the Saudi Arabian Public Sector in this study.

As a result the Saudi bureaucracy, has assumed a new role to formulate and administer over-ambitious development programs and to modernize the entire society. This is a role completely different from the traditional one of maintaining the law and keeping national matters in order.

The decade following the augmentation of the price of oil in 1973 witnessed an enormous growth of wealth that necessitated a rapid growth of bureaucracy (Othman, 1979). The government assumed a leadership role for recycling the petro-dollars through various transformation activities to bring about major changes. As Joseph La Palombara (1963)
in his book *Bureaucracy and Political Development* stated "Whether it is the building of roads, the creation of new industries, or the radical transformation of traditional villages, one can usually expect to find the bureaucracy ultimately involved." The Saudi government assumed full responsibility to lead the society into the modern world.

Because the high degree of social, economic, and technological developments has been the cause rather than the result of the expanding bureaucracy, the increasing demands on the public sector have startled the bureaucracy which was not fully prepared for the job (El Mallakh, 1982). As a result, the bureaucracy has become unable to provide the essential services at a sufficient level (Othman, 1977, 1979; Rudolph, 1984; Chackerian and Shadukhi, 1983; Huyette, 1985). Even though the total public employment grew at an average annual rate of 8.4 percent between 1975 and 1980 (Kavoussi, 1984), the lack of manpower appears to be the crucial factor affecting the administrative capacity. The second five-year development plan (1975-1980) suggested a remarkable increase in administrative positions. Between 1970 and 1977 the number of positions increased 135 percent (from 79,870 in 1970 to 188,288 in 1977) requiring an increase in employment at an annual rate of 18 percent (Pamphlet published by the Saudi
Arabian Government, Civil Service Bureau, 1977). In the process of trying to fill some of the new positions, another crucial problem of the bureaucracy prevailed—position classification. Since the emphasis in position classification is on duties and responsibilities (Halloran, 1967), the Saudi Arabian Public Personnel Bureau issued a law in 1970 to emphasize the merit system as the basis for position classification in the recruitment process (Pamphlet published by the Saudi Arabian Government, Public Personnel Bureau, 1971). The essential stages to be followed in establishing a position classification system, however, have not been followed systematically (Othman, 1979). Given the importance of family ties, senior bureaucrats tend to promote family members and tribal relations regardless of their qualifications. Nepotism therefore has not only become a common feature of the Saudi bureaucracy (Al-Awaji, 1971), it has also become an expected practice that represents yet another crucial problem in the administrative system (Al-Tawail, 1974). Further, since promotion depends on ascriptive factors rather than on ability or performance, there is hardly any incentive on the part of the individuals to perform well (Huyette, 1985). In addition to the extended family tradition which is embodied in the Bedouin Ethos exhibiting strong respect for the elders and those in authority (Patai, 1976), Islam in Saudi Arabia
has also served as a unifying ideology. Generally, Islam is seen as more than just a religion. It embodies social, cultural, and political norms. Thus top officials and religious leaders who generally occupy a paternalistic role exercise sufficient authority to maintain order and enforce social values. They closely supervise and monitor the communications media to ensure that the Islamic values are properly instilled (Huyette, 1985). In describing the political socializing process in Saudi Arabia, Scott Huyette (1985) states:

...the government retains the ultimate control over the media which is used to foster the people's sense of national identity...the media report only the positive developments in the kingdom...and in the absence of political opposition and a critical press, the media becomes a vital tool for perpetuating the regime.

Further, Daniel Lerner (1966) in his article "Communication Systems and Social Systems" identified two types of communication systems -- media and oral, and classified Saudi Arabia as corresponding to the oral system. He characterized the oral system as having a "homogenizing effect on behavioral styles." He further explained that according to the oral model of communication, messages usually flow from certain sources authorized to speak by virtue of their status in the social hierarchy as well as in the organization hierarchy. These messages are typically seen as prescriptive rather than descriptive (i.e., announcing regulations
to govern the audience behavior). David Bell (1975) regarded this style of communication as "authoritative communication" which refers to any communicated decisions that guide the choices made by others.

Because communication in a hierarchical society (or organizations) works according to the principle that govern gravity (Harriman, 1974), given the Saudi authoritative communication style and the centralization of power in the hands of senior officials with their full control over the information flow as a result of the tight system of censorship, the individual's initiative is usually rare and their participation in the decision-making process is low. William Newman (1967) explains such situations by stating that when top management officials fail to provide their managers in lower levels of the hierarchy with the necessary information regarding recent changes in the organization planning and/or policy, these managers tend to lose most of their incentive and enthusiasm to perform. He further maintained that the frustration that goes along with inadequate information generally creates an attitude of rejection and alienation. Such barriers make these managers' participation difficult if not impossible to achieve.

Since Likert's theory of participative management anticipates that an intense system of communication,
interaction, and influence tend to generate some common positive perceptions and attitudes that blend into an overall system of norms, these norms provide a framework that guides the process of organizational decision making. By the same token, if the system of communication and interaction is less intense in the sense that individuals are kept relatively uninformed and/or misinformed about the latest developments in their organizations, the overall system of norms will indeed reflect a highly centralized process for decision making. When applying this theory to the Saudi Arabian public organization context, one might infer that censorship and control over the organizational communication system by top officials resulting from the heavy centralization of authority and power at the top levels of the hierarchy tends to generate some negative perceptions and attitudes reflecting a tight decisional process framework highly centralized in nature.

Likert's theory further postulates that a strong normative system contributes positively to the effectiveness and satisfaction of the organization members (Smith and Jones, 1968). Conversely, a weak normative system that results from an inefficient system of communication and interaction impacts negatively upon the members' overall effectiveness and satisfaction. Reflecting on the Saudi Arabian social context, a weak normative system could be
detected as a result of the inefficient systems of communication in public organizations due to the heavy control over the information flowing downward the communication channels. Members at middle and lower levels of the organizational hierarchy are therefore expected to be less informed, less involved, and hence, less satisfied.

In accordance with the Hair, et al., (1966) classical cross-cultural study, Diyab (1978) compares the Saudi Arabian government manager's level of job satisfaction to other managers of the world based on Maslow's needs hierarchy. He found that self-actualization and self-esteem needs are the least satisfied needs among middle level managers in Saudi Arabia. He explains that this may be due to the over centralization of decisional authority at the top of the administrative ladder which directly reflects the Saudi social structure that is hierarchically organized into explicit gradations of status from superior to inferior (Patai, 1976). Reflecting on organizational behavior in Saudi Arabia, the employee and the employer accordingly occupy certain positions that carry with them some well-defined and ascribed rights and duties (Anastos, Bedos, and Seaman, 1980). Superiors usually occupy a paternalistic and authoritarian role by which they hold the right to consult with their subordinates without necessarily allowing them to influence the outcome of the final decision
(Mikdashi, 1984). Pateman (1970) referred to this situation as "partial participation" as opposed to "full participation by which each member as a part of the decision-making body has equal power to determine the outcome of decisions." Since Saudi organizational behavior is governed by norms and values deeply rooted in the rigid social structure, the concept of the free flow of information in organizations is regarded foreign to the social norms of the Saudi Arabian culture which strongly limits the employee's full decision participation.

In summary, the tall, complex Saudi Arabian organizational structure with its maximum administration centralization and its rigid and ill-developed bureaucracy lacking an effective communication system tends to create negative attitudes and perceptions regarding superior-subordinate relations. These relations include communication, interactions, and influence. The result is a low desire among employees to initiate new ideas. Arrangements of this type clearly discourage the development of individual self-expression and creativity which are so necessary to the personal satisfaction of employees and which are an essential ingredient of the democratic (participation) organization (Worthy, 1967).
CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION OF THE THEORY AND MODEL

From the previous chapter, one can see that several sets of scholars have done wide-ranging reviews of thinking and research on participation in the workplace (i.e., Lowin, 1968; Strauss, 1982; Dachler and Wilpert, 1978). Locke and Schweiger (1979) conducted perhaps the most comprehensive review of empirical research. They reviewed more than 50 laboratory studies, correlational studies, multi-variate field studies, and univariate field studies. They suggested a number of contextual factors to account for the effectiveness of participation such as individual knowledge and motivation organizational task attributes, group characteristics, leader's attributes, and organizational size and technology. They also noted that a variety of models have been advanced in the field to account for the effectiveness of participation should it influence the employee's job satisfaction level and productivity. The three major models cognitive, affective, and contingency were reviewed by the authors to highlight the important effects each model has on the participation process. The cognitive model advocated by theorists such as Anthony
(1978); Frost, Wakely, and Ruh (1974); Miles and Ritchie (1971); and Ritchie and Miles (1970) propose that effective participation can be maintained through bringing high-quality information to decisions and through the utilization of workers' knowledge and expertise at times of implementation. The affective model, on the other hand, suggests that effective participation can be enhanced through intervening motivational processes. Advocates of this model (i.e., Coch and French, 1948; McGregor, 1960; French, Israel, and As 1960; Blake and Mouton, 1964; and Likert, 1967) argue that increased employee needs require satisfaction and participation fulfills needs. Therefore, a participative climate would be adequate for increasing job satisfaction. The contingency model, by contrast, argues that no single model of participation is appropriate for all employees in all organizations. Rather, a variety of contingencies such as personality, particular decision situations, superior-subordinate relationships, and job levels intervene heavily in the process of participation. Scholars advocating this approach are Vroom (1960); Vroom and Yetton (1973); Vroom and Jago (1978); Hulin (1971); and Singer (1974). Furthermore, Locke and Schweiger (1979) provided several examples of managers and academicians advocating the use of participation regardless of which approach or model one adopts.
Finally, the authors concluded that in spite of the "plethora" of empirical research studies investigating participation in the decision-making process, when reviewers of the literature draw conclusions on its effectiveness and the factors influencing its efficiency and workability, they invariably still state that "it depends" (Locke and Schweiger, 1979; Lowin, 1968; and Singer, 1974). Unfortunately, the factors directly influencing effectiveness have never been clearly identified (Miller and Monge, 1986). The present study is suggesting that the key prerequisite for successful participation is communication. The model presented in Exhibit (1) provides a more general approach to account for the effectiveness of participation than the three models mentioned above. In fact, this model encompasses all the factors offered by the other models because communication inherently provides information for decisions, allows employees to express their needs and wants, and maintains a positive climate and a healthy atmosphere in which all employees at all levels achieve a fair degree of satisfaction with their jobs.

Communication is only implicitly mentioned in almost all participation research as an essential strategy and a necessary condition for implementing and operating a participative system (i.e., Carlson, 1951; Burns, 1954; Landsberger, 1961; Kelly, 1964; Stinchcombe, 1974). The
literature, by and large, lacks a clear and direct framework in which the relationship between organizational communication and the degree of employee's participation in the decision-making process is directly related. When stressed in the participation literature, communication is always mentioned implicitly in connection with leadership styles (Kelly, 1964; Vroom, 1970; Vroom and Yetton, 1973) or with organizational structure (Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971). But with a few exceptions (i.e., Abegglen, 1958; Yoshino, 1968; and Pascale, 1978), the concept has never been treated as a separate variable. Therefore, it is usually seen as either a means to facilitating participation effectiveness, or an outcome of a successful participation program (Rosenfeld and Smith, 1967; Lammers, 1967; Lowin, 1968; Sashkin, 1976; Hawley, 1982; Powers and Powers, 1983). Rarely is it seen as a variable which may or may not have a direct effect on decisional participation.

Hypothesis: Based on these findings, the present study will attempt to test the following hypothesis:

The formal organizational communication system (its direction, content, and sources) as perceived by Saudi Arabian middle and lower level managers in public organizations will have a positive effect on their degree of participation in the decision-making process regarding both strategic and operational decisions.
More specifically, a manager's perception of the organizational communication system should provide a significant predictor of his degree of participation regarding strategic and/or operational decisions. This perception will be largely determined by the manager's personal and organizational characteristics such as age, level of education, and position within the organizational hierarchy. Hence, this hypothesis is based on the assumption that "the more informed the manager is, the more involved he must be in the decision-making process."

Because the posited hypothesis concerns managers in Saudi Arabian organizations, a few predictions could be cast in light of the social characteristics of the Saudi culture.

The literature reviewed in the previous chapter has revealed that the Saudi Arabian social structure is hierarchically organized into explicit gradations of status from superior to inferior (Patai, 1976). Reflecting on organizational structure and behavior in Saudi Arabia, the employees and the employers accordingly occupy certain positions and ascribed rights and duties (Anastos, Bedos, and Seaman, 1980). Superiors usually play an authoritarian role by which they hold the right to consult with their subordinates without necessarily allowing them to influence the outcome of the final decision (Mikdashi, 1984). Due to
the rigid structure of the Saudi Arabian bureaucratic system, interaction relationships among members are influenced by status and role structure in the work situation. Katz and Tushman (1979) indicated that hierarchical structure manifests greater differentiation in status and role and furthermore tends to cut off communication. This result reflects the inefficiency of the Saudi Arabian communication system which is expected to effect the managers' interaction patterns and involvements in organizational decision-making, policy setting, and problem-solving.

Based on the above findings, the following predictions are in order:

1. Due to the Beduin Ethos which exhibits strong respect for the elders in Saudi Arabia, it is predicted that the manager's age will be positively correlated with his position.

2. Since education has only recently been stressed as a prerequisite for recruitment, the manager's level of education and his age are also predicted to be negatively correlated.

3. As a result of the rigid bureaucracy that is deeply rooted in traditions of centralization and formalities, decisions are more often seen as a property of top-ranked officials, thus they are mostly determined by status rather than merit. Therefore, this study predicts that middle and lower level managers' perception of their actual decisional participation will be significantly correlated with their position, education, and age.

4. Lammers and Hickson (1979:403) stated: "Both rank-and-file members and dominant elites perform their roles and relate to one another in ways which stem from values, norms, and habits imported from the outside (society)." Since the
communication pattern of a given society is part of its total culture pattern (Hall and Whyte, 1966:572), communication and culture are regarded as primary predictors of organizational behavior (Sypher, et al., 1985). Therefore, it is predicted that the manager's age, education, and administrative status (position) be significantly correlated with this perception of the effectiveness of the organizational communication system in which he functions.

Prior to confirming or rejecting the posited hypothesis and the casted predictions, the methodology employed by this study will first be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Sampling

Because of the Saudi Arabian conservative culture and rigid beaucracy, the researcher had to rely on "convenient sampling" that was selected under the supervision of the Saudi Arabian Education Mission (Denver office). The researcher, therefore, was not fully informed of the exact criterion on which the selection process was based. One hundred and fifty questionnaires were mailed to a number of middle and lower level managers of the Mission's official's choice. Only 134 responses were received (at a response rate of 89%). For unspecified reasons, 16 managers did not return their questionnaire, and four of the ones returned had to be discarded because they were incomplete. The 130 remaining respondents represent the sample of this study. Because of the nature of the selection process, this sample is probably only a quasi-representation of the population under study. It is understood that certain statistical tests can only be applied to a randomly selected sample, but in the absence of known intentional biases, it was decided to subject this quasi-representative sample to a
variety of statistical tests. Interpretation was therefore made in accordance with this limitation.

The subjects of this study were all Saudi males from middle and lower levels of management between the age of 35 and 40 most with college degrees (56% of the respondents had a college degree). Since the purpose of this study is to measure the degree of decisional participation among middle and lower level managers, respondents were asked to define their administrative positions by checking one of the following levels:

- Middle level manager (Head of a department)
- Supervisor (Head of a division)
- Lower level manager (Head of a unit)
- Other (Please specify).

**Research Design**

The present study is designed to compare directly the effectiveness of the formal organizational communication operating within the Saudi Arabian public organizations on the middle and lower level managers' participation in the decision-making process. The preceding review of the literature suggested that the more informed the manager (or employee) is about various issues related both to his work and to the organization in which he functions, the more able he is to be involved in a wider range of decisions (i.e., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969; Vroom, 1970; Hage, et al., 1971; Conrath, 1973; Allen, 1979; Hunt, 1980;
Lesniak, 1981). Consequently, it was hypothesized that there will be a positive relationship between measures of effectiveness of the formal organizational communication system as perceived by middle and lower level managers and their decisional participation in Saudi Arabian public organizations. It was thus expected that managers' perception of their organizational communication system will provide a significant predictor of their decisional participation. This perception is based on the subject's personal and organizational characteristics such as the manager's age, level of education, and hierarchical position within his organization. Exhibit 1 indicates the relationship between the dependent and independent variables which will be discussed in the following section.

The Dependent Variable

As the model presented in Exhibit 1 indicates, this thesis takes the position that the focus of organizational decision-making process must consider the structure of the organizational networks which comprise the formal organizational communication system. This position is based on the belief that the degree to which subordinates participate in the decision-making process depends upon the effectiveness of the organizational communication system in transmitting the information needed for decisions to the lower levels of
Exhibit 1. The Communication Model
the organizational hierarchy. Hence, with a small addition, Massarik's (1983:3) conceptualization of decisional participation is adopted here to define the dependent variable in this study. Provided with the relative information they need "persons at subordinate levels of an organization's hierarchy take part in making decisions regarding the organization and their work 'jointly' with persons at superior levels of the hierarchy."

To operationally deal with this variable, a questionnaire was developed (see Appendix A, Part 3) based on Alutto and Belasco's (1972) model. Subjects were presented with a series of ten decisional situations dealing with both strategic and operational decisions. For each decisional situation, subjects were asked to respond to the questions: (1) I currently participate in this type of decision, and (2) I would like to participate in this type of decision, and circle a number on a scale from 1-5 that best represents their response. The first question will reflect whether or not the managers are currently participating in the decision listed in the questionnaire, and the second question will reflect whether or not the managers desire to participate in these decisions.
The Independent Variables

The model presented in Exhibit 1 shows that the core interest of this study is the effect of the organizational formal communication system on creating a consultative, supportive, and informative atmosphere which allows the organizational members at all managerial levels to participate in various decisions related to their job and their organization as a whole. The preceding review of the literature indicated that communication is an act of sharing information with others (i.e., Haney, 1973; Carl, 1968; Allen, 1979; Foltz, 1981) just to name a few. Because information can be shared among everyone, communication exchange directly affects the potential contribution made by individuals regarding the accomplishment of organizational goals, the making and implementing of organizational decisions, and the solving of essential organizational problems. Allen (1979) explained that if the employees know what the exact situation and/or problem is, they are more likely to work on it; and if they know what the solution is, they are more likely to produce. However, if either of these is known only by one or a few officials of the organization, then a different communication structure promoting the exchange of information is needed to provide all supervisory positions with equal access to information. Therefore, the effective formulation and implementation of
major managerial tasks such as policy setting, decision-making, and problem-solving rely heavily on communication between all levels of the organization (Allen, 1979).

Measurement of the independent variable in this study (organizational communication) was achieved through the use of a slightly modified version of an instrument called Employee Communication Index (ECI). This tool was developed by J. Foehrenbach and K. Rosenberg in 1980, members of the International Association of Business Communications; and was sponsored by Towers, Perrin, Foster, and Crosby - a management consulting company. The Index was framed to specifically measure how well an organization's communication system meets and achieves its objectives based on employee perception of it. The ECI has quickly gained popularity as an effective means for examining an organization's communication programs. Foehrenbach and Rosenberg (1982) in their article "How are we doing?" noted that within two years the Index was offered in more than twenty-five organizations representing nine different industries in the United States. The instrument, the authors added, was also offered to six organizations in Canada and Five in the United Kingdom.

For the purpose of this study, the ECI was modified slightly to better fit the nature of the Saudi Arabian social and administrative characteristics. Items dealing
with union matters, for example, were completely eliminated because of lack of applicability to Saudi Arabian organizations where unions do not exist. Scales were also re-arranged to match the direction of the relationship between the variables as stated in the hypothesis. The original version of the ECI consists of four scales each measuring a certain aspect of the communication system. The first scale measures the general climate of the communication system by examining the upward and downward communications. The second scale measures the quality of the information exchanged within the communication system by examining the reliability of the current sources from which the employees receive their information as opposed to the ones they prefer. The third scale measures the deficiency of the communication system by looking into whether or not the employees are receiving enough information on a wide-range of related organizational issues. The final scale measures the quality and usefulness of the organizational publications ranging from bulletin boards to newsletters, and from booklets to messages and memos.

The modified version used in this study will be discussed in the following section.
Instrumentation

The data for this study were obtained by means of two questionnaires comprising the entire instrument. To serve the purpose of this study a questionnaire was based on a moderately revised version of a tool called Employees Communication Index (ECI). This tool was developed by Foehrenbach and Rosenberg in 1980 to measure the effectiveness of an organization's communication system. This part of the instrument contained three sections (see Appendix B). The first section contained a series of 24 items taken directly from the ECI to measure the directionality of the oral and written communication activities and to determine the most dominant channels through which important information travels. The second section also contained a series of 13 items rearranged to measure the effectiveness of the communication system by checking whether or not the employees have a need to receive adequate information regarding certain issues in the organization ranging from organizational future plans and allocation of resources to job related how-to information and feedback on job evaluations. As the employees' need for more information increases, the effectiveness of the communication system decreases accordingly. Therefore, a response of strongly disagree that there is a need for information regarding a
certain communication issue, indicates an increase in the effectiveness of the communication system. The last section of this part of the questionnaire dealt with measures of the reliability of the sources from which the employees receive their information in comparison with their preferred sources. A list of ten different sources ranging from "top management" and "department meetings" as formal sources of information, to the "grapevine" and "peers from other departments" as informal sources of information was also included. For each item within all three sections (or scales), respondents were asked to circle a number on a five-point scale ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. For ease of interpretation, these numbers were switched during the statistical analysis so they are all positively worded. This means that as the number increases from 1-5, the variables will also increase.

The second questionnaire was developed on the basis of Alutto and Belasco's (1972) model to measure the employee's participation in two types of decisions - strategic and operational. As mentioned above, a series of ten decisional situations dealing with a wide range of both strategic and operational decisions was followed by a set of two statements: (a) I participate in this type of decision, and (b) I would like to participate in this type of decision.
Data Analysis

Upon receiving the questionnaires, the data was entered into the computer and a data file was created. These data were assembled and subjected to a series of initial analysis. This analysis consisted of the following steps:

1. A Cronbach's Alpha was applied to all the scales measuring the dependent and independent variables for assessing internal consistency reliability.

2. A series of factor analyses were performed on the data within each assembled scale (see Table B.1).

3. A Pearson Product - moment correlations were computed in the form of a zero-order correlation matrix including all independent and dependent variables. This matrix indicated the relationship both among and between the independent and dependent variables, and the degree to which they all tend to co-vary (Correlation between selected variables are shown in Table 1).

4. Based upon observed interrelationships between independent and dependent variables, another correlation analysis was run using the factors assembled within each of the scales measuring both independent and dependent
Table 1. Significant Correlations Between Manager Characteristics and Perception of Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Position</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo12</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo40</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo45</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r = correlation
p = significance (≤ .05)
variables. The matrix in Table B.2 indicates the relationship between the scales measuring both the independent and dependent variables.

Upon entering data from the initial analysis of the questionnaires into a second data file, a regression analysis technique was used to study the general composition of the model and to test the posited hypothesis (see Table B.3). A stepwise regression was then conducted to confirm the indicated relationships in the regression analysis.

The results of both initial and the secondary data analyses will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One hundred and thirty Saudi Arabian managers representing middle and lower levels of management in government organizations answered two questionnaires. These questionnaires were intended to measure their perceptions of their organizational communication system, and the degree of their decisional participation in both strategic and operational decisions. Four aspects of the communication system were measured - upward communication, downward communication, effectiveness of overall communication system, and employee's current and preferred sources of information. Also included were two aspects of decisional participation - manager's actual and preferred (desired) participation (see Table B.4 for distribution of subject's means and standard deviations).

Reliability Checks Results

To ensure the internal consistency of the scales used to measure both independent and dependent variables, a reliability test was conducted for all scales and the results were acceptable in this sample. The downward communication scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .85 (n of cases =
130, n of items = 16). Alpha for the upward communication scale was .69 (n = 130, n of items = 8); for the communication effectiveness scale was .86 (n = 130, n of items = 13); for the current information scale .68 (n = 130, n of items = 10); and for the preferred sources of information scale alpha was .73 (n = 130, n of items = 10). The scale measuring the dependent variable (decisional participation) also had a high reliability alpha at .89 (n = 130, n of items = 20).

**Factor Analysis Results**

A factor analysis was run to confirm that the items for each scale measured their intended constructs (see Table B.1). The original factor analysis produced 27 factors which were reduced to what appeared to be six significant factors.

Items 9-24 comprised the first scale, downward communication. These items did not produce high loadings on any of the forced six factors. Of these sixteen variables, eleven showed a loading above .4 on factors 1. The other five variables loaded at a .34 magnitude or less. Variables 25-32 comprised the second scale, measured upward communication. Nearly all these variables resulted in a loading above .4 on factor 1 with the exception of variable 25 which loaded at a -.30. The fact that the variables in
both scales loaded on one factor (Factor 1) but had different signs, proves that these variables are actually measuring the same construct (upward and downward communication) but at opposite ends of the spectrum.

The third scale measured the effectiveness of communication and resulted in the highest loading at .5 and above on Factor 2 for all thirteen variables. Despite variable 59, nine of the ten variables in the fourth scale (managers preferred sources of information) showed substantial similarities in composition producing high loadings on Factor 4 at a .44 magnitude and above. Variable 59 (labeled grapevine) resulted in a low loading at only -.0. The reason is believed to be a translation problem. In the process of translating the questionnaire into the Arabic language, the best equivalent Arabic term that was chosen to translate the expression "grapevine" had a negative connotation in the Saudi Arabian culture. This problem of equivocality resulted in a strong disagreement (70% of the respondents strongly disagreed) in considering the grapevine as a source of information.

The last scale measuring organizational communication focused on the managers' current sources of information. When factor-analyzed, only five out of ten variables resulted in a loading at .46 and above on Factor 5. The other five variables showed a low loading at .3 or less.
These results certainly support the overall structure of the scales to measure the intended constructs in this study. When factor analyzed, the scale measuring the dependent variable (decisional participation) also produced high loadings at .56 and above on Factor 1 for all twenty items.

Despite the minor variances in some of the variables in the first and fifth scales, this factor analysis, in general, yielded positive results regarding the similarities within the composition of variables as they were structured in each scale. The factor analysis further suggested that there were, in fact, differences between the scales.

**Pearson Correlations Results**

Regarding the demographic predictions, the communication matrix illustrated that there is no significant correlation between the subject's age and his organizational position. The second predictor, however, showed a significant negative correlation between the manager's age and his education level (n=-.15, p=.04, n=130).

Subject's actual participation scores were not significant to have correlated with their age, education, and position. When these characteristics of the subject's were examined in relation to the manager's scores of the
perception of the effectiveness of the communication system, a number of significant correlations were found (see Table 1). These results suggest that while there is no direct significant relationship between the manager's personal and organizational characteristics and their degree of participation in the decision-making process, these characteristics seem to have some direct relationship with the manager's perception of the effectiveness of their organizational communication system.

This initial finding implies that the relationships between the subjects' characteristics, their perception of the effectiveness of the communication system, and their actual decisional participation are in the hypothesized direction.

As Table B.2 indicates, there were some significant correlations among the scales measuring the independent variables. The scale for current sources of information was positively correlated with the upward communication scale ($r = .17$, $p = .03$). This suggests that as the managers' perception of the level of current sources of information increases, his perception of the level of upward communication also increases. The same scale (current sources) also showed a significant positive correlation with the downward communication scale ($r = .21$, $p = .009$). This suggests that as the manager's perception of the current sources of
information increases, his perception of the downward communication will also increase. The scale measuring the communication effectiveness was positively correlated with the downward communication scale ($r = .15, p = .05$). As the managers' perception of the communication effectiveness increases, his perception of the level of downward communication also increases. Finally, the scale measuring the level of upward communication showed a significant positive correlation with the level of downward communication ($r = .65, p = .001$). As the manager's perception of upward communication increases, his perception of the downward communication will tend to increase as well.

Table B.2 also indicated that there are significant correlation between the dependent variables and three of the independent variable scales. The scales measuring the current and preferred sources of information showed no significant correlation with the independent scale. This result does not provide support for the posited hypothesis which predicted that all four aspects of the communication system should be positively related to the manager's reported decisional participation. The other three aspects of organizational communication yielded significant correlations with the dependent variable scale. Communication effectiveness, for instance, was negatively correlated with actual participation ($r = -.15, p = .05$). This means that as
the manager's perception of the communication effectiveness increases, his actual participation will accordingly decrease. This result does not seem to support the hypothesis. But when considering that the questions comprising the effectiveness scale measured the managers' need for communication, high effectiveness thus means low perceived need for communication. This could be interpreted as a positive relationship between a manager's need for communication and their decisional participation. A manager, for example, who had little need for communication tended not to participate in decisions. It may be that in this sample, these managers did not want to communicate, nor participate. This also implies that when a manager reported needs for communication they tended to participate more. Interpreted in this way, the effectiveness scale (communication needs) can be seen to support the hypothesis. The ambiguous nature of the scale, however, weakens any support it may offer.

The upward communication scale was positively correlated with actual participation ($r=.28, p=.001$). This supports the hypothesis that as the managers' perceive themselves to communicate upward, their participation tends to be higher. Finally, a downward communication was negatively correlated to the actual participation scale ($r=-.25, p=.002$). This suggests that as the managers'
perception of the level of downward communication increases, his participation tends to decrease. Although this result does not support the hypothesized relationship, it is not surprising because in a centralized conservative bureaucracy, employees in middle and lower managerial ranks tend to get stifled with "formal" communication in the form of rules and regulations, new decisions and tasks, and orders and commands flowing downward the organizational hierarchy. This situation does not allow for a consultative and participative organization.

In general, the correlations illustrated in Table B.2 between the scales measuring the dependent and independent variables provide mixed support for the hypothesis of the present study. The manager's perceived level of overall communication did not appear to be positively related to their reported decisional participation. Their perceived level of upward communication, however, was positively correlated to decisional participation. It appears then, that upward communication may present the only potential predictor of decisional participation.

Multiple Regression Results

The five communication scales (perceived level of upward and downward communication, perceived effectiveness of communication, current and preferred sources of
communication) and two demographic variables (age and education), were entered as independent variables in a multiple regression analysis (see Table B.3). Though the model provided a significant predictor of the managers' perceived level of decisional participation \( (p=.02) \), it explained only a small portion of the variance in the dependent variable \( (R^2=.124 \text{ and } \text{adjusted } R^2=.074) \). Upward communication appeared to be the only independent variable that approached significance in the prediction of decisional participation though its significance level is slightly out of range \( (p=.06) \). The regression model thus did not support the hypothesis that the five communication scales had a positive effect on managers' decisional participation.

The five communication scales and manager's age and education were entered as independent variables in a stepwise regression model. The resultant recommended independent variable was upward communication. This variable alone provided a significant predictor of decisional participation \( (p=.002) \) though it only explained a small portion of the variance in the dependent variable \( (R^2=.074, \text{ adjusted } R^2=.067) \). This confirmed the findings of the original regression analysis that only upward forms of communication were useful in predicting a manager's decisional
participation in this sample regardless of the decision type (see Table 2).

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients Between Upward Communication and Decision Types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Measuring</th>
<th>Reported Actual Participation in Both Types of Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Vo66)**</td>
<td>r = .224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo68)*</td>
<td>r = .150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo70)**</td>
<td>r = .155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo72)*</td>
<td>r = .200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo74)**</td>
<td>r = .201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo76)*</td>
<td>r = .053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo78)*</td>
<td>r = .170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo80)**</td>
<td>r = .194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo82)*</td>
<td>r = .219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vo84)*</td>
<td>r = .241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Operational Decisions  
**Strategic Decisions

All scales entered in the stepwise regression, and the other various statistical analyses, were averaged except for the scale measuring the current and preferred sources of information. The reason the items comprising this scale were not averaged was that, unlike the other scales that measured one construct, this particular scale measured different items. Each item represented a
different source of information. Thus an average would not accurately reflect all the items. However, in an effort to keep a consistent pattern of scale construction, another stepwise regression procedure was run with all scales averaged. The new analysis yielded results that were no different from the previous stepwise regression. The same variable was included in the model and had a similar impact on decisional participation.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study provided limited support for the hypothesis that managers' perception of the overall communication effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness will have a significant impact on their decisional participation. Correlation analysis revealed that downward communication was negatively correlated to decisional participation. This means that managers' perception of the level of downward communication in their organization was negatively related to their reported participation in decision-making activities. This suggests that the Saudi Arabian governmental organizations may be sending out large quantities of information via their organizational communication systems but the communication process usually occurs one-way only. Too much transfer of information does not necessarily assure that more understanding has occurred, only that the number of meetings and pounds of memos have increased. Since the availability of information is not as important as whether those who receive this information know how to utilize it, an increase in communication that is not based on understanding can result in information overload.
(O'Connell, 1979). Hence, the mutual sharing of information along with the freedom to ask questions, to voice opinions, to influence operations, or to simply disagree is what open communication is all about. This mutuality and receptivity of both parties involved regardless of their organizational levels is the determinant of a real and effective participation. Therefore, too much communication flowing from top to bottom does not necessarily reflect a high level of participation among organizational members. This would explain the negative correlation found between the two variables.

As for upward communication, results of the correlation analysis revealed that upward communication was positively correlated to managers' reported decisional participation. This finding was expected because in a rigid centralized and hierarchical bureaucracy such as that of the Saudi Arabian's, interactive relationships among members of different levels of the organization are influenced by both the status and role structure in the work situation. "Hierarchical structure manifests a greater differentiation in status and roles in general and furthermore tends to cut off communication?" (Kuty, 1979). Hence, managers' ability to communicate upwardly would furnish a common ground for easier understanding and expression of both opinions and feelings, and for a complete sharing of
useful ideas and essential information for various decisions. Upward communication, therefore, is unsurprisingly positively related to the managers' participation in decision-making activities.

The regression analysis does not fully support the hypothesis that the organizational communication systems (its direction, content, and sources) have a significant positive effect on decisional participation. It is concluded, however, that upward communication in particular may provide a useful predictor of decisional participation. This result was further confirmed by the stepwise regression analysis which suggested that upward communication alone provides a significant predictor of decisional participation.

The results of this study do not provide conclusive support for the hypothesis. Two sets of reasons may have created this lack of support. The first set of reasons is of a technical nature that is directly related to the holes and flaws in the overall design of this study. The second set is of a cultural nature that is directly concerned with the social characteristics peculiar to the Saudi Arabian culture that might have led to different findings contrary to those anticipated.

As for the technical reasons, one possible explanation of why some of the expected independent variables did
not have a significant impact on the dependent variables could be accounted for by the relatively small size of the sample. With only 130 subjects, this study was obviously operating at a less than optimal level. This small sample is seen as a major factor in the lack of statistical power to detect differences when differences exist (Balsley and Clover, 1979). A larger sample size of one to two thousand managers would have allowed for more variances and differences among subjects.

Another possible explanation is that there may have been errors in the translation of the questionnaire. Since the native tongue of the subjects under investigation is Arabic, the questionnaire was translated into the Arabic language. Due to this process, some aspects of the measured constructs must have been, at least, slightly altered creating a potential loss of meaning of certain expressions such as the grapevine, two-way street communication, and the formal and informal communication system. This problem of equivocality may have caused a lack of accuracy and clarity in the measurement process. This could have been a potential cause of the inadequate variances among the subjects' replies.

There is another potential problem with the questionnaire. The scale measuring the downward communication is worded such that the statements imply, to a certain
extent, a direct criticism of top management's communication style. Because these are Saudi Arabian organizations that are culturally influenced via "respect those above you in the hierarchy," employees usually hesitate to offer their frank opinions and voice their criticism. It must have been difficult, therefore, for the managers to disagree with statements such as: "Top management explains the overall goals of the organization," "My immediate supervisor gives clear instructions," and "Top management is helpful and accessible." This avoidance of criticizing those higher in rank may have caused the overall agreement that the formal downward communication system is effective and efficient (See Table B.4). The case might have been different if the statements were worded in a less critical tone which could have yielded a positive, rather than negative, correlation between downward communication and the degree of decisional participation.

In retrospect, the sampling process, as explained earlier, has largely contributed to another technical problem that might have caused the lack of support for the posited hypothesis. Given the cultural reasons peculiar to the Saudi Arabian tradition, the author, in an effort to abide by the dictated rules and regulations regarding the administration of the questionnaire, had to rely on a convenient sample method instead of a random sample. This
was, unfortunately, the only available alternative. Since the convenient sample provided only a quasi-representation of the target population, analysis of the results offer very little explanation of the phenomenon under study. Accordingly, the attempt to draw any generalization of the results could be, to a certain degree, a false application of the general findings of this study.

Further, it has been noted by many social scientists that difficulties arise when drawing conclusions about causal relationships from survey research (Balsley and Clover, 1979). For the previously explained cultural reasons which completely prohibit the association between the sexes in a workplace, the researcher (being a female) was not allowed to conduct any sort of field observation and/or interviews with the subjects. As a result, this study had to rely heavily on a survey questionnaire as the only available medium to collect the needed data. It is hence believed that even though this research tool did provide the needed data, it is still questionable whether or not these data reflect the real situation under which causal relationships among variable can be drawn. Consequently, generalization of the results must be done with some reservations.

When subjected to internal validity and reliability tests, the scales within the questionnaire yielded
relatively positive results. The construct validity of the variables is, however, in question. It is not certain whether the scales are really measuring what they were intended to measure. Because the literature clearly lacks similar previous qualitative (as well as quantitative) research in the area of organizational communication and decisional participation in Saudi Arabia, it is hard to ascertain whether the scales were really measuring the constructs as the Saudi Arabian managers perceived it to be. In other words, since there is a huge lack of qualitative research to provide a clearer understanding of what the Saudi Arabian managers really mean by participation and organizational communication, the issue of construct validity remains unsolved.

This perceptual issue leads to the second set of reasons (the cultural differences) which may explain the lack of support of the posited hypothesis in light of the Saudi Arabian cultural and social characteristics. More specifically, the second set of reasons will bridge the gap created by the absence of qualitative research and offer an explanation that is based on the cultural characteristics of Saudi Arabia.

As known, it was hypothesized that the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the organizational communication system in Saudi Arabian governmental agencies will
have a positive effect on their middle and lower level managers' degree of participation in the decision-making process. The results of the study, however, did not conclusively support the posited hypothesis. Aspects of organizational communication which were employed to measure its effectiveness (i.e., upward communication, downward communication, and sources of information) did not (except for upward communication) have any significant relationship with the managers' reported participation.

Two different sets of cultural explanations could be offered here. First, the sample may have come from organizations whose structure and managerial practice reflect the Saudi Arabian authoritative and hierarchical social structure. Second, the sample may have come from organizations whose structure fits the social structure but the practice does not because they have been challenged by a number of interdependent developments (i.e., economic, political, and social).

If the sample came from the traditional organizations (structure and practice), one explanation as to why the managers' perception of the organizational communication system were not more strongly related to this decisional participation in that this type of organization may be sending out a large quantity of information that has no substantial value. The regular meetings and the numerous
memos, for example, may not reflect an effective communication system nor cause more participation if they provide irrelevant and unimportant information. Another explanation could be the lack of skills among Saudi managers to utilize important information into effective decisions.

The young adult in Saudi Arabia accepts the fact that life in the work environment is overcontrolled and that he will be kept in a constant state of accountability. His home, life, and formal education have prepared him to accept not only external direction, but also external discipline. He is therefore accustomed to receiving detailed orders and unaccustomed to having his opinions sought. Hence, even if provided with the information that demands his long atrophied skills, the Saudi manager will most likely get confused and perplexed as to how he can utilize that information. The increase of communication in this case can only result in an information overload, but not necessarily an increase in participation.

The third cultural explanation suggests that even if they are receiving relevant and useful information, and they are equipped and skilled enough to utilize this information for effective decisions, the Saudi Arabian managers may lack the desire to participate in decision-making processes. The conservative life-style based on the teachings of the Islamic doctrine, results in a well-defined set of
rules and regulations that govern the general conduct of all members (Mikdashi, 1984). This restricted social standard leaves no room for mistakes or misconducts. Making the wrong decision or failing to make the right choice may call for harsh punishments and ultimately result in a loss of face. Therefore, even if provided with both the information and the skills, the Saudi Arabian managers are usually afraid to participate since they may make a mistake that brings them criticism and embarrassment. An increased level of communication in this case will obviously have no effect on the decisional participation level.

Vroom (1960) offered a personality-based explanation of the individual's lack of desire to participate in decision-making. This provides another reason for the Saudi Arabian managers' lack of desire to participate in decision-making. The fact that the Saudi Arabian managers are products of their authoritarian culture may have caused them to develop authoritarian personalities. According to Vroom (1960) "authoritarian personalities prefer status-laden leadership, accept strongly directive leadership, and regard the authoritarian leader as more effective than his democratic counterpart." The democratic atmosphere would, hence, be frustrating to the manager with an authoritarian personality. Saudi Arabian managers, therefore, may lack the desire to participate in decision-making when it seems
that they are well equipped for it, and are provided with the relative information, because they prefer to work only as directed, and to refer all uncertainties upward for decisions.

Finally, a discussion of the meaning of participation in the Saudi Arabian culture will offer the fourth explanation as to why the findings of this study did not support the posited hypothesis.

Given a situation where the manager in Saudi Arabia has all the information, skills, and desire needed to participate in decision-making, when and how does he exactly perceive himself to participate?

Due to the highly conservative life-style that guides the general conduct of all members, people in Saudi Arabia had learned to be guarded in expressing their views openly. At the organizational level, supervisors are usually reluctant to express themselves openly, and often hesitate to share information or to coordinate efforts with each other. Managers, for the most part, are not accustomed to working things out together, or to speaking about issues they do not understand. There is not much sense of responsibility for exchanging opinions, ideas, information, and thoughts regarding important decisions. Therefore, it may be that the Saudi managers' idea of participating in a decision is to be solely in control of the decision.
Consulting with others means revealing serious ideas, information, thoughts, and feelings which may jeopardize his position and/or integrity. Hence, participation in the Saudi Arabian sense of the word, may mean that a manager at the top delegates full responsibility and authority to a manager at a lower rank in the organization. The delegate is then in charge of studying a situation, and making the needed decision. Not until he is participating "in" management as opposed to participating "with" management does the Saudi manager perceive himself to be involved in the decision-making process. Asking his opinion, consulting with him on a certain matter, and soliciting his information regarding a certain decision just may not be sufficient enough to be called active participation.

Another reason for their desire to work alone could be because only a handful of people have the power to make decisions. Saudi managers in middle and lower levels of the organization often lack that power and long badly for it. Therefore, having full control over a decision means gaining and enjoying the power always desired but never granted. Unless the manager is in full control of the situation to make a decision alone, he may not perceive himself to be actively involved in the decision-making process regardless of the level of communication.
The second set of cultural explanations for the lack of statistical support of the hypothesis concerns the case in which the sample of the study came from organizations whose structure mirrors that of society but whose practice does not. Those types of organizations have been challenged by a set of conditions that began to develop in Saudi Arabia in 1973. The public bureaucracy in Saudi Arabia has been facing a change in management practices because of the rapidly shifting economic, political, and social scenes. They have been forced to comply with new laws and unfamiliar demands due to the massive and ambitious development plan. The social, political, and economic systems are affected by increasing technology and information, higher cost of living, and new needs, demand, and expectations. As a result, changes have worked their way through the system gradually modifying structural arrangements, and transforming organizational practices and power relationships.

The most notable development which has contributed to the evolution of the new nonauthoritarian managerial attitude in large-scale government organizations has undoubtedly been the growth of an educated managerial class. In the past, the economic disparities and unequal balance of power between the managers and the managed caused unrest, but these feelings were not expressed. The modern minded,
well-educated Saudi youth now entering the administrative world are different from their counterparts 30 years ago. The long accepted authoritarian practices are now being somehow challenged wherever it is believed that human resources can be utilized more effectively. As the country's youth look ahead to adult life, they will demand jobs where they will be more than a number on a punched card. They will want what is labeled in their classrooms as "self-actualization," a demand that is now echoed throughout the Saudi Arabian society. Even though the traditional hierarchical pyramid is still alive, the traditional managerial practice is gradually disappearing. The current system of authority in the workplace is a combination of themes from the previous perspectives and some of the modern ones. If the sample of this study consisted of a combination of organizations with traditional as well as modern practice, variations in subjects' responses will prohibit the expected findings because of the mixed systems. Managers from organizations that promote less authoritarian styles of management will provide responses contrary to those expected. This would have contributed to the lack of support for the hypothesis.
Implication for Future Research

The findings of this study have suggested that the current Saudi Arabian governmental agencies could be a combination of the traditional authoritative organizations, and some of the modern nonauthoritative ones. It would be beneficial to replicate the study by distinguishing the traditional and then examine the effects of their organizational communication systems on their managers' decisional participation.

It would also be beneficial to replicate the study on managers in the private sector in Saudi Arabia to see if the rigid bureaucracy differs between the two sectors. A comparative study between the two sectors to study the effects of the communication system on managers' decisions participation may provide useful information.

A cross-cultural comparison between the communication system in the Saudi Arabian bureaucratic system with other Western countries could yield interesting results regarding the cultural effects on the organizational communication systems in different bureaucracies with diverse societies.

Further research among different Saudi firms, and between the organizations of different countries might help us to better understand the relationship between
communication and participation and specifically the seemingly important role that upward communication may play.
APPENDIX A

On the following pages, a three-part questionnaire will list several statements regarding your attitude toward the characteristics of your formal organizational communication system.

For each statement, you will be asked to give a rating on a five-point scale which will look like this:

1  2  3  4  5

You are to circle the number on the scale that best represents your opinion of the statement being rated. Each number on the scale refers to how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

Please read carefully the instructions preceeding each part, and answer all items.

Thank you
PART ONE

The following questions concern some general personal information - please check "one" only.

Vo01. AGE: In what age category do you fit? (Check one only)

18-25  26-35  36-45  46-55  over 55

Vo02. EDUCATION: In what education level do you fit?

Less than High School  High School Diploma
Some College Work  College Degree
Graduate Work

Vo03. SENIORITY: How long have you been working with this organization?

Less than 1 year  1-5 years  6-10 years
11-15 years  More than 15 years

Vo04. PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE: In how many organizations have you been employed before?

None  One  Two  Three  4 or more

Vo05. HIERARCHICAL POSITION: At what administrative level is your present position?

Middle level manager (Head of a department)
Supervisor (Head of a division)
Other (Please specify)
Vo06. How long have you been in this present position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vo07. Does your organization have a written organizational chart?

YES  NO

Vo08. Have you ever seen the formal organizational chart for your organization?

YES  NO
PART TWO

Section One: The following statements concern your perception of the effectiveness of the formal communication system inside your organization. Please read each statement carefully, and circle the number that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downward Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo09 This organization keeps employees well informed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo10 I have been given the information I need to do my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo11 Compared to other organizations, this organization has good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo12 Communication here is candid and accurate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo13 Official communication in this organization does not tell the full</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo14 Top management explains the overall goals of the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vo15
Top management is helpful and accessible
1 2 3 4 5

Vo16
Job descriptions are very clear
1 2 3 4 5

Vo17
My immediate supervisor keeps me well informed
1 2 3 4 5

Vo18
My immediate supervisor discusses my job performance once a year
1 2 3 4 5

Vo19
My immediate supervisor has never misinformed me
1 2 3 4 5

Vo20
My immediate supervisor gives clear instructions
1 2 3 4 5

Vo21
The written communications in my office help me in my work
1 2 3 4 5

Vo22
The written communications I receive are good sources of organization news
1 2 3 4 5

Vo23/Vo24
The written communications sent to me by my immediate supervisor are:
up-to-date ---
1 2 3 4 5
and believable
1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upward Communication</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo25 Communication in this organization is a two-way</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo26 Management here acts on employees ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo27 My immediate supervisor welcomes criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo28 This organization encourages differences of opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo29 My immediate supervisor listens to me when I make</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a suggestion regarding handling problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo30 My immediate supervisor gives me some of his time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss all kinds of problems and complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo31 I am able to influence operations in my department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo32 I always need to make an appointment when I want</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to see my immediate supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO

Section Two: The following statements concern your perception of some topics that may need more communication in your organization. Please read each topic carefully and circle the number that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There needs to be more communication of

Vo33
Organizational plans for the future

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo34
Job related "How-To" information

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo35
How profits are used

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo36
Operations outside my department or division

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo37
Personnel changes and promotions

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo38
How well I am doing in my job

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo39
Organizational policies

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Vo40
The procedures that are used to judge and evaluate my performance

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vo41 | Problems faced by the management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vo42 | How organization decisions are made and the results of their implementations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vo43 | Promotion and advancement opportunities available in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vo44 | Important developments in my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vo45 | How external events affect my job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
PART TWO

Section Three: The following statements concern first your perception of the sources of information from which you currently receive information in your organization, and secondly the sources from which you would prefer to receive your information. Please read the statements carefully and circle the number that best represents your opinion.

I currently receive the information I need to do my job from the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo46 My immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo47 Top management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo48 Department meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo49 The &quot;grapevine&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo50 Subordinates in my own department or division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo51 Formal management presentations or mass meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo52 Peers in other divisions and departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo53 Annual business reports to employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo54 Organization records, archives and official documents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo55 Organization computer (if available)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to receive the information I need to do my job from the following sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo56 My immediate supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo57 Top management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo58 Department meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo60 The &quot;grapevine&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo61 Subordinates in my own department or division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo62 Peers in other divisions and departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo63</td>
<td>Annual business reports to employees</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vo64</th>
<th>Organization records, archives and official documents</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vo65</th>
<th>Organizational computer (if available)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART THREE

The following statements concern the degree of your participation in the decision making process in your organization. Each statement is a decision type followed by two responses: (a) relates to your actual degree of participation now, and (b) refers to the degree of participation you would like to have. Please read each statement carefully and circle the number that best represents your opinion on both (a) and (b).

Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Agree

Types of Decisions

Adoption of policies, programs and goals for the organization.
Vo66
(a) I participate in this type of decision now 1 2 3 4 5
Vo67
(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision 1 2 3 4 5

Establishing disciplinary rules
Vo68
(a) I participate in this type of decision now 1 2 3 4 5
Vo69
(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing joint or cooperative programs with other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving client's complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The determination of any needed changes of future expansions and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting specific instructions and criterion for employees performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation and appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo77</td>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of new instructions, methods, and techniques for job performance in my department or division</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo78</td>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo79</td>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of budgets and resources allocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo80</td>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo81</td>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting training programs for subordinates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo82</td>
<td>(a) I participate in this type of decision now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo83</td>
<td>(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel matters (i.e., hiring, firing, promotions, and transfers)

**Vo84**
(a) I participate in this type of decision now

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Vo85**
(b) I would like to participate in this type of decision

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
### Table B.1. Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix (After Rotation with Kaiser Normalization). For Both Dependent and Independent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo09</td>
<td>.16970</td>
<td>Vo33</td>
<td>.50761</td>
<td>Vo56</td>
<td>.50424</td>
<td>Vo46</td>
<td>.61317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo10</td>
<td>.23162</td>
<td>Vo34</td>
<td>.57252</td>
<td>Vo57</td>
<td>.63757</td>
<td>Vo47</td>
<td>.50106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo11</td>
<td>.50489</td>
<td>Vo35</td>
<td>.57710</td>
<td>Vo58</td>
<td>.62084</td>
<td>Vo48</td>
<td>.75922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo12</td>
<td>.34273</td>
<td>Vo36</td>
<td>.54341</td>
<td>Vo59</td>
<td>-.01982</td>
<td>Vo49</td>
<td>.18331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo13</td>
<td>.17773</td>
<td>Vo37</td>
<td>.62365</td>
<td>Vo60</td>
<td>.62564</td>
<td>Vo50</td>
<td>.30869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo14</td>
<td>.52682</td>
<td>Vo38</td>
<td>.66129</td>
<td>Vo61</td>
<td>.73080</td>
<td>Vo51</td>
<td>.65529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo15</td>
<td>.56215</td>
<td>Vo39</td>
<td>.65845</td>
<td>Vo62</td>
<td>.44505</td>
<td>Vo52</td>
<td>.46366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo16</td>
<td>.32435</td>
<td>Vo40</td>
<td>.66148</td>
<td>Vo63</td>
<td>.65632</td>
<td>Vo53</td>
<td>.31009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo17</td>
<td>.76650</td>
<td>Vo41</td>
<td>.66638</td>
<td>Vo64</td>
<td>.60625</td>
<td>Vo54</td>
<td>.28603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo18</td>
<td>.44435</td>
<td>Vo42</td>
<td>.69299</td>
<td>Vo65</td>
<td>.51762</td>
<td>Vo55</td>
<td>.31778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo19</td>
<td>.42748</td>
<td>Vo43</td>
<td>.62474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo20</td>
<td>.70378</td>
<td>Vo44</td>
<td>.62073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo21</td>
<td>.67173</td>
<td>Vo45</td>
<td>.51515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo22</td>
<td>.57248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo23</td>
<td>.64576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo24</td>
<td>.58419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo25</td>
<td>-.30603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo26</td>
<td>-.53143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo27</td>
<td>-.73455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo28</td>
<td>-.57976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo29</td>
<td>-.69336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo30</td>
<td>-.71307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo31</td>
<td>-.42532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo32</td>
<td>-.44441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo66</td>
<td>.67038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo68</td>
<td>.56478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo70</td>
<td>.68308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo72</td>
<td>.60613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo74</td>
<td>.74702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo76</td>
<td>.75158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo78</td>
<td>.64691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo80</td>
<td>.64691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo82</td>
<td>.70336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo84</td>
<td>.67114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

186
Table B.2. Pearson Correlations for Scales Measuring Independent and Dependent Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Sources</td>
<td>-.1303</td>
<td>.1655</td>
<td>.3115</td>
<td>.2061</td>
<td>-.0904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.030**</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.009*</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.0340</td>
<td>-.0674</td>
<td>-.1461</td>
<td>-.1484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.049**</td>
<td>.046**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Communication</td>
<td>.0381</td>
<td>.6480</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Sources</td>
<td>.0917</td>
<td>-.1100</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .01 Level of Significance
**P < .05 Level of Significance
Table B.3. Multiple Regression, Communication and Selected Demographic Variables as Predictors of Decisional Participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downward Communication</td>
<td>-1.65169</td>
<td>.3777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Communication</td>
<td>3.26748</td>
<td>.0628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Effectiveness</td>
<td>-1.89241</td>
<td>.1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Communication Sources</td>
<td>-.02787</td>
<td>.8473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Communication Sources</td>
<td>-.13499</td>
<td>.3563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26745</td>
<td>.7920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.96312</td>
<td>.2319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .12487$  \hspace{1cm} Adjusted $R^2 = .07466$  \hspace{1cm} $p = .0202$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo01 Age</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo02 Education</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo03 Seniority</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo04 Experience</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo05 Position</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo06 Time spent of job</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo07 Written organizational chart</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo08 Have seen chart</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo09 This organization keeps employees well informed</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo10 I have been given the information I need to do my job</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo11 This organization has a good communication system</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo12 Communication here is candid and accurate</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo13 Official communication here does not tell the whole story</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo14 Top management explains the overall organizational goals</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo15 Top management is helpful and accessible</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo16 Job descriptions are very clear</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo17 My immediate supervisor keeps me well informed</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo18 My immediate supervisor discusses my job performance once a year</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo19 My immediate supervisor has never misinformed me</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo20 My immediate supervisor gives me clear instructions</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo21 The written communication I receive helps me in my work</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo22 The written communication is a good source of organization news</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo23 The written communication is up-to-date</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo24 The written communication is believable</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo25 Communication here is a two-way street</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo26 Management here acts on employee's ideas</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo27 My immediate supervisor welcomes criticism</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo28 The organization encourages differences of opinions between managers</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo29 My immediate supervisor listens to my suggestions</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo30 My immediate supervisor gives me some of his time to discuss all kinds of problems and complaints</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo31 I am able to influence operation in my department</td>
<td>1.738</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo32 I always need to make an appointment when I need to see my immediate supervisor</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo33 Plans for future</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo34 &quot;How-to&quot; information</td>
<td>1.677</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo35 Profits use</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo36 Outside operations</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo37 Personnel changes and promotions</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo38 My job performance</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo39 Organizational policies</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo40 Job evaluation procedures</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo41 Top management problems</td>
<td>1.938</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo42 How and what decision-making and results</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo43 Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>2.169</td>
<td>1.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo44 Organizational developments</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo45 The effect of external events</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo46 Supervisor as current source of information</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo47 Top management as current source of information</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo48 Department meetings as current source of information</td>
<td>2.338</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo49 Grapevine as current source of information</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo50 Interdepartmental subordinates as current source of information</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo51 Mass meetings as current source of information</td>
<td>2.354</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo52 Extradepartmental peers as current source of information</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo53 Business reports as current source of information</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo54 Organizational records and documents as current source of information</td>
<td>2.108</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo55 Organizational computer as current source of information</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo56 Supervisor as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.4. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo57 Top management as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo58 Departmental meetings as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo59 Grapevines as preferred source of information</td>
<td>4.377</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo60 Interdepartmental subordinates as preferred source of information</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo61 Mass meetings as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.908</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo62 Extradepartmental peers as preferred source of information</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>1.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo63 Business reports as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo64 Organizational records and documents as preferred source of information</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo65 Organizational computers as preferred source of information</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo66 Strategic decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>1.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo67 Strategic decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.169</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo68 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo69 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>3.515</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo70 Strategic decision (actual)</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo71 Strategic decision (preferred)</td>
<td>3.946</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo72 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>1.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo73 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo74 Strategic decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo75 Strategic decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo76 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>1.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo77 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo78 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo79 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.369</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo80 Strategic decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo81 Strategic decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo82 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>1.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo83 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo84 Operational decision (actual)</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>1.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo85 Operational decision (preferred)</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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