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Communication, in one form or another, occupies most of a manager's time and possibly that of other workers (Burns, 1954; Kelly, 1964; Klemmer & Snyder, 1972). At one time or another almost any manager can be heard discussing problems in supervision, decision-making, coordination, or morale, which he attributes to "poor" communication. If communication does cause organizational dysfunctions, it is worth examining in some detailed, systematic fashion. If "improved" communication does have beneficial effects on individual attitudes and organizational performance, it should be measured. However, this cannot be done nor can communication be related to other organizational variables until its various facets are identified.

Organizational communication is what Dubin (1969) would refer to as a summary variable including a variety of phenomena involved in information transmission, attribution of meaning to that information, and consequent response. Research efforts concerned with organizational communication are at a stage of development in which mapping the communication domain is a prerequisite to relating its dimensions.
to other organizational variables (Guetzkow, 1965; Porter & Roberts, in press; Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton & Porter, 1973; Thayer, 1967). Here we discuss some of the problems involved in and past efforts concerned with assessing organizational communication, and provide one further approach to measurement.

**Measurement Problems**

At least two major difficulties exist for the organizational researcher interested in communication. One concerns the kinds of other organizational variables which should be related empirically to communication to extend our knowledge in this area. This problem is discussed elsewhere (Farace & Russell, 1972; Porter & Roberts, in press; Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton & Porter, 1973). A preliminary and more fundamental problem, discussed here, concerns the dimensions of communication organizational researchers might measure and how this might be done.

First, there is little consensus among writers about what the relevant dimensions of organizational communication are. Perhaps this is because researchers who have been generally interested in communication come from many disciplines and thus have dissimilar views of the communication domain. One result of this is that different communication
dimensions are rarely considered as they relate to one another. Obviously, the most important dimensions of organizational communication are probably not conceptually or operationally orthogonal. For example, it is difficult to discuss the accuracy of information flow in organizations without simultaneously considering the degree to which it is distorted. Within any domain one would not expect the components to be independent of one another when the real world is probably a cobweb of relationships among variables.

Second, there are problems involving methods of measurement which are feasible in real life organizations, particularly when one is attempting to measure a process rather than a static concept. Behavioral observations are often impossible to make at all, much less over time. Self-report forms suffer from response bias and frequently are phrased in such a manner that they take snapshots of process variables. It may be possible, however, to develop an instrument which allows respondents to summarize behavior over time hoping that many of the response errors will wash out by aggregating individual summaries.

With these two problems in mind what are the requirements for a useful initial measure of organizational communication? It should be capable of use over a wide variety of organizations and jobs. It should be short, easily administered, and easily scored. It should generate scores indicative of a number of dimensions of organizational
communication, and should be relatable to other aspects of work. The measure should be relatively free of bias, reliable in terms of internal consistency and stability over time, and valid.

Measurement of Communication Facets in Previous Organizational Research

Before looking at empirical investigations of organizational communication one might consider approaches used in related areas. The methodologies of studies concerned with rumor transmission, innovation diffusion, and dissemination of political information are sometimes applicable to organizational communication research, and are well reviewed elsewhere (Back, Festinger, Hymovitch, Kelley, Schachter, & Thibaut, 1950; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971; Sears, 1969). The massive findings from the laboratory network investigations are also well summarized elsewhere (Collins & Raven, 1969; Shaw, 1964).

The early investigations of organizational communication concentrated on network aspects of information flow and were conducted in the laboratory. As such they added a didactic and not an empirical understanding of real life organizational communication. More recently relevant investigations in this area are field rather than laboratory studies. Porter and Roberts (in press) review these investigations commenting that "some six different
methods for gathering data have been utilized. . . . Rather surprisingly -- given their widespread use in many other areas of industrial/organizational psychology -- typical attitude questionnaires have been the primary technique for data collection in only three of the investigations. More widely used have been interviews . . . and self recording forms . . . (p. )."

Figure 1 is a selective compilation of the kinds of laboratory and field methodologies which exist, the communication variables investigated, and other aspects of behavior related to them. There is an attempt to standardize the disparate vocabularies of the researchers represented. Hence, Figure 1 is an oversimplification of the dimensions of communication actually researched relevant to organizations, and fails to illustrate the diverse labels often attached by researchers to seemingly similar variables.

In light of our previous discussion two questions are important:

1 - What kinds of communication facets have been or should be investigated?

and

2 - What efforts have been made to develop useful instruments for investigation.
**Communication facets.** Overwhelmingly, and not surprisingly, most research attention has been given to network aspects of organizational communication. Many studies are concerned with who initiates a message and where it goes. There is more emphasis on hierarchical than on other aspects of directionality. The line-staff functions of senders and receivers and the existence of isolates, liaisons, and bridges, also have been the subject of research attention. Undoubtedly, the explication of organizational communication rests heavily on describing operating networks in organizations.

Purposes of communication, its content, and the modalities used for information transmission are also popular in investigations of organizational communication. Some attention has been devoted to information accuracy and distortion, importance of information transmitted, and transmission volume and speed. The other communication variables in Figure 1 have received less empirical attention.

How might we extend the notions mentioned in Figure 1 in developing useful ways to measure organizational communication? One possibility is to look more closely at those communication aspects not yet very carefully differentiated from one another. For some years there has been considerable discussion of the phenomenon of gatekeeping (Allen & Cohen, 1969; Breed, 1955; Lewin, 1966). With the exception of two field studies (Allen & Cohen, 1969; Breed, 1955), one of which does not provide empirical data,
gatekeeping has not been looked at in organizational life. For example, the concept has not been refined and empirically differentiated from facets of communication such as summarization, or the propensity to withhold or distort information, although researchers have thought some about all of these dimensions.

Another possibility is that there are components of communication which have not yet received any research attention in organizations, and which should be considered in any initial measurement which attempts to tap for descriptive purposes a large proportion of the domain. Some investigations cited in Figure 1 deal directly with communication frequency and many more allude to it. These discussions suggest that considerably more attention should be given to a closely related aspect of communication, general interaction level (perhaps an aggregate of communication activities in all directions), and to its cousin, the desire to interact with other people on the job. People's perceptions about the degree to which they interact with or wish to interact with others are probably related to their perceptions of the degree to which they feel overloaded with information. Finally, the industrial psychologists' concern with job satisfaction suggests a related concern with satisfaction with communication at work, and the degree to which it is related to other aspects of communication.
Useful instrumentation. The sad state of affairs is that none of the reported investigations discuss efforts to develop reliable and valid instrumentation for measuring organizational communication facets. A necessary prerequisite to instrument development is the ability to use the same form in different situations. Since only Jacobsen and Seashore (1951), and Lawler, Porter, and Tenenbaum (1968) provide their actual instruments, only their studies are easily replicable. It would be helpful to have better information about these instruments than is provided. For example, the intercorrelations of the communication facets measured in the Lawler, Porter and Tenenbaum study might tell us a great deal. Perhaps "giving information" and "giving instructions" are highly intercorrelated, implying that the measurement of one is the measurement of the other.

If communication is a time dependent process, investigations should measure the same characteristics over time. As indicated previously, if this cannot be done it might be possible to develop a set of questions which ask respondents to make their own summarizations over time. Burns (1954), Kelly (1964), Sutton and Porter (1968), and Wickesberg (1968) are the only researchers represented in Figure 1 who apply some methodology which considers time. Three of these studies use behavioral recording forms over time and the fourth uses a relatively unstructured diary.
General Methodology

Based on a review of past research efforts and our own extensions, an item pool of 189 Likert-type items was created to assess respondent perceptions of the following aspects of organizational communication: desire for interaction with others, directionality and volume of contact (upward, downward and lateral), estimated accuracy of information received, summarization of information, propensity to withhold information (labelled here, gatekeeping), modalities used for communication, information overload, and satisfaction with communication in general. Communication purpose, content, importance and speed (all represented in Figure 1) were considered in initial instrument development, but later discarded because of the difficulty respondents had in answering questions about them.

In addition to these questions about communication, items were borrowed from Likert (1967) and Read (1962) to assess three non-communication variables considered relevant. These three variables, respondent's trust in superior, perceived influence of the superior, and respondent's mobility aspirations, have been found by a number of researchers (Cohen, 1958; Friedlander, 1970; Hurwitz, Zander, & Hymovitch, 1960; Jones, Gergen, & Jones, 1963; Loomis, 1959; Mellinger, 1956; O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973; Read, 1962; Zand, 1972) to considerably affect communication in organizations. Unfortunately, only Read (1962) reports the
intercorrelations of items supposedly measuring two of these dimensions (trust .39 to .68; influence -.07 to .62).

The 189 items in the pool were administered to 70 graduate students, all of whom had prior work experience. These students were asked to respond to the questions based on their experiences in some past or current job. Intercorrelations of the items were then used to reduce the item set. Items were retained which had high intercorrelations with other items ostensibly measuring the same facets and low intercorrelations with the rest of the item pool. A 60 item questionnaire resulted.

The 60 item version of the questionnaire (51 communication and 9 non-communication items) was administered to 86 mental health workers, at all job levels, on five health care delivery teams working in a large medical center. Their responses were subjected to a cluster analysis to further reduce the number of questionnaire items. The technique used, developed by Tryon and Bailey (1970), does not seek orthogonal item groups. It does select as definers of dimensions items most nearly independent of the definers of other dimensions. Clusters were retained for further consideration if communality estimates did not exceed 1.00, if they were not composed of doublets, and if they made conceptual as well as empirical sense. Two single communication items were included (one measuring overload and the other general satisfaction with communication) only after it was determined that these questions behaved appropriately
with regard to the rest. The question concerned with satisfaction is a modification of the GM Faces scale (Kunin, 1955). When this question was related to the clusters it showed relationships to each cluster without loading heavily on any one, suggesting that satisfaction with communication in an organization is perceived to be partly related to interaction, partly to accuracy, partly to directionality of information flow, etc.

One cluster analysis of the 60 item version of the instrument also included non-communication items. Trust, influence, and mobility items defined separate clusters and were then looked at independently. Conceptually trust, influence and mobility, should be more independent of one another than are the communication items. Consequently these nine non-communication items were subjected to a factor analysis using a varimax rotation. Three separate factors emerged. These items were included in a test battery completed by 95 officers and enlisted men in a U.S. military unit. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

Based on these analyses the total instrument was reduced to 35 items (see Appendix 1). The 35 items were then scored to yield the dimensions discussed above. As previously mentioned, overload and satisfaction are one
item measures. Similarly, questions concerned with modality use are reported as individual items since it makes little sense to combine them. A description of the communication and non-communication dimensions is in Figure 2. The questions from the instrument (Appendix 1) contributing to each index are also indicated.

Figure 2 about here

In addition to the mental health workers, the 35 item version of the questionnaire was administered to the military sample referenced above, 54 emergency room and out-patient clinic hospital personnel, 52 business managers from various firms, and 179 respondents at various job levels in six United Kingdom locations of a large financial institution. Cluster analyses for the military and mental health samples showed no appreciable differences. Means, standard deviations and Cronbach alphas (a measure of the internal consistency of the dimension) are reported in Table 2 for the communication and non-communication dimensions for all five samples. Note that within the set of three samples using 5-point Likert-type items, the alphas are relatively consistent. Differences in the means suggest that it is possible to discriminate among organizations.
To provide test-retest reliability information, the 35 item version of the instrument was administered twice to 24 graduate business students (all with previous job experience), and a second time to 42 of the original 52 managers. The two administrations were three weeks apart in both cases. The test-retest reliabilities for the ten indices and six individual items (modality use, overload, and satisfaction with communication in general) are reported in Table 3. Nine of the ten indices have reasonable test-retest reliabilities.

In the interest of greater differentiation of communication problems, practitioners might find it more beneficial to use the items rather than communication indices. Test-retest reliabilities are available for the items. Obviously, they are not quite as high as for the indices.

Validity

Figure 2 suggests that adequate criterion variables might be devised for comparison with each of the
communication facets. For example, assessments of objective accuracy from an information theoretic standpoint might be compared to estimated accuracy. Sociometric measures of influence might be made and compared to perceived influence, etc. However, these and other criterion measures require separate reliability and validity assessments before they can be used to validate the communication dimensions described in Figure 2. Moreover, subjective respondent perceptions may be more important than objective measures of the kinds of facets in Figure 2. For example, a respondent's information processing behavior may be more dependent on his perception of the accuracy of messages he receives than on an objective measure of accuracy. These two reasons, difficulty in obtaining objective criterion measures and their potential irrelevance once obtained, warrant consideration of more indirect validity assessments; construct, face, and a very limited attempt at convergent-discriminant validity.

First, results of the cluster analyses show that inter-item correlations among items within any index in the instrument are higher than are the correlations among items forming different indices. This provides some evidence for the construct validity of the ten dimensions and increases confidence that even similar appearing facets such as trust and influence, or interaction and desire for interaction, can be successfully differentiated from each other.
Second, individual questionnaire items appear to have face validity. For example, asking a respondent to differentiate his communication behavior with respect to superiors, subordinates, and peers, is a reasonable task. Questions concerned with use of various modalities are differentiable in a respondent's mind from those concerned with perceived accuracy of received information or satisfaction with communication. On the other hand, during the item development respondents stated that in their own minds they could not clearly differentiate among some other aspects of communication (for example, task and social information). Additional aspects of communication, such as the speed with which messages are sent, were also not sufficiently definable to be measured by a questionnaire.

Finally, in the spirit of convergent-discriminant validity, intercorrelations of nine communication and three non-communication dimensions with other similar and dissimilar measures are presented in Table 4 for the military sample. The other measures include assessments of overall job satisfaction (Kunin, 1955), supervisor's considerate leadership style (Stogdill & Coons, 1957), organizational competence and flexibility (Campbell, 1971), organizational commitment (Porter & Smith, 1970), and respondent's age and tenure.

Table 4 about here
Examination of Table 4 reveals some of the expected convergence and discrimination. Education and tenure may be surrogates for rank in military units. Thus, it was hypothesized that only communication facets which change as a result of rank would be related to education and tenure. Of the eighteen correlation coefficients involving education and tenure three are significant. Education is correlated with desire for interaction; men in similar ranks may want to interact with one another. Job tenure is positively related to amount of information passed downward and negatively related to lateral information transmission. Higher ranked individuals are more likely to have more subordinates; hence, pass more job related information downward. Similarly, higher ranking members are apt to have fewer opportunities for lateral information transmission. Perceived influence of the superior (a non-communication variable) is also significantly correlated with tenure: if high tenure respondents are of higher rank than low tenure respondents they are likely to have even higher rank, influence supervisors.

Other relationships are also of the type expected. Trust in superior, for example, is related to the respondent’s overall job satisfaction, perceived considerate leadership style, perceived organizational competence and flexibility, and commitment to the organization, but not to tenure and education. The amount of information an individual passes is significantly related to his overall job satisfaction and to his perception of his superior as being considerate, but not to other variables. Desire for interaction also shows appropriate
relationships with responses to other perceptions about the organization. The negative relationship between information overload and overall job satisfaction, and the positive correlation between communication satisfaction and considerate leadership are also understandable. Finally, the large number of significant relationships among overall job satisfaction and communication and non-communication indices seem logical. The negative relationship (upward directionality of information flow and satisfaction) may mean that in military units it is likely that information transmitted upward could have negative effects for the sender and that downward information transmission is most often in the form of orders or directives which are relatively safe to send. In sum, while the results presented here are in no way definitive, they do provide a crude, first approximation of convergent-discriminant validity and increase confidence in the indices.

Further examples of convergence and discrimination are obtainable by comparing perceptions about communication by people in jobs dependent upon information transmission (such as dispatchers and operations officers in the military unit) with those of people occupying jobs not as sensitive to information transmission (such as mechanics, etc.). The results of these comparisons are not reported here, but suggest that communication facets measured by the questionnaire can, in general, discriminate perceptions about communications for occupants of jobs dependent on information from those not so dependent. The former are more discriminating among the communication dimensions (they think more frequently about them).

Conclusions

Obviously much work is left to be done in developing
a measure which can describe various facets of organizational communication. The data reported here should be viewed as an initial attempt in this direction.

A research effort is being made to extend the facets within the instrument, both in terms of the number of items measuring each facet, and the development of additional facets to adequately cover the communication domain. Within that domain there should also be multiple-methodological approaches to measurement.

Future research using the reported instrument should test its generalizability and discriminability across more and different kinds of organizations. More will be understood about the instrument when it is used in different cultural and sub-cultural settings. Within any single organization researchers might look for job level and other subgroup differences to see how various organizational participants differentially perceive communication in their organizations. With valid indices, certain differences should appear.

Finally, the communication facets discussed here must be examined more rigorously in relation to other organizational variables. This process will increase our understanding about how communication is important in organizational life and about what comprises "good" communication. An obvious need is to relate measures of communication to objective rather than perceptual or attitudinal criteria, such as performance, turnover, etc. All of these efforts should result in data which adequately assess convergent-discriminant validity. Since the data reported here are purely exploratory efforts at developing an easily completed descriptive measure of organizational communication they should be supplemented by additional research efforts.
Footnotes

1 This study was partially supported by Public Health Service Grant MH22054-01 and Office of Naval Research Grant N000314-69-A-0200-1054.

2 This question eliminated based on statistical analyses.
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Appendix 1
This is a series of questions about how people communicate at work. Imagine a typical week at work on your current job, and answer the questions accordingly. Please attempt to answer all the questions.

Some questions ask you to fill in an answer. Other have seven point scales on which to answer. On these questions, please check the point that represents most closely how you feel. For instance, to the question, "How rich do you want to be?" you might answer:

```
Very poor  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Very rich
```

How free do you feel to discuss with your immediate superior the problems and difficulties you have in your job without jeopardizing your position or having it "held against" you later?

1. Completely free  | Very cautious

How often is your immediate superior successful in overcoming restrictions (such as regulations or quotas) in getting you the things you need in your job, such as equipment, personnel, etc.?2

2. Always successful  | Never successful

Immediate superiors at times must make decisions which seem to be against the interest of their subordinates. When this happens to you as a subordinate, how much trust do you have that your immediate superior's decision was justified by other considerations?

3. Trust completely  | Feel very distrustful

In general, how much do you feel that your immediate superior can do to further your career in this organization?

4. Much  | Little

How much weight would your immediate superior's recommendation have in any decision which would affect your standing in this organization, such as promotions, transfers, etc.?

5. Important  | Unimportant
As part of your present job plans, do you want a promotion to a higher position at some point in the future?

(6) Content
   as I am

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

How important is it for you to progress upward in this organization?

(7) Not
   important

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

To what extent do you have confidence and trust in your immediate superior regarding his general fairness?

(8) Have little
    confidence or trust

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

While working, what percentage of the time do you spend interacting with:

(9) Immediate superiors

(10) Subordinates

(11) Peers (others at the same job level)

Of the total time you engage in communication while on the job, about what percentage of the time do you use the following methods to communicate:

(12) Written

(13) Face-to-face

(14) Telephone

(15) Other
    (specify)
When receiving information from the sources listed below, how accurate would you estimate it usually is:

(16) Completely accurate

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Completely inaccurate

Immediate superiors

(17) Completely accurate

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Completely inaccurate

Subordinates

(18) Completely accurate

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Completely inaccurate

Peers—others at your job level

Do you ever feel that you receive more information than you can efficiently use?

(19) Never

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Always

Of the total time you spend receiving information at work, what percentage comes from:

(20) Immediate superiors

_________

(21) Subordinates

_________

(22) Peers (others at the same level)

_________

100%

Of the total time you spend sending information at work, what percentage goes to:

(23) Immediate superiors

_________

(24) Subordinates

_________

(25) Peers (others at the same level)

_________

100%
When transmitting information to immediate superiors, how often do you summarize by emphasizing those aspects which are important and minimizing those aspects which are unimportant?

(26) Always | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
Never

When transmitting information to subordinates, how often do you summarize by emphasizing those aspects which are important and minimizing those aspects which are unimportant?

(27) Always | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
Never

When transmitting information to peers (others at your job level), how often do you summarize by emphasizing those aspects which are important and minimizing those aspects which are unimportant?

(28) Always | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
Never

Of the total amount of information you receive at work, how much do you pass on to:

Immediate superiors:

(29) All | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
None

Subordinates:

(30) All | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
None

Peers (others at your own job level):

(31) All | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
None

How desirable do you feel it is in your organization to interact frequently with:

(32) Very desirable | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
Completely undesirable

Immediate superiors
(33) Very desirable

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Completely undesirable

subordinates

(34) Very desirable

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Completely undesirable

Peers—(others at the same job level)

Put a check under the face that expresses how you feel about communications in general, including the amount of information you receive, contacts with your immediate superior and others, the accuracy of information available, etc.
Figure 1. Communications and other behavioral facets previously investigated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Communication facets</th>
<th>Related to ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen &amp; Cohen (1969)</td>
<td>Field: Questionnaires and interviews, N=38 in 1st R &amp; D lab, N=28 in 2nd R &amp; D lab.</td>
<td>-Information flow in R &amp; D lab, -Information sources, -Social relations, -Technical relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Cheney, &amp; May (1972)</td>
<td>Laboratory: Manipulation, direct observations and questionnaire response, 70 male and 70 female = 140 subjects.</td>
<td>-Modality, -Sex of subject</td>
<td>-Satisfaction, -Task performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (1954)</td>
<td>Field: Behavioral self-recording form, N=4 managers.</td>
<td>-Content: Decisions, instructions, advice, information, -Hierarchy of contact, -Initiator, -Modality use, -Purpose: Giving, obtaining, systematizing, recording, informational</td>
<td>-Activity content: sales, personnel, R &amp; D, etc., -Location of activity, -Time spent in activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Communication facets</td>
<td>Related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cohen, Robinson, & Edwards (1969) | Laboratories: Manipulations and direct observations, N=44 (4-17 member organizations). | -Centralized to decentralized subgroups  
-Embeddedness of network | -Emergent problem solving systems  
-Job satisfaction  
-Organizational (and subgroup performance (time to answer, # of errors, # of changes in answers)  
-Satisfaction with group |
| Cook (1968)         | Laboratory: Manipulations and questionnaires, N=120 students,  
Field: Questionnaires, N=154 managers in 59 companies.            | -Frequency of feedback about performance                                             | -Attitude toward task  
-Level of aspirations |
| Davis (1953)        | Field: Echo analysis using questionnaires, N=67 managers.               | -Communication between line and staff  
-Content  
-Distortion  
-Hierarchy of contact  
-Individuals not passing information on  
-Initiator  
-Isolated communicants  
-Modality use  
-factor  
-Propensity to communicate  
-Speed of communication | |
| Davis (1968)        | Field: Echo analysis using questionnaires, N=116 managers.               | -Initiator  
-Knowledge of communication content: By level and by department | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Communication facets</th>
<th>Related to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graves (1972)</td>
<td>Field: Diary and questionnaire, N=53 managers in 3 organizations.</td>
<td>-Content&lt;br&gt;-Duration&lt;br&gt;-Information purpose: giving or receiving instructions or information or socializing&lt;br&gt;-Location importance</td>
<td>-Informal status relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobsen &amp; Seashore</td>
<td>Field: Interview and questionnaire, N=204 clerical and secretarial.</td>
<td>-Content&lt;br&gt;-Frequency of contact&lt;br&gt;-Hierarchy of contact&lt;br&gt;-Importance&lt;br&gt;-Individual position in network&lt;br&gt;-Reason&lt;br&gt;-Subgroups in communication</td>
<td>-Status differentials&lt;br&gt;-Power relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly (1964)</td>
<td>Field: Activity sampling by questionnaire, N=4 managers.</td>
<td>-Hierarchy of contact</td>
<td>-Activity content: Programming, technical&lt;br&gt;-Time spent in various plant locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler, Porter, &amp; Tenenbaum (1968)</td>
<td>Field: Behavioral self-recording form (adapted from Burns), N=34 middle, 70 lower managers in 5 organizations.</td>
<td>-Hierarchy of contact&lt;br&gt;-Manager interaction: Self and other initiated&lt;br&gt;-Modality use&lt;br&gt;-Nature of activity&lt;br&gt;-Purpose: Giving, receiving, or evaluating information or instruction</td>
<td>-Attitudes towards interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Communication facets</td>
<td>Related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald &amp; Farace (1972)</td>
<td>Field: Interviews, N=600 first line supervisors and non-supervisory employees.</td>
<td>-Communication structure: Interdependence of subgroups, isolates, liaisons and bridges</td>
<td>-Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Frequency</td>
<td>-Employee success measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Function of or message attributes: Production, innovation, self and system maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Group connectedness and dominance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-System level-reciprocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly &amp; Roberts (1973)</td>
<td>Laboratory: Manipulation, observation, questionnaire, N=80 students.</td>
<td>-Gatekeeping of important or unimportant and favorable or unfavorable information</td>
<td>-Interpersonal trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Satisfaction with communication</td>
<td>-Mobility aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Total information passed</td>
<td>-Perceived influence of receiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Upward communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Upward communication accuracy</td>
<td>-Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read (1962)</td>
<td>Field: Interview, N=52 superiors, 52 subordinates in 3 organizations.</td>
<td>-Message volume</td>
<td>-Interpersonal trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Time communicating</td>
<td>-Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snadowsky (1972)</td>
<td>Laboratory: Manipulation, direct observation, post-experimental questionnaire, N=320 subjects (80-4 man groups).</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Authoritarian/non-authoritarian leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Leader satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Performance rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Task complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Communication facets</td>
<td>Related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sutton & Porter  | Field: Ecoo analysis using questionnaire, N=79 employees of regional tax office. | -Hierarchy of contact  
- Liasons  
- People not passing information  
- Task relevance of content | -Personality characteristics |
| Wade (1968)      | Field: Interview, Bureau of Budget personnel.                           | -Difficulty of obtaining needed information  
- Number of face-to-face contacts  
- Number of phone calls received and initiated | -Enjoyment of agency contacts  
- Propensity to overlook agency rules to complete work |
| Wagner (1972)     | Field: Questionnaire, N=1,544 managers.                                 | -Communication role of information and opinion seeker or giver                         | -Hierarchical status                             |
| Webber (1968)    | Field: Content analyses, job and work flow descriptions, interviews, N=54 managers in 2 organizations. | -Communication initiation  
- Time spent receiving information  
- Volume verbal interaction | -Leadership style  
- Personality characteristics |
| Weirshall (1966)  | Field: Diary, interviews, observations and questionnaires, N=50 managers. | -Consensus about character of interaction  
- Consensus about existence of interaction  
- Dominance  
- Initiation content: Topic, decision, instruction, advice, information  
- Modality use  
- Time of interaction |                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Communication facets</th>
<th>Related to ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wickesberg (1968) | Field: Daily log of all communication, N=91 businessmen from 35 organizations. | -Communications purpose: Information, approval or instructions given or received, problem solving, non-business  
- Frequency of communication  
- Modality use  
- Size of network  
- Time spent communicating | |
| Zaenglein & Smith (1972) | Field: Questionnaire, N=1443 staff from 17 hospitals. | -Communication directionality  
- Coordination  
- Decision-making  
- Hospital goals  
- Influence or power  
- Job satisfaction  
- Tension level among staff | |
| Zand (1972) | Laboratory: Observations, questionnaire, | -Conversation content: Defensiveness, openness, antagonism | - Interpersonal trust |
Figure 2. Description of communication and non-communication indices and questions contributing to them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Question Numbers (Appendix 1)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1, 3, 8</td>
<td>Respondent's trust in his superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>Respondent's perception of how much influence his superior has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility aspirations</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>Degree to which the respondent feels that future promotions are important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for interaction</td>
<td>32, 33, 34</td>
<td>General indicator of the degree to which the respondent desires to interact with others in the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality -Upwards</td>
<td>9, 20, 23</td>
<td>General indicator of the amount of contact the respondent has with his superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality -Downward</td>
<td>10, 21, 24</td>
<td>General indicator of the amount of contact the respondent has with his subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality -Lateral</td>
<td>11, 22, 25</td>
<td>General indicator of the amount of contact the respondent has with others at his job level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>16, 17, 18</td>
<td>Respondent's estimate of how accurate he perceives the information he receives to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarization</td>
<td>26, 27, 28</td>
<td>Estimate of how often information is summarized before it is passed on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to withhold information</td>
<td>29, 30, 31</td>
<td>Estimate of how much information the respondent receives he actually passes on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality -written</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Percentage of time the respondent uses this modality to transmit information at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality - face-to-face</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Percentage of time the respondent uses this modality to transmit information at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality - telephone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Percentage of time the respondent uses this modality to transmit information at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>How often the respondent feels he receives more information than he can use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indicator of how satisfied the respondent is with communication in general in his organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Varimax factor loadings for items assessing trust in superior, perceived influence of superior, and subordinate's mobility aspirations for a sample of 95 military subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items ¹</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Loadings (N=95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trust</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Influence</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Influence</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mobility Aspirations</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mobility Aspirations</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of communality accounted for:

1. Items scored on seven point scales
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicies</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Mental Health Agency (n=111)</th>
<th>Teachers (n=52)</th>
<th>Financial Institution (n=175)</th>
<th>Military Unit* (n=55)</th>
<th>Hospital Workers* (n=54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapacity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact-Upward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact-Downward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact-Lateral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated accuracy of receipt of information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to summarize information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to withhold information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modalities used for communication***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items scored on seven point scales. Other samples use five point scales.

**Scoring done only for reprimands with subordinates.

***Modality item scores for the mental health agency, financial institution, and military sample were converted from percentage responses to a 10 point scale. Responses for the samples of managers and hospital workers are reported as percentage answers.
Table 3. Test-retest reliabilities. Three week interval between test and retest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Description</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Test-retest correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students (N=24)</td>
<td>Managers (N=42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived influence of superior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility aspirations of respondent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for interaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact- Upward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact- Downward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directionality of contact- Lateral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated accuracy of received information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to summarize information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to withhold information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities for communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information overload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with communication in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>