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ABSTRACT

Working environments differ from all angles as well as their culture, economic and social development. In this context some of these organizations’ have cumbersome reporting lines, which are difficult for the employee to abide by. This study, therefore examined the effect of communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study is 6,026 comprising the entire staff of Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. Taro Yamane formula was used to derive the sample size of 488. A structured questionnaire was administered resulting in a response rate of 79.9%. A confirmatory factor analysis was done to establish validity of the questionnaire. A test-retest was done using Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis reliability for the major constructs ranging between 0.889 to 0.924. The data gathered was analyzed with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 software involving frequency distributions and linear regression. Findings revealed that horizontal communication has a significant effect on organisational performance ($r = 0.620, R^2 = 0.384, p = 0.000< 0.05$); vertical communication has a significant effect on organisational performance ($r = 0.545, R^2 = 0.297, p = 0.000< 0.05$); and diagonal communication has a significant effect on organisational performance ($r = 0.724, R^2 = 0.524, p = 0.000< 0.05$). From the study, it is evident that communication variables, namely, horizontal, vertical and diagonal communication, each has a significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. Based on the findings, the study recommends that top management of manufacturing industries should emphasize the importance of latent and future needs. So as to improve the guidance of employees towards organisational goals and mission.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY
Around the world, Businesses are demanding and tasking. For businesses to stay successful and make profits in a competitive and demanding global economic market, factors of production should be managed wisely. Human Resources constitutes challenges in view of the fact that employee management requires skilled management of thoughts, feelings as well as emotions to achieve high output. Channels of communication play a role in dealing with the difficult tasks.

Communication has crucial impacts among work groups in that organizational communication is a channel to flow information, resources, and even policies. “Organizational communication can be broadly defined as communication with one another in the context of an organization (Eisenberg & Goodall, 1997; Shockley-Zalabak, 2006)” as cited in Eunju (2009). Communication involves sending and receiving messages through various authority levels, involving message systems. Communication engages influencing the opinions and views within communities, organizations, governments. Communication is used to pass documents within members of the organization, to supervise activities, reduce manager workload. Therefore the focus of the study is on communication and organizational performance in the Nigerian bottling company.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Working environments differ from all perspectives such as culture, economic and social instigation. With such circumstances, organizations' bulky reports would be tough for the employees to understand. These reports sometimes include conflicting information, and obligations hereby making some subordinates become more answerable to a particular
superior. Intra-communication equipment which includes emails and memos are ignored by some organizations which ends up causing lack of knowledge for the employees on the mission and vision of the organization. Academic works have shown that effective communication helps employees to achieve goals. This also includes decision-making, problem solving and change-management process etc. This enables members of an organization or institution to work towards a common goal and purpose. Organizations with communication challenges continue to find the most effective channels for communicating across the subordinates.

Communication channels play an important role in organizational performance because it helps in achieving its goals and objectives. Organizations need an effective and efficient inflow of communication and communication systems in order to be able to pass information across to the society. Unlikely, there seems to be a lack of efficient and effective communication strategy at Coca Cola. Coca Cola consumers have made complaints of major delays in the processing of their orders. Communication plays an important role in coordinating and balancing all departments of an organization and to enhance organizational performance, there was a need to evaluate the organizational communication structure, channels of communication, communication policy and communication system at Coca Cola to assess how relevant and effective they are in this era of Information Technology.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study will attempt the following research questions:

a. Does horizontal communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

b. In what way does vertical communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?
c. Does diagonal communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of this study is to assess the effect of communication channels on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

The objectives of the study are;

i. Examine the effect of horizontal communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

ii. Determine the effect of vertical communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

iii. Assess the effect of diagonal communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses for the study are as follows:

\( H_0_1: \) horizontal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

\( H_0_2: \) vertical communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

\( H_0_3: \) diagonal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The Manufacturing Industry
The findings of the survey will be used by stakeholders in the manufacturing industry to make appropriate decisions towards adopting different technological channels in delivery services. They will understand the benefits of adopting a good communication system in their manufacturing companies. They will also appreciate the impact of information, communication and technology on organisational performance.

**The Academicians and Scholars**

Future researchers and scholars may use the survey as a source of reference for further research. Manufacturing sector, technological inventions depend on the survey carried out in such areas. It is important to document the research findings for future reference. They would be keen to understand the impact of technology on the organisational performance in the manufacturing industry.

**The Government**

The government will be interested in finding out how technology can be maximized in stimulating economic growth in manufacturing institutions. Finally, the study is meant to help in bridging the gap that currently exists between technology and service quality of the firms that take up technological innovations.

**1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

This study will be restricted to Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. The researcher will limit the research to the Nigerian bottling company, which is a major player in the manufacturing industry. The manufacturing company was picked because the level of communication practices employed by the company in getting their products out into the market is on the high level. They send messages to the employees and consumers who are the receivers and all these are done utilizing various techniques such as the people, the process and the technique.
The focus respondents for this study consists of the total number of management personnel working at a strategic level and operational level within the company. The total estimated figure for the population arrived at, based on a survey of the firm was six thousand and twenty six (6,026) personnel. Information with regards to the population number was sourced from the Nigerian Stock Exchange index April 26, 2016. Using Taro Yamane (1967) formula for sample size determination, the study was able to arrive at a sample size of four hundred and eighty eight (488) respondents including a provision for thirty percent non-respondent. Sampling method to be used in this study is the stratified sampling technique simply because of the stratification variables included in the scope of the study and the study would be carried out using descriptive survey design.

1.8 DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Communication:** this is the exchange of information either by speaking, writing, or some other medium. It is also the means of sending or receiving information, such as mobile phones or computers.

**Organisational Performance:** this comprises the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended goals and objectives.

**Horizontal communication:** this form of communication flows laterally within the organization and involves persons at the same level in an organization.

**Vertical communication:** this is where information or messages flow between or among the subordinates and superiors of the organization.

**Diagonal communication:** is a way of communication between employees from different organizational units and from different hierarchical levels.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the conceptual review, theoretical review and empirical review from prior research and relevant literature on the following research variables communication and organizational performance. The theory discussed in this study is the Dynamic capability
theory. How the theory relates to this study and the reason for pursuing this research are discussed.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

2.1.1 Communication

Communication covers all activities that an individual does when he wants to make a transformation in someone else’s mind. This is a meaning bridge between an individual or individuals and organization. Communication contains expressing, listening and understanding. It is further theorized that employees are likely to be more productive if their performance is rewarded assuming that the reward received has value to them, as argued by the expectancy theory (Vroom, 2015). Communication is vital in organizations such that Orpen (2013) argued that communication has a vital role in the accomplishment or failure of any organization. It is used to resolve the contradictions in work organization in order that such organization may progress. People must come together, think together, work together, learn together and advance together. Human interaction allows man to forge new horizons and explore new possibilities. According to Ince and Gül (2015) communication is the exchange of ideas, emotions and opinions through words, letters and symbols among two or more people. He states that this may be defined as a technical fact. Yet it is uncertain whether symbols are transferred truly or not, to what extent symbols meet the transmitted message and how effective transmitted fact on the receiver (Kalla, 2015; Baltas & Baltas, 2012). Without communication, through readings, listening (the receptive skills), speaking and writing (the productive skills) mankind would find it difficult to unravel some of the mysteries of life. Those things that we are ignorant of or have knowledge of, or that we have doubts about can be explained to us better through communication. Altinöz (2018) defines communication as a means through which the task and the resources needed to carry out an assignment, the roles and duties and the expected results are made known to the subordinates.
This means that communication is the transfer of information (a message) from one person to another. Thus effective communication is therefore the transfer of message, followed by feedback, from the receiver to the sender, indicating an understanding of the message. The Multi-dimensional aspect of the notion of communication along with its analyses from different viewpoints affects its definition, communication is needed to review, conceptualize and direct interaction in an organization.

Employee communication is the dissemination of information which is related to the daily performance of an employer’s job and also important if the worker is expected to be an effective member of staff. It connotes a consideration of human beings as a vital resource (Buchanan & Doyle 2014). Communication is the transfer of information from a sender to a receiver, with the message being understood by the receiver. Myers and Myers (2012) defined organizational communication as “the central binding force that permits coordination among people and thus allows for organized behaviour,” and Rogers and Rogers (2016) who argue that “the behaviour of individuals in organizations is best understood from a communication point of view.”

In many ways, organizations have evolved in directions that make the latter view more appropriate. Changes confronting organizations and the associated changes in organizational forms have made organizational communication increasingly important to overall organizational functioning. Communication is said to be the foundation for sound management, communication helps greater coordination and interaction among workers, good communication helps in motivating the workers, and communication helps in establishing links between different hierarchies and functions of management, communication clears confusion, misunderstanding and delays in administration, it helps in achieving maximum productivity with minimum cost, it helps in building genuine human
relation. Communication is not only an essential aspect of these recent organizational changes, but effective communication can be seen as the foundation of modern organizations (Grenier & Metes 2012; D”Aprix 2016; Witherspoon 2017; von Krogh et al. 2000).

Effective communication is needed for management to develop and sustain a competitive advantage for organizational performance and improvement (Aviolio, Lado, Boyd & Wright, 2012; Rowe, 2011). The association between employee satisfaction and job performance suggests that an important contributor to the employee’s engagement within the organization is the leader employee relationship.

Foong (2011) concludes that managers use leadership behaviours to influence employees. Lee and Chuang (2009) explain that an excellent leader not only inspires subordinates, giving them the potential to enhance efficiency, but also meets their requirements in the process of achieving organizational goals. How a leader communicates is as important as to how he leads. The leader is the guiding force within a group and organization. A leadership style that resonates with followers will allow the leader to achieve greater employee productivity. Conversely, poor leadership styles lead to poor communication and can have negative effects on workers performance and in turn productivity. The process by which employees are made aware of organizational goals and their involvement in the achievement of them is recognized to play an important role in fostering job commitment (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Haskins, 1996). Goris et al. (2000) and Ooi et al. (2006) find organizational communication to have an important positive association with affective commitment, whilst (Brunetto & Farr-Whartons” 2004) findings “suggest a strong relationship between communication processes and job satisfaction and affective job commitment”.

Research shows that when employee needs are met through satisfying communication, employees are more likely to build effective work relationships. (Tsai & Chuang 2009). This
“research satisfaction” – “the total of an individual’s satisfaction with information flow and relationship variables” (Tsai & Chuang 2009) has been correlated with key variables such as job performance and turnover rates. Further, “certain facets of employees” communication satisfaction that exhibit both information and relationship features supervisory communication, personal feedback, and communication climate were found to be the major dimensions of communication-job performance relationships” (Tsai & Chuang 2009).

In other words, the ways in which information flows in an organization is critical to the way that personnel understand their relationship to and within the organization. In short, as Chen (2008) stated, each passing study seems to reveal “that the relationship between internal/employee communication and corporate effectiveness is more significant than what has previously been assumed”. The implementation stage is an operations-oriented phase where managers must make things happen. Arguably it is the most demanding and time-consuming part of the strategic management process. It requires preparing a strategic plan that sets out annual objectives, establishes an effective organizational structure, fixes a budget, develops a viable information system and generally devises a work plan for job execution. It also involves motivating employees, creating a supportive culture, allocating resources and linking employee compensation to the organization (Thompson, 2014).

There is little controversy regarding the labeling of the goal orientation topic in the sixty articles that we have reviewed. Sashittal and Wilemon (2015) have pointed out that some terms synonymous with “implementation”, such as “execution”, and “actualization of goals” are often employed in the management literature, but are not frequently used by managers themselves. As far as the terms „execution” or „executing” in the strategic context are concerned, most of the 60 articles in our literature review, use strategic implementation as a key word or as a part of the title and only very few use the term strategy execution.
Communication Process

Communication process involves the following:

a. Sender: The sender/encoder is the initiator of the message. The sender can be an individual, group or organization with ideas, desires, needs to transmit to other parties.

b. Encoding: This is a process that selects the appropriate language which the receiver understands. Examples of encoding include making signals, symbols, and letters.

c. Message: Message refers to idea, thoughts, emotions etc, put into a symbol, figure, sign, etc.

d. Channel: This is a means by which a message is conveyed from one party to the other parties. The sender must make sure that the appropriate channel is used to transmit a message.

e. Receiver: This is the recipient(s) of the transmitted information. If the information is not received by the receiver, then there is no communication.

f. Decoding: Decoding is a process that occurs at the reception level where impulses, figures and symbols are interpreted and translated into meaningful information. Communication can only occur when both the encoder (sender) and decoder (receiver) attach the same or at least similar meanings to the symbols that make up the message.

g. Noise: Noise is anything that disturbs and interferes with the flow of communication. Noise can occur either internally (wrong encoding, transmission, interruption etc) or externally (confined environment).

2.1.2 Horizontal Communication
This is also called lateral communication. It is the transmission of messages along the same lateral or similar level in an organization. This occurs between team members, between different teams and employees on the same or similar level. The use of horizontal communication is on the increase because of the interactive electronic communication technologies such as e-mail and phone messages that greatly enhance horizontal communication by making it possible to establish learning communities and virtual teams of employees who work together even in different locations.

Horizontal communication is related to communication between employees at the same level of business activity, with the purpose of increasing the total employee activity, which contributes to more effective functioning and business in the sports organisation. Buble points out that “through horizontal channels, we ensure information distribution, coordination and solution of interdepartmental problems” (Buble, 2010:190). Companies use work teams which integrate the work flow processes instead of having specialists who exclusively deal with one function or product. That is why, in an organisation divided into cross-functional teams, horizontal communication among the team members is extremely important to achieve individual and team goals (Lehman and Dufrene, 2015:9).

2.1.3 Vertical Communication

Vertical communication is an organization communication that involves two different movements, that is, from “up down” and from “down to up” along the organizational hierarchy. It comprises downward and upward communication. (i) Downward Communication: this refers to movement of information from the top management to the lowest officers. (ii) Upward Communication: this is the pattern trough which superior gets necessary feedback on subordinates' actions.
Vertical top-down communication implies communication which flows from the management to the employee, and bottom-up communication flows from the employee to the management. When it comes to vertical top-down communication, it should be pointed out that a disadvantage of this type of communication is the inability to inform the management on how and in what way the employees understand their assigned demands or tasks, and the inability to listen to the employee’s beat as the fundamental factor in a sports institution, together with pupils or students. “Katz and Kahn identified five categories of downward communications: 1. Communication of organisational goals and mission 2. task instructions and training (how) 3. task rationale (why) 4. communication about rules, policies, procedures 5. performance and other feedback to subordinates (Rouse and Rouse, 2005:27).

It is important to emphasise that neither will provide actual results in sports organisations, unless they are two-way. Just as Cutlip states, “the goals of communication are to identify, establish and maintain mutually beneficial relationships between the organisation and the employees on whom its success or failure depends (Cutlip et al., 1985, according to Theaker, 2003).

2.1.4 Diagonal Communication

Diagonal communication refers to communication between managers and workers located in different functional divisions (Wilson, 2012). Although both vertical and horizontal communication continue to be important, these terms no longer adequately capture communication needs and flows in most modern organizations. The concept of diagonal communication was introduced to capture the new communication challenges associated with new organizational forms, such as matrix and project-based organizations.

Diagonal communication is practiced in situations where members of the organization cannot communicate through other channels. Individuals in an organization typically communicate
with co-workers in their departments who have attained the same status they have, or they communicate with their direct superiors or subordinates. Diagonal communication routes depart from these hierarchical norms by engaging individuals who work at different levels and in different departments. Diagonal communications have several important functions; however, they're not without risk.

2.2 ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Performance is the end result of activities carried out and for any business it is concerned with the general efficiency or productivity. Two ways to deal with performance have been recognized in literature: the financial or “sales-based” and the non-financial or “firm-based”. Whereas the financial is measured with dimensions such as profitability, growth, productivity, level of sales revenue, market share and product, return on investments, product added value; the non-financial is measured in terms of employee development, customer satisfaction, job satisfaction and efficient organizational internal processes (Eniola & Ektebang, 2014). Therefore, the practice of strategic management is justified in terms of its ability to improve organizations’ performance (Agha et al., 2011). Organizational performance comprises the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended outputs (or goals and objectives). The performance of any business organization is affected by the strategies in place within that organization (Mutuku, 2005). Strategies determine the long term performance of the firm. Business managers must therefore monitor customer needs and preferences, competitors’ actions, technology development, and the performance of internal processes, as well as the overall financial condition of the business and develop appropriate strategies.
Performance is normally measured using standards which are usually detailed expressions of strategic objectives. They are also the measures of acceptable performance results. Measures used to assess organizational performance depend on the organization and the objectives that need to be achieved. These objectives are normally established in the strategy formulation stage of the strategy management process and they could include: profitability, market share and cost reduction among others. Thompson et al., (2007) identified two distinct performance yardsticks. They are those relating to financial performance and those relating to strategic performance. Those relating to strategic performance are the outcomes that indicate if a company is strengthening its market standing, competitive vitality and future business prospects.

Conventionally an organization’s performance can be gauged using its current financial data. Strategy level performance measurement should include both financial and operating measures. Chakravarthy (1986) studied firms operating in the computer industry and concluded that financial performance measures are inadequate indicators of a broader construct, ‘’excellence’’. This is partly due to the fact that financial indicators largely ignore the interests of stakeholders other than stockholders. Chakravarthy (1986) argued that future oriented indicators, such as investment in R&D, should also be part of the measurement and control system. A study by Ernst and Young’s Center for Business Innovation (Daily, Certo & Dalton, 2002) found that investment analysts who considered nonfinancial as well as financial performance indicators were more accurate in their earnings estimates than those who just used financial indicators. This suggests that a comprehensive performance evaluation system has greater predictive validity than one that is purely financially oriented. In view of the above, most studies on organizational performance use a variety of financial and nonfinancial success measures.
2.3 THEORETICAL REVIEW

Theories and Models have developed so that communication and organizational performance can grow. Such models and theories can be argued to form the framework to many studies as they support the development of hypotheses and ultimately give rise to new findings which enlarge a particular. Such theory as considered in this study is the Dynamic capability theory.

2.3.1 The Dynamic Capability Theory (1994)

The DCT was initially introduced by David Teece and Gary Pisano in 1994. According to Teece & Pisano (1994) in the past successful companies pursued a “resource-based strategy of accumulating valuable technological assets, often reserved by a defensive approach towards intellectual property” p. 515. Dynamic capability theory is an outgrowth of resource-based view theory. While resource-based view theory is concerned with how a firm can achieve competitive advantage, dynamic capability theory is more concerned about short term competitive advantage that can be used to build longer term competitive advantage for development and sustainability (Lim et al., 2012). Dynamic capability theory focuses on the ability of a firm to quickly learn changes and innovations that are coming up in the business environment, build strategic assets that would enable them to compete and or transform assets that are existing within the firm to suit changes that are occurring within the business environment so as to increase business performance.

The criticisms of dynamic capability theory are that the theory is incomplete in terms of specifics (Arend & Bromiley, 2011). Critics have outlined that the theory is not able to explain when there is need for a change and when not to change (Vos & Schiele, 2014). Also, there were no specific details explaining organisation pricing and opportunity costs of changes created within the organisation and as such there is a need to properly align the theory with a theory of the organisation (Li & Liu, 2014). Here the dynamic capability theory mainly discusses changes so as to achieve organisation survival but fails to examine the cost
of changes and at what equilibrium cost can a change be effected so as not to affect organisational performance and sustainability (Arend & Bromiley, 2011). Another criticism of the dynamic capability theory is that the theory lacks definitional bounds that appear to be inconclusive and elastic (Arend & Bromiley, 2011). Attempts were made to define this theory and clarify some of the concerns raised for the theory by Eisenhardt and Martin (2000). However, the theory still does not resolve the measurement challenges in terms of what constitutes a dynamic capability, thus making dynamic capability to appear everywhere whether at the operational level or at the environmental level. Dynamic capability theory assumes capabilities are firm-specific processes, activities or routines, and also put the immutability of the firm capability to build and reconfigure the resource base as the key to attaining competitive advantage (Lin & Wu, 2014).

Leonard-Barton, (1992) argues that dynamic capabilities allow firms to continually have a competitive advantage and may help firms to avoid developing core rigidities which inhibit development of inertia and stifle innovation. Eisenhardt and Martin, (2000) opined that dynamic capabilities involve the organisational processes by which resources are utilized to create growth and adaptation within changing environments and permit the renewal and reconfiguration of a firm’s resources. Further, Ambrosini, Bowman and Collier (2009) point that four different outcomes may result from the deployment of dynamic capabilities. First, they can lead to sustainable competitive advantage if the resource base created is not imitated over a long period of time and the rent is sustained. Secondly, they can lead to temporary advantage. Third, they may only give competitive advantage if their effect on the resource base is simply by allowing the firm to operate in the industry rather than to outperform rivals. Finally, the deployment of dynamic capabilities may lead to failure if the resulting resource stock is irrelevant to the market.
For the purpose of this study also, the dynamic capability theory will be an anchor theory. The rationale for selecting it is that, it shares similar assumptions with the resource-based view theory of firms, however, it incorporates internal and external cultural and strategic factors such as institutional and market position which are vital considering the dynamic and turbulent nature of the present-day business environment making it useful for assessing impact of organisational culture and corporate competitiveness.

2.3.2 Resource-based view of the firm

The resource based view of firm (RBV) originated from the work on Penrose (1959) and was formalized into a theory by Barney (1991). It focused on resource as an analytical unit for understanding firm-level sustained competitive advantage. The RBV recognizes the value of a firm’s resources and capabilities, and is determined by the market context within which the firm is operating. Its basic assumption is considered as the asset that can be acquired and owned by a company. Furthermore, it assumes that through resource procurement, production, distribution, and consumption, firms generate competitive advantage. It suggests that for an organization to achieve its objectives, it needs to structure its internal capabilities to the external environment. The key internal intangible resources and the external market conditions may be used as a framework to investigate the development of this unique strategy dimension.

Since its introduction into the strategic management literature, the resource based view (RBV) of the firm (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1986; 1991; 2001; Conner, 1991) has earned great attention among scholars as a framework for explaining the conditions under which a firm may gain sustained competitive advantage. Strategy researchers have emphasized the importance to consider the opportunities and constraints faced by firms as a result of their
resource base as well as the industry characteristics when investigating a firm’s decision concerning its growth (Delios & Beamish, 1999).

Wernerfelt (1984) introduced the notion that firms should be analyzed from the resource side at the level of the firm, not just from the product side at the level of industry while Barney (1986, 1991) argues that a firm has the potential to generate sustained competitive advantage from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN). These resources can be viewed as bundles of tangible and intangible assets, such as a firm’s management skills, its organizational processes and routines, and the information and knowledge under its control (Barney, Wright and Ketchen, 2001) tied semi permanently to the firm (Wernerfelt, 1984). To distinguish resources as inputs and capabilities within the firm to enable it to select, deploy, and organize them, the concept of “dynamic capabilities” was coined to mean ‘firm’s processes that use resources to integrate, reconfigure, gain and release other resources to match and create market change. Therefore, dynamic capabilities are organizational and strategic routines by which firms achieve new resource configurations as markets emerge, collide, split, evolve and die (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). In his argument, Leiblein (2003) indicated that RBV assumes that firms are profit maximizing entities directed by boundedly rational managers operating in distinctive markets that are to a reasonable extent predictable and moving towards equilibrium. RBV challenges the market based view of economists by regarding resources and competitive advantage as factors specific to a firm rather than general to the industrial environment (Tseng, Tansuhaj, Hallagan, and McCullough, 2007). On scope of application of RBV, Connor (2002) argues that the RBV applies only to large firms with significant market power.

Although the resource based view is considered an influential management theory it has been criticized to be conceptually vague and redundant, with limited focus on the mechanisms by
which resources actually contribute to competitive advantage (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). However, this argument, though plausible to the extent that smaller, nimbler firms do not have adequate resources for SCA, is nullified on the grounds that intangible resources have capability to generate SCA even in small firms. However, the RBV only applies to firms striving to achieve SCA not those satisfied with their competitive position (Kraaijenbrink, et al., 2010). Critiques have also argued that SCA is not actually achievable since both the skills and resources, and the way the organization uses them must constantly change leading to the creation of continuously changing temporary advantages (Fiol, 2001). In a dynamic environment, firms cannot derive SCA from static resources.

Both address resources and actions as important drivers of competitive advantage and superior performance, but each focuses on one of these factors at the expense of the other. The RBV primarily addresses resources, or the tangible and intangible factors of firm control. Specifically, this research argues that valuable and rare resources provide the basis of competitive advantage and make superior performance. A relatively overlooked assumption in the RBV is that firms know how to leverage their resources to gain competitive advantage, which in turn can lead to superior performance.

2.3.3 Assimilation Theory

Assimilation theory is based on Festinger’s (1957) dissonance theory. Dissonance theory posits that consumers make some kind of cognitive comparison between expectations about the product and service and the perceived product and service performance (Peyton, Pitts, & Kamery, 2003). This view of the consumer post-usage evaluation was introduced into the satisfaction literature in the form of assimilation theory (Anderson, 1973). According to Anderson (1973), consumers seek to avoid dissonance by adjusting perceptions about a given product and service to bring it more in line with expectations (Peyton, Pitts, & Kamery,
2003). Consumers can also reduce the tension resulting from a discrepancy between expectations and product and service performance either by distorting expectations so that they coincide with perceived product and service performance or by raising the level of satisfaction by minimizing the relative importance of the dis-confirmation experienced (Olson & Dover, 1979).

Payton et al (2012) argues that Assimilation theory has a number of shortcomings. First, the approach assumes that there is a relationship between expectation and satisfaction but does not specify how disconfirmation of an expectation leads to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Payton, Pitts, & Kamery, 2008). Second, the theory also assumes that consumers are motivated enough to adjust either their expectations or their perceptions about the performance of the product and service (Forman, 2007). A number of researchers have found that controlling for actual product and service performance can lead to a positive relationship between expectation and satisfaction (Olson & Dover, 2004). Therefore, it would appear that dissatisfaction could never occur unless the evaluative processes were to begin with negative consumer expectations (Bitner, 2005).

Attempts by researchers to empirically test the assimilation contrast model have met with varied results. For instance Anderson (1994) and Olson & Dover (1979) found some evidence to support the assimilation theory approach. In debating both of these studies, Oliver (1980) argues that Anderson (1994) and Olson & Dover (1979) findings cannot be accepted because they only measured expectations and supposed that there were perceptual differences between disconfirmation or satisfaction.

This criticism is of some significance because researchers do not actually measure satisfaction or dissatisfaction; instead, researchers usually assumed that it is the perception of disconfirmation that leads to satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Hoveland, 1957). In
contradiction to the findings supporting the assimilation theory, Cadotte, Woodruff & Jenkins (1983) reported negative correlation between expectation and disconfirmation. They therefore resolved that satisfaction is truly an “additive function of the two concepts”. Further, Peyton (2003) asserts that uncertainty was created by results of study from the work of Oliver (1977), which found no relationship between expectation and disconfirmation.

Moreover, Olshavsky & Miller (1972) in “consumer expectations, product performance and perceived product quality” supported the assimilation-contrast theory. However, it has been found that if the discrepancy was too large to be assimilated, then the contrast effect occurs.

2.4 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Two studies focused on communication and learning. Heide studied the role of ICT, particularly the Intranet, for learning in Ericsson Mobile (2012) and Jimes analyses the relation between communication and learning in two case companies (2015). Both authors depart from a social constructionist view on organizations and communication, and they clearly employ an interpretive perspective. Jimes dissociates herself from the view that communication is a learning tool, and that learning is a communication product. In return, she emphasizes sense making processes. Her purpose is to find concepts to explain the relation between communication and learning, and she highlights two: local conversations and text negotiations.

The results of the research concur with the results of Ekman (2014), previously mentioned above. Ekman establishes that learning in her case companies takes place in everyday conversations and in conversations on texts, which in turn create new texts that structure the organizations. The rhetoric of managers and the narratives of co-workers form textual expressions of organizational change and organizational problems. Ekman sees that co-workers' sense making and understanding are built on interaction of these linguistic
expressions. She considers that organizations ought to pay attention to everyday conversations. They are important both to innovation oriented and decentralized activities, as well as for centralized and routine activities (Jimes 2015).

One of the conclusions made by Heide is just that conversations are the most important medium to people’s potential to learn (Heide, 2012). All mediation via technical and digital media involve information losses, which in turn affects the receivers’ possibilities to interpret and understand the senders’ intentions – and to convert information into knowledge. Heide considers Intranets have advantages as learning tools. They enhance availability of information, they give co-workers better insight into the organization and its processes, and it has a democratizing role, since more people gain access to information.

The managers’ distributive role diminishes in importance, while the collected information in the Intranet is part of the organizational memory and forms an important resource to the organization as a whole and to individual co-workers. In turn they acquire a more active role in information seeking, and experience an enlarged freedom. However, the use of ICT is not solely positive. Some disadvantages pointed out by Heide are that managers no longer know if co-workers have received and made sense of the information.

Obstacles that render seeking and acquiring information complicated are information overload, structural problems making information difficult to find, lack of time, distrust and interpretation of difficulties. The web is good for storing and distribution of information; but in everyday practice, many situations are characterized by insecurity and ambiguity – in those cases more information does not necessarily help, but rather guidance on interpretation of the matter is what is needed (Weick 2015) is. Heide’s study shows that work-related communication primarily goes through”private channels” such as conversations and e-mail (Heide, 2002).
Kaplan and Norton (1998) proposed that there is a close connection between organizational learning and organizational performance; in order to embolden the learning environment in the organization, the top manager is the key person encouraging this to take place. In more detail, Marr (2016) said that it is essential that not only do top management need to participate in supporting a learning environment but also all organization members. To do so, he suggested that the organization needs to encourage organizational learning through a social context in which members can share knowledge both tacitly and explicitly, and encourage commitment, collaboration, mutual respect and a sense of belonging.

Organizational members need to feel important to the community to create value as a whole. In an even more complex example from the service business sector, Singapore Airlines has encouraged all of its staff to share and relocate knowledge jointly. This leads to the development of an ‘organizational identity’, so that all members feel that they are important to the organization and are fully willing to serve customers to the best of their ability (Chong 2017). To encourage learning in the organization, Singapore Airlines provided training from the lowest to the top positions of the organization. Eventually, as in the healthcare industry, Liu et al. (2016) and Rusnakova et al. (2014) established that customer satisfactions had been raised and, in turn, organizational performance had been improved.

Researchers generally view organizational performance by two main measures: Objective and subjective. For example, Waybright and Kemp (2012) compared objective measures to the scores of league sports; financial statements help the scorekeepers, or accountants, to collect financial data about how well the organization has scored; data such as sales volumes, profits or return on assets is taken from financial records and externally recorded and audited accounts. Against this solid evidence which determines which team wins, there are subjective measures as reported by respondents themselves (Wall et al. 2014).
Traditional analysts emphasize that organizational performance for small business ventures embraces explanations of why people start their ventures, what problems business ownership overcomes and generates for the owners or top management, and specifically what the firm’s top management actually desire to achieve for themselves (Beaver and Jennings 2011; Chaganti and Chaganti 1983; Marlow and Patton 2013; Thorpe 2001).

Different organizations have different purposes in running their business; therefore, the determined goals of each organization may be different and the levels of organizational performance may be varied (Fan et al. 2014). Organizational performance could be defined as the ability to reach a desired objective or the degree to which anticipated results are achieved (Stefan 2005). It could also be well-defined multi-dimensionally by looking at four different categories: achieving organizational goals, increasing resourcefulness, satisfying customers and improving internal processes (Cameron 1986; Redshaw 2001). Organizational performance also serves the purpose of monitoring performance, identifying the areas that require attention, enhancing motivation, improving communications and strengthening accountability (Waggoner et al. 1999).

Today’s organizations are run by multi and cross functional teams which show little tolerance for unquestioned authority. To deal with this situation, the art of persuasion and the effort to find the correct emotional match with your audience is necessary. This match means that it is not enough for communication to be a one-way ticket(Torrington and Hall, 1991) as cited in Rajhans 2012.

Oyetunde & Oladejo (2012) in a study titled “communication approach and firms performance: appraisal of Nigerian Bottling Company(CocaCola), Ilorin-Nigeria” submitted that research findings no doubt have validated the synerginous relationship between communication approach and efficient performance of NBC, Ilorin plant. They also
recommended that there can still be more room for improvement and consequently better performance if management embraces the following recommendations: (i) More clarity of ideas before attempting to communicate; Communication messages that are precise and are of short run often possess long run importance; (viii) All stakeholders should be encouraged to be good listeners; (ix) Immediate actions must be accompanied and accomplished with communication; and (x) Communication that would be effective require a follow up and effective feedback mechanism process.

Kukule (2012) in” Internal communication crisis and its impact on organization’s performance” cited that the importance of symmetry has been marked by Gruning and Hunt, describing symmetric communication as a source and a recipient which cannot be separated but are equal participants of a communication process seeking(striving for) mutual understanding and proportional two-way effect(Grunig, Grunig A. Larissa,1989). The research work, carried out under the auspices of the paper, points at the lack of symmetric approach in internal communication, which is marked by the research participants (not representing the dominant coalition) as an important cause of the problem and of crisis in the organization He opined that lack of leadership, unclear managerial style and incomprehension of employees’ need for information created a fundamental problem in the organization’s internal communication.

Furthermore, the role of informal communication and “grape-vine telegraph” in an organization’s communication is viewed as one of crucial factors influencing organization’s operations and may become a threat to an organization. He further suggested that organizational crises may not only be caused by external conditions which are difficult to control for an organization , but also by internal factors which are closely linked to communication problems in the organization.
2.5 GAP IN LITERATURE

This literature provides in-depth knowledge on the subject under study; however, most of the studies were not completely directed towards communications and organizational performance and more specifically in the manufacturing industries. Therefore, this study is further situated in selected manufacturing companies in Abuja and will also look at communications and organisational performance of the selected manufacturing company stated in this study.

It is believed by the researcher that there has been consistent neglect in research in this area especially in the manufacturing industries which could lead to a disservice to the sector and also the economy at large. Hence, the study will be based on the premise that probably there are not many studies in the field. Thus, the study will examine how horizontal communication, vertical communication and diagonal communication as parameters for organisational communications will affect the overall performance.

2.6 CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR THE STUDY
CHAPTER THREE

Source: Researcher’s Model (2020)
METHODOLOGY

This chapter focuses on the methodology that was used for the study which is survey methodology. It presents the research design, the sampling technique and size, instrument for the data collection, pilot testing of the instrument, validity and reliability of instrument and method of data analysis of the research. It also explains the various techniques and procedures that were used in collecting data as well as reasons for adopting this methodology.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is the overall framework of a research that explains the direction and the method to be used in the study to collect the information needed (Huang, Li, Liu, & Long, 2009). The design adopted for this study was survey design, which was employed to empirically investigate the relationships among variables of the research. Survey design involves collection of data in order to test hypotheses and provide answers to questions concerning the current status of subjects(s) in a study (Asika, 2004).

Survey design was used because it largely focuses on vital facts, beliefs, opinion, demographic information, attitudes, motives and behaviors of correspondent giving responses to the research instrument (Aliyu, Tudun & Oladejo, 2014; Osinbanjo, 2014), its uniqueness and relevance as it concentrates on descriptiveness of the event. For the study, a quantitative approach was used in analyzing the data collected. Quantitative approach was adopted because it permits measurement of objective facts using variables, statistical analysis and reliability testing (Prasad, 2012).

3.2 SOURCES OF DATA
The study made use of a self-structured questionnaire which reflects the study objectives and questions. The self-administered questionnaire will comprise of thirty (14) questions and it was divided into (3) sections A, B and C. Section A contains personal information of respondents such as sex, age, marital status, educational qualification and length of service. Section B and C will consist of Likert type questions which focused on the research variables, communication and organisational performance.

Likert Scale measurement was adopted in this research work. The Likert type questions tend to measure the concentration of thoughts of the respondent with respect to the information being sought for in the questionnaire. A six point rating scale was used to measure the responses consisting of strongly agree, agreed, partially agree, partially disagree, disagree and strongly disagreed. Asika (2004) submits that Likert scale is a rating technique used widely to measure personal characteristics and reflect the extreme positions on a continuum, which enable the respondents to freely indicate their opinion on the structured statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sources of Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
<td>Self-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical communication</td>
<td>Self-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal communication</td>
<td>Self-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organisational performance</td>
<td>Organisational performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demographic Information</td>
<td>Sex, age, marital status, educational qualification and length of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research study, 2020
3.3 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

For the purpose of the study, the primary source of data collection was adopted. The primary data was sourced using a questionnaire. The questionnaires were distributed directly to the target respondents within the population. Questionnaire was used because it assumes the anonymity of the respondent and therefore affords the boldness to fill answers to questions appropriately (Asika, 2004). All other advantages of questionnaire were fully utilized whilst the shortcomings will be guided against so as to make it free from bias and ensure good generalization.

3.4 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The target population for the study comprises the decision making officers such as chief executives, general managers, marketing and sales executives, managers, directors and so on, middle and lower level employees, casual workers, personnel and administrative staff members of Nigerian bottling company in Abuja, Nigeria. The total population for the study is six thousand and twenty six (6,026) staff of selected manufacturing companies in Abuja, Nigeria. (NSE index, April 26, 2016). Nigerian bottling company was chosen because it is a key player in the sector and was selected because there is a high level of communication practices employed by them in getting their products out into the market and are also quoted in the Nigerian Stock Exchange.

3.5 SAMPLE SIZE

In order to determine the sample size for the study, Taro Yamane (1967) formula for calculating sample size for finite population was adopted. One of the assumptions of this formula is that it assumes the population from which the sample will be derived is a finite one.
and not infinite. Secondly, it assumes that the acceptable error margin for any sample must be greater than zero and never equal to or less than zero. Yamane (1967) provides a simplified formula to calculate sample sizes. Where ‘n’ is the sample size, ‘N’ is the finite population size, and ‘e’ is the level of precision.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \]

The formula is as follows: \( n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \)

The reason for adopting this formula is that it is simple and less complicated and can also provide accurate results of the necessary sample size that will be adequate for the research study since the population for this study is a finite one. Also, adopting this formula increases the level of precision and the confidence level of making less risk in determining the actual sample size necessary for the study. Applying the formula above, where:

\( n \) = sample size

\( N \) = Finite population size which is 6,026 that is total number personnel within the population.

\( e \) = Maximum acceptable error margin which is 5%

We then have:

\[ n = \frac{6,026}{1 + 6,026(0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{6,026}{1 + 6,026 (0.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{6,026}{1 + 15.065} \]

\[ n = \frac{6,026}{16.065} \]
The sample size derived for this study, using Taro Yamane formula, is four hundred and eighty eight (488) elements. However, the four hundred and eighty eight elements were chosen using stratified random sampling technique so as to increase the sampling precision for the study.

**3.6 SAMPLING TECHNIQUE (S)**

Sampling is a proportion or a segment of the whole population. Since the entire employees of the study companies cannot be included in the study. The study employed stratified sampling technique to determine the sample of the study. The justification for choosing this sampling technique is that it increases the sampling precision during the process of dividing the population into strata (Kumar, 2005).

The following formula was adopted to get sample size;

$$H = \frac{y}{N} \times (n)$$

Where:

- $H$ = is the proportionate sample size
- $y$ = represent the total number of element for each stratum
- $N$ = represent the total population size for the study
- $n$ = represent sample size derived for the study

**3.7 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSES**
To determine the statistical technique to be used in the study, a comprehensive analysis of prior research will be carried out in order to establish the methodology that would be adopted for the study. The data will be analyzed with the use of both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics such as contingency table simple percentage value (%) and frequency distribution will be considered appropriate for description of variables such as respondent status, category of age, sex group and position occupied of selected manufacturing companies.

Inferential statistical technique to be adopted for this study is simple linear regression analysis which will be used to understand the relationship existing among identified variables. Simple linear regression analysis is a statistical method that allows a single explanatory or criterion variable to be examined on a dependent variable (Tarfardar & Gordon, 2010). The rationale for the adoption of simple linear regression analysis is that first, it shows optimal result when the relationship between the independent and dependent variable are almost linear. Just like the name implies, it is simple and less complicated in deriving findings and also interpreting the findings. Simple regression technique also enables one to take information about the independent variable and use it to make a powerful and accurate prediction about the dependent variable. Simple regression is considered good for this study because the study consists of one independent and one dependent variable. The effect of this independent variable would be examined on the dependent variable. Simple regression analysis will be carried out using statistical package social science (SPSS) 21.0 software.

**3.8 STUDY VARIABLES AND MEASUREMENT/ MODEL SPECIFICATION**

\[ Y = f(X) \]

\[ Y = \text{Dependent Variable} \]

\[ X = \text{Independent Variables} \]
Where:

\[ Y = \text{Organisational Performance} \]

\[ X = \text{Communication} \]

\[ Y = (Y) \]

\[ X = (x_1, x_2) \]

Where:

\[ Y = \text{organisational performance} \]

Where:

\[ x_1 = \text{Horizontal communication} \]

\[ x_2 = \text{Vertical communication} \]

\[ x_3 = \text{Diagonal communication} \]

\[ Y = f(X) \]

\[ Y = f(x_1) \] \text{Equation 1}  

\[ Y = f(x_2) \] \text{Equation 2}  

\[ Y = f(x_3) \] \text{Equation 3}  

The variables in Equation 1-3 are the working Equations to be evaluated in this study.

\[ Y = a_0 + \beta_1x_1 + \mu \] \text{Equation 1}  

\[ Y = a_0 + \beta_2x_2 + \mu \] \text{Equation 2}  

\[ Y = a_0 + \beta_3x_3 + \mu \] \text{Equation 3}  

3.9 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

3.9.1 Validity of Research Instrument

Content validity was used for this study to check the operationalization against the relevant content domain for the construct. Content validity is concerned with how well the content of a measurement instrument measures what it is designed to measure (Asika, 2004). Before actual distributions of questionnaires to respondents, steps were carried out in order to ensure that the scale items adequately cover the area of the construct. Copies of this questionnaire
were given to the researcher's supervisor as well as experts in marketing for validation. This was done in order to obtain their general comments and necessary suggestions on the adequacy and sequence of the question. Some items were also added based on their valuable recommendations, in order to become more accurate and enhance the research instrument.

A confirmatory factor analysis was done to establish validity of the questionnaire. For the establishment of content validity, the questionnaires that were distributed for pilot after retrieval were subjected to a factor analysis test using the Principal Component analysis method of extraction. The factor loadings of these items were used to establish the average variance extracted AVE based on the formula below:

\[ AVE = \frac{SSFL}{NOI} \]

Where AVE=Average variance extracted

- SSFL=Sum of Squared Factor Loadings
- NOI= Number of variables indicators

For each of the variables, the Average variance extracted was thus computed as shown in the table that follows. Since the average variance extracted is greater than 0.5 for each of the variables, it therefore gives room for the establishment of convergent validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No of items</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vertical communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diagonal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organizational performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9.2 Reliability of Research Instrument:

The reliability of an instrument is based on the degree of consistency, stability, repeatability and precision with the appropriate measure. Reliability refers to the appropriateness and the consistency of a method of measurement to provide the same result under the same conditions if a test or measurement is repeated or carried out. A pilot test was carried out before actual data collection on 50 respondents of the research sample for the purpose of determining the reliability of the survey instrument vagueness and clarity of items. The researcher will apply a test-retest of the survey instrument on fifty (50) employees and management personnel of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State. Seven days after the initial questionnaire is distributed, the same questionnaire was distributed to the same respondent to determine the consistency in their response.

3.6.3 Internal Consistency Reliability Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Alpha for the instrument</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.859</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2020

In order to assess the internal consistency reliability of each variable, coefficient alpha (Cronbach’s alpha) was applied on the pilot test conducted. The results of the Cronbach’s
alpha test carried out will suggest if the instrument used for evaluation is highly reliable. The internal consistency will thus be validated.

3.10 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Every form of research methodology has limitations. Limitations to the present study’s methodology include: The methodology allows for the findings to be biased by researchers’ perspective. However, the researcher is aware of this and therefore will make efforts to be neutral and objective. That is, the researcher will not attempt to influence findings of the study. People may read different meaning into each question and therefore reply based on their own interpretation of the question – that is, what is 'good' to someone may be 'poor' to someone else, therefore, there is a level of subjectivity that is not acknowledged.

Lastly, the methodology allows for some level of the researchers’ imposition, meaning that when developing the questionnaire, the researcher may be making decisions and assumptions as to what is and is not important and therefore they may be missing something that is of importance. To mitigate this, the researchers will consider some parameters that are most needed and make sure to use the right ones that are most important to the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter gives a breakdown of data retrieved. It presents the data analysis, results and discussions and findings in the study. The tables with the percentages are tools for descriptive analysis of data in the Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. A questionnaire served as the basis for statistical analysis in which data retrieved was analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Inferential statistics was carried out using simple linear regression, so as to understand the effect of communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. Findings in the study were discussed.

4.1 ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Copies of the questionnaire were administered directly to the decision making officers such as the chief executives, directors, general managers, marketing and sales executives,
managers, and also to the middle and lower level employees, of selected manufacturing companies in Abuja.

Out of four hundred and eighty eight (488) copies of the questionnaire distributed, three hundred and ninety (390) copies were retrieved from the field. The overall response rate for the study is 79.9%. A non response rate of 20.1% was recorded for the study, which occurred as a result of busy schedule, inadequate time and loss of questionnaire on the part of the respondents.

**Table 4.1  Questionnaire response rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administered Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Returned questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unreturned questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percentage used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percentage not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total percentage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Study, 2020

### 4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS

Four demographic variables were- Gender, Age, Educational qualification and Marital Status. Table 4.2 shows the gender sampled distribution.

**Table 4.2: Gender variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent%</th>
<th>Valid Percent%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 reveals that 208 (53.3%) of respondents were male, while 182 (46.7%) were female. This shows that male respondents participated more in the study than female respondents.

Table 4.3: Classification of Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Age)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent%</th>
<th>Valid Percent%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and above</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey (2020)

Table 4.3 shows that 102 (26.2%) of the respondents were between the ages of 25-30 years, and 160 (41.0%) were between the ages of 31-35 years, while 92 (23.6%) were between the ages of 36-40 years, however 36 (9.2%) were at the age of 41 years and above; by implication most respondents were between the ages of 31-35 years.

Table 4.4: Educational Qualification variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Valid Percent%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc / MBA</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.hD</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey (2020)

Table 4.4 shows that 120 (26.2%) of respondents had a B.Sc degree, 156 (41.0%) had an MSc or MBA, 65 (23.6%) had a PhD, 49 (9.2%) had another qualification, and the rest (26.2%) had a Bachelor's degree.
Source: Researcher’s Field Survey (2020)

Table 4.4 shows the qualifications based on educational levels. 120 (26.2%) of respondents possessed the B.Sc degree, 156 (41.0%) had an MSc / MBA degree, and 65 (23.6%) were P.hD holders. 49 (9.2%) had other degrees. 56.67% had an MSc/ MBA or higher degree.

Table 4.5: Marital Status variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Valid Percent%</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey (2020)

Table 4.5 shows the marital status of respondents. Where 103 (26.4%) of the respondents surveyed were single, while 208 (53.3%) surveyed were married, and 79 (20.3%) were divorced; by implication most respondents were married.

4.3 DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

Restatement of Objective and Research Question 1

Research Objective 1: To examine the effect of horizontal communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Research Question 1: How does horizontal communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

The result in this section represents the frequency interpretation of the responses of participating employees of cola bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria to the effect of horizontal communication on organisational performance.
Table 4.6  Descriptive analysis of Horizontal Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Horizontal Communication</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication between employees at the same level</td>
<td>276 (70.8%)</td>
<td>104 (26.7%)</td>
<td>8 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Electronic communication technologies</td>
<td>231 (59.2%)</td>
<td>129 (33.1%)</td>
<td>25 (6.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Information distribution</td>
<td>203 (52.1%)</td>
<td>130 (33.3%)</td>
<td>33 (8.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>183 (46.9%)</td>
<td>139 (35.6%)</td>
<td>42 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Solution of interdepartmental problems</td>
<td>177 (45.4%)</td>
<td>78 (20.0%)</td>
<td>14 (3.6%)</td>
<td>31 (7.9%)</td>
<td>68 (17.4%)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average | 5.22 | 1.01

**Source:** Researcher’s Field Survey 2020.

Table 4.6: The descriptive analysis shows 276 (70.8%) respondents indicated that Communication between employees at the same level is very high, 104 (26.7%) respondents indicated high and 8 (2.1%) indicated Undecided. The respondents on average indicated that Communication between employees at the same level is very high (Mean = 5.68, STD = 0.54).

In addition, 231 (59.2%) respondents indicated that electronic communication technologies are very high, 129 (33.1%) indicated high, 25 (6.4%) indicated Undecided and 2(0.5%) indicated low. On the average the respondents indicated that electronic communication technologies are very high (Mean = 5.49, STD = 0.71). On Information distribution, 203 (52.1%) respondents indicated very high, 130 (33.3%) indicated high, 33 (8.5%) Undecided and 5(1.3%) low. The respondents on average indicated that Information distribution is very high (Mean = 5.30, STD = 0.89). Further, the results revealed that 183(46.9%) respondents indicated that Coordination...
is very high, 139 (35.6%) indicated high, 42 (10.8%) Undecided and 9 (2.1%) low, none is missing. The respondents on average indicated that Coordination is very high (Mean = 5.22, STD = 0.96). Also, 177 (45.4%) respondents indicated that Solution of interdepartmental problems was very high, 78 (20.0%) indicated high, 14 (3.6%) Undecided, 31 (7.9%) low and 68 (17.4%) very low. The respondents on average indicated that Solution of interdepartmental problems is very high (Mean = 4.40, STD = 1.95).

Test of Hypothesis One

**Hypothesis 1** (H\(_{01}\)): Horizontal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Model 1 for (H\(_{01}\)) is stated as \(Y = f(x_i)\) and \(Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \mu\)

**Linear Regression Analysis between horizontal communication and organisational performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.620(^a)</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>2.77243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a.\) Predictors: (Constant), HRZC

**ANOVA\(^a\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1862.633</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1862.633</td>
<td>242.330</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2982.303</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>7.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4844.936</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a.\) Dependent Variable: ORGP

\(b.\) Predictors: (Constant), HRZC

**Coefficients\(^a\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hypothesis one was tested between horizontal communication and organisational performance. The correlation value in the analysis is given as $r = 0.620$ which explains the level of relationship between horizontal communication and organisational performance. This implies therefore that a 62.0% relationship or correlation exists between horizontal communication and organisational performance. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.383$. This explains the impact of horizontal communication on organisational performance. 38.3% indicates the changes that occur positively in organisational performance can be accounted for by horizontal communication.

The result in the table therefore showed that there is a statistically determinant relationship between horizontal communication and organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria as the probability of the t-calculated is equal to 0.000 which is less than 0.005 or 5%. Hence the null hypothesis that states that horizontal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria is hereby rejected.

**DISCUSSION ON FINDINGS**

The findings are consistent with the findings of Ekman (2014) who established that learning in her case companies takes place in everyday conversations and in conversations on texts, which in turn create new texts that structure the organizations. The rhetoric of managers and the narratives of co-workers form textual expressions of organizational change and organizational problems. Ekman sees that co-workers' sense making and understanding are built on interaction of these linguistic expressions. She considers that organizations ought to pay attention to everyday conversations. They are important both to innovation oriented and decentralized activities, as well as for centralized and routine activities (Jimes 2015).

One of the conclusions made by Heide is just that conversations are the most important medium to people’s potential to learn (Heide, 2012). All mediation via technical and digital media involve information losses, which in turn affects the receivers’ possibilities to interpret and understand the senders’ intentions – and to convert information into knowledge. Heide
considers Intranets have advantages as learning tools. They enhance availability of information, they give co-workers better insight into the organization and its processes, and it has a democratizing role, since more people gain access to information.

The managers’ distributive role diminishes in importance, while the collected information in the Intranet is part of the organizational memory and forms an important resource to the organization as a whole and to individual co-workers. In turn they acquire a more active role in information seeking, and experience an enlarged freedom. However, the use of ICT is not solely positive. Some disadvantages pointed out by Heide are that managers no longer know if co-workers have received and made sense of the information.

**Restatement of Objective and Research Question 2**

Research Objective 2: To determine the effect of vertical communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Research Question 2: Does vertical communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

This results of the frequency interpretation of the responses show that there is an effect of vertical communication on organisational performance.

Benchmark scale of interpretation of mean.

Where: 1= 0-1.5, 2= 1.6-2.5, 3= 2.6-3.5, 4= 3.6-4.5, 5=4.6-5.5, 6=5.6-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7</th>
<th>Descriptive analysis of Vertical Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Communication</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Communication of organisational goals and mission</td>
<td>179 (45.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Task instructions and training</td>
<td>183 (46.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Communication of task rationale</td>
<td>197 (50.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication about rules, policies, procedures</td>
<td>178 (45.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Performance and other feedback from subordinates</td>
<td>211 (54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Researcher’s Field Survey 2020.

Table 4.7 represents the results of the descriptive analysis. 179 (45.9%) respondents indicated that Communication of organisational goals and mission is very high, 170 (43.6%) respondents indicated high, 32(8.2%) indicated Undecided and 6(1.5%) indicated low. The respondents on average indicated that the Communication of organisational goals and mission is very high (Mean = 5.68, STD = 0.54).

In addition, the result revealed that 183 (46.9%) respondents indicated that Task instructions and training is very high, 145 (37.2%) indicated high, 46 (11.8%) indicated Undecided, 6(1.5%) indicated low and 2(0.5%) indicated very low. The respondents on average indicated that Task instructions and training is very high (Mean = 5.49, STD = 0.71). On Communication of task rationale, 197 (50.5%) respondents indicated very high, 114 (29.2%) indicated high, 54 (13.8%) Undecided and 8(2.1%) low. The respondents on average indicated that Communication of task rationale is very high (Mean = 5.30, STD = 0.89). Further, the results revealed that 178(45.6%) respondents indicated that Communication about rules, policies, procedures is very high, 160 (41.0%) indicated high, 32(8.2%) Undecided and 3(0.8%) low, none is missing. On the average, respondents indicated that Communication about rules, policies, procedures is very high (Mean = 5.22, STD = 0.96). Also, 211 (54.1%) respondents indicated that Performance and other feedback from subordinates was very high, 94 (24.1%)
indicated high, 49 (12.6%) Undecided and 16 (4.1%) low. The respondents indicated that Performance and other feedback from subordinates is very high (Mean = 4.40, STD = 1.95).

**Test of Hypothesis Two**

**Hypothesis 2** ($H_{02}$): Vertical communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Model 1 for ($H_{02}$) is stated as $Y = f(x_2)$ and $Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_2 x_2 + \mu$

**Linear Regression Analysis between vertical communication and organisational performance**

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>2.96327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), VERC

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1437.917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1437.917</td>
<td>163.754</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3407.019</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>8.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4844.936</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP
b. Predictors: (Constant), VERC

c. Predictors: (Constant), VERC

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.713</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>6.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VERC</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation
The hypothesis two was tested between vertical communication and organisational performance. The correlation value in the analysis is given as $r = 0.545$ which explains the level of relationship between vertical communication and organisational performance. This implies therefore that a 54.5% relationship or correlation exists between vertical communication and organisational performance. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.297$. This explains the deterministic impact of vertical communication on organisational performance. This indicates that 29.7% of the changes that occur positively in organisational performance can be accounted for by vertical communication.

The result in the table therefore showed that there is a statistically determinant relationship between vertical communication and organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria as the probability of the $t$-calculated is equal to 0.000 which is less than 0.005 or 5%. Hence the null hypothesis that states that vertical communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria is hereby rejected.

Discussion of Findings

The findings discovered from this study is consistent with the findings of Marr (2016) who said that it is essential that not only top management need to participate in supporting a learning environment but also all organization members. To do so, he suggested that the organization needs to encourage organizational learning through a social context in which members can share knowledge both tacitly and explicitly, and encourage commitment, collaboration, mutual respect and a sense of belonging. Evidence shows that organizational performance is used to determine organizational learning in different areas (see, for example, Murray 2013; Panayides 2017; Pemberton et al. 2001; Spicer and Sadler-Smith 2016; Vakola and Rezgui 2000; Vincent and Ross 2001). Similarly, a variety of approaches to evaluating organizational performance have been applied to help continue learning in the organization (see, for example, Afifioui 2017; Aragon-Correa et al. 2007; Chang and Lee 2007; Michie and Sheehan-Quinn 2011; Michie and Zumitzavan 2012). Marr (2016) recommended that it is important to create a learning environment in the organization in order to heighten
organizational performance. Kaplan and Norton (1998) proposed that there is a close connection between organizational learning and organizational performance; in order to embolden the learning environment in the organization, the top manager is the key person encouraging this to take place.

Today’s organizations are run by multi and cross functional teams which show little tolerance for unquestioned authority. To deal with this situation, the art of persuasion and the effort to find the correct emotional match with your audience is necessary. This match means that it is not enough for communication to be a one-way ticket(Torrington and Hall, 1991) as cited in Rajhans 2012.

Oyetunde & Oladejo (2012) in a study titled “communication approach and firms performance: appraisal of Nigerian Bottling Company(CocaCola), Ilorin-Nigeria” submitted that research findings no doubt have validated the synerginous relationship between communication approach and efficient performance of NBC, Ilorin plant. They also recommended that there can still be more room for improvement and consequently better performance if management embraces the following recommendations: (i) More clarity of ideas before attempting to communicate; Communication messages that are precise and are of short run often possess long run importance; (viii) All stakeholders should be encouraged to be good listeners; (ix) Immediate actions must be accompanied and accomplished with communication; and (x) Communication that would be effective require a follow up and effective feedback mechanism process.

Kukule (2012) in” Internal communication crisis and its impact on organization’s performance” cited that the importance of symmetry has been marked by Gruning and Hunt, describing symmetric communication as a source and a recipient which cannot be separated but are equal participants of a communication process seeking(striving for) mutual understanding and proportional two-way effect (Grunig, Grunig A. Larissa,1989). The research work, carried out under the auspices of the paper, points at the lack of symmetric approach in internal communication, which is marked by the research participants (not representing the dominant coalition) as an important cause of the problem and of crisis in the organization He opined that lack of leadership, unclear managerial style and incomprehension of employees’ need for information created a fundamental problem in the organization’s internal communication.
Restatement of Objective and Research Question 3

Research Objective 3: To assess the effect of diagonal communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Research Question 1: How does diagonal communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

This section shows the results of the frequency interpretation of the responses of participating employees of Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria to the effect of diagonal communication on organisational performance.

Table 4.8 Descriptive analysis of Diagonal Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Diagonal Communications</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication between managers and workers in different functional divisions</td>
<td>109 (27.9)</td>
<td>89 (22.8)</td>
<td>64 (16.4)</td>
<td>51 (13.1)</td>
<td>12 (3.1)</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication with new organizational procedures</td>
<td>36 (9.2)</td>
<td>24 (6.2)</td>
<td>98 (25.1)</td>
<td>96 (24.6)</td>
<td>41 (10.5)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication through other channels</td>
<td>35 (9.0)</td>
<td>21 (5.4)</td>
<td>49 (12.6)</td>
<td>124 (31.8)</td>
<td>60 (15.4)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communicate businesses within the organization</td>
<td>56 (14.4)</td>
<td>30 (7.7)</td>
<td>89 (22.8)</td>
<td>138 (35.4)</td>
<td>9 (2.3)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication with direct superiors or subordinates</td>
<td>31 (7.9)</td>
<td>7 (1.8)</td>
<td>112 (28.7)</td>
<td>135 (34.6)</td>
<td>27 (6.9)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8 Present results of descriptive statistics on Diagonal Communications. The results of the descriptive analysis revealed that 109 (27.9%) of the respondents indicated that Communication between managers and workers in different functional divisions is very high, 89 (22.8%) of the respondents indicated high, 64(16.4%) indicated Undecided, 51(13.1%) indicated low and 12(3.1%) indicated very low none is missing. On the average the respondents indicated that Communication between managers and workers in different functional divisions is very high (Mean = 5.68, STD = 0.54).

In addition, the result revealed that 36 (9.2%) of the respondents indicated that Communication with new organizational procedures is very high, 24 (6.2%) indicated high, 98 (25.1%) indicated Undecided, 96(24.6%) indicated low and 41(10.5%) indicated very low. On the average the respondents indicated that Communication with new organizational procedures is low (Mean = 4.30, STD = 0.71). On Communication through other channels, 35 (9.0%) respondents indicated very high, 21 (5.4%) indicated high, 49 (12.6%) Undecided, 124(31.8%) low and 60(15.4%) very low. On the average the respondents indicated that Communication through other channels is low (Mean = 5.30, STD = 0.89). Further, the results revealed that 56(14.4%) respondents indicated that Communicate businesses within the organization is very high, 30 (7.7%) indicated high, 89(22.8%) Undecided, 138 (35.4%) low and 9 (2.3%) very low. The respondents on average indicated that Communicate businesses within the organization is low (Mean = 5.22, STD = 0.96). Also, 31 (7.9%) respondents indicated that Communication with direct superiors or subordinates is very high, 7 (1.8%) indicated high, 112 (28.7%) Undecided, 135(34.6%) low and 27 (6.9%) very low. The respondents on average indicated that Positive image in the eyes of the target audience is low (Mean = 4.40, STD = 1.95).

**Research Question 3:** How does diagonal communication affect organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria?

From Table 4.8 and 4.9, the answer to the research question one can be found, which is that there is a positive relationship between diagonal communication and organisational performance.
Test of Hypothesis Three

**Hypothesis 3** ($H_{03}$): diagonal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

Model 3 for ($H_{03}$) is stated as $Y= f(x_3)$ and $Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_3 x_3 + \mu$

**Table 4.9 Linear Regression Analysis between diagonal communication and organisational performance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model three</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_3 x_3 + \mu$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.416</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagonal communication</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>20.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Dependent Variable: organisational performance
- b. r = 0.724 $R^2 = 0.524$ $F$-stat = 426.311

**Source:** Research Study, 2016

**Interpretation**

The hypothesis one was tested between diagonal communication and organisational performance. The correlation value in the analysis is given as $r = 0.724$ which explains the level of relationship between diagonal communication and organisational performance. This implies therefore that a 72.4% relationship or correlation exists between diagonal communication and organisational performance. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.524$. This explains the deterministic impact of diagonal communication on organisational
performance. This indicates that 52.4% of the changes that occur positively in loyalty of customers can be accounted for by diagonal communication.

A constant value (alpha) of 9.416 which is the predicted value of the dependent variable measure (organisational performance) when the predictor is set at 0 and the coefficient of independent variable (beta = 0.652) the size of the coefficient of independent variable measure giving that the size of the effect it has on the dependent variable is 0.652. The prediction component as shown in Table 4.10 is the t-value and significance. The t-statistic is the coefficient divided by its standard error. If 95% of the t-distribution is closer to the mean than the t-value, then the coefficient will have a p-value of 5%. The p-value indicates that the independent variable measures diagonal communication. The result indicates satisfactory goodness of fit between the independent variable (diagonal communication) and dependent variable (organisational performance). It also shows that the F-value which is the mean square model divided by the mean square residual yielded F=426.311.

The result in Table 4.10 therefore showed that there is a statistically determinant relationship between diagonal communication and organisational performance of selected manufacturing companies in Lagos State as the probability of the t-calculated is equal to 0.000 which is less than 0.005 or 5%. Hence the null hypothesis that says diagonal communication has no significant effect on organisational performance of selected manufacturing companies in Lagos State is hereby rejected.

**Discussion of Findings**

The findings discovered from this study is consistent with the findings of Marr (2016) who said that it is essential that not only top management need to participate in supporting a learning environment but also all organization members. To do so, he suggested that the organization needs to encourage organizational learning through a social context in which members can share knowledge both tacitly and explicitly, and encourage commitment, collaboration, mutual respect and a sense of belonging. Evidence shows that organizational performance is used to determine organizational learning in different areas (see, for example, Murray 2013; Panayides 2017; Pemberton et al. 2001; Spicer and Sadler-Smith 2016; Vakola and Rezgui 2000; Vincent and Ross 2001). Similarly, a variety of approaches to evaluating organizational performance have been applied to help continue learning in the organization (see, for example, Afiouni 2017; Aragon-Correa et al. 2007; Chang and Lee 2007; Michie and Sheehan-Quinn 2011; Michie and Zumitzavan 2012). Marr (2016) recommended that it
is important to create a learning environment in the organization in order to heighten organizational performance. Kaplan and Norton (1998) proposed that there is a close connection between organizational learning and organizational performance; in order to embolden the learning environment in the organization, the top manager is the key person encouraging this to take place.

Today’s organizations are run by multi and cross functional teams which show little tolerance for unquestioned authority. To deal with this situation, the art of persuasion and the effort to find the correct emotional match with your audience is necessary. This match means that it is not enough for communication to be a one-way ticket (Torrington and Hall, 1991) as cited in Rajhans 2012.

Oyetunde & Oladejo (2012) in a study titled “communication approach and firms performance: appraisal of Nigerian Bottling Company(CocaCola), Ilorin-Nigeria” submitted that research findings no doubt have validated the synerginous relationship between communication approach and efficient performance of NBC, Ilorin plant. They also recommended that there can still be more room for improvement and consequently better performance if management embraces the following recommendations: (i) More clarity of ideas before attempting to communicate; (ii) Communication messages that are precise and are of short run often possess long run importance; (iii) All stakeholders should be encouraged to be good listeners; (iv) Immediate actions must be accompanied and accomplished with communication; and (v) Communication that would be effective require a follow up and effective feedback mechanism process.

Kukule (2012) in” Internal communication crisis and its impact on organization’s performance” cited that the importance of symmetry has been marked by Gruning and Hunt, describing symmetric communication as a source and a recipient which cannot be separated but are equal participants of a communication process seeking(striving for) mutual understanding and proportional two-way effect (Grunig, Grunig A. Larissa,1989). The research work, carried out under the auspices of the paper, points at the lack of symmetric approach in internal communication, which is marked by the research participants (not representing the dominant coalition) as an important cause of the problem and of crisis in the organization. He opined that lack of leadership, unclear managerial style and incomprehension of employees’ need for information created a fundamental problem in the organization’s internal communication.
Table 4.8 represents the descriptive statistics on Diagonal Communications. The results of the descriptive analysis revealed that 109 (27.9%) respondents indicated that Communication among managers and workers in different functional sectors is very high, 89 (22.8%) respondents indicated high, 64 (16.4%) indicated Undecided, 51 (13.1%) indicated low and 12 (3.1%) indicated very low. The respondents on average indicated that Communication among managers and workers in different functional sectors is very high (Mean = 5.68, STD = 0.54).

In addition, the results revealed 36 (9.2%) respondents indicated that Communication with new organizational procedures is very high, 24 (6.2%) indicated high, 98 (25.1%) indicated Undecided, 96 (24.6%) indicated low and 41 (10.5%) indicated very low. The respondents on average indicated that Communication with new organizational procedures is low (Mean = 4.30, STD = 0.71). On Communication through other channels, 35 (9.0%) respondents indicated very high, 21 (5.4%) indicated high, 49 (12.6%) Undecided, 124 (31.8%) low and 60 (15.4%) very low. The respondents on average indicated that Communication through other channels is low (Mean = 5.30, STD = 0.89). Further, the results revealed that 56 (14.4%) respondents indicated that Communicate businesses within the organization is very high, 30 (7.7%) indicated high, 89 (22.8%) Undecided, 138 (35.4%) low and 9 (2.3%) very

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Organizational Performance</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Profitability</td>
<td>212 (54.4%)</td>
<td>128 (32.8%)</td>
<td>35 (9.0%)</td>
<td>5 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>133 (34.1%)</td>
<td>133 (34.1%)</td>
<td>63 (16.2%)</td>
<td>22 (5.6%)</td>
<td>11 (2.8)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td>193 (49.5%)</td>
<td>96 (24.6%)</td>
<td>56 (14.4%)</td>
<td>16 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Customer loyalty</td>
<td>125 (32.1%)</td>
<td>152 (39.0%)</td>
<td>54 (13.8%)</td>
<td>26 (6.7%)</td>
<td>4 (1.0%)</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Positive image in the eyes of target audience</td>
<td>229 (58.7%)</td>
<td>107 (27.4%)</td>
<td>28 (7.2%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
<td>9 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE.

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey 2020.
low. On the average, respondents indicated that Communicate businesses within the organization is low (Mean = 5.22, STD = 0.96). Also, 31 (7.9%) respondents indicated that Communication with direct superiors or subordinates is very high, 7 (1.8%) indicated high, 112 (28.7%) Undecided, 135(34.6%) low and 27 (6.9%) very low. On the average, respondents indicated that Positive image in the eyes of the target audience is low (Mean = 4.40, STD = 1.95).

4.9 Summary Table of Findings

The result of the entire hypothesis tested can be summarized in the table as we have below:

Table 4.10 Summary Table of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Apriori expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \mu$ .......... (1)</td>
<td>$P &lt; 0.5$; $H_0_1$ was rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_2 x_2 + \mu$ .......... (2)</td>
<td>$P &lt; 0.5$; $H_0_2$ was rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$Y = \alpha_0 + \beta_3 x_3 + \mu$ .......... (3)</td>
<td>$P &lt; 0.5$; $H_0_3$ was rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Study, 2020

From Table 4.10, we can see that the hypothesis proposed for models 1, 2 and 3 were rejected because their p values were less than 0.05 meaning that analysis was significant.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the analysis and interpretation of the study and provides recommendations for the problems identified in the study and suggestions for further areas of research.

5.1 SUMMARY

The study focuses on Communication and Organizational Performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. Communication refers to exchange of information by speaking, writing, or using some other medium. It also signifies sending or receiving documents, for example through use of computers. The variables used to measure communication are horizontal communication, vertical communication and diagonal communication. Organizational performance is the actual output or results of an organization as measured
against its intended outputs (or goals and objectives). The first chapter deals with the background of the study, identified appropriate problems related to the study, outlined the objectives of the study, formulated appropriate research questions and hypotheses. The chapter also highlighted the scope and significance of the study and gave operational definition of terms and variables used in the study.

The second chapter conceptually and empirically reviews related literatures relevant to the communication and organizational performance including variables considered in the study. Relevant theories related to the study were identified and a conceptual model of communication and organizational performance was constructed based on the review of the extant literature.

Chapter three presents the methodology used in the study. The chapter presents research design, sources of data, method of data collection, population of the study, sample size, sampling technique, method of data analysis, study variables and measurement/model specification, validity and reliability of research instrument and limitation of the study. The study adopts descriptive survey research design. The population for the study is six thousand and twenty six (6,026) consisting of management personnel as well supporting personnel working at the strategic and operational level within the firm. Taro Yamane (1967) formulae for sample size determination, was adopted for determining sample size for the study. Based on the population estimate, the study arrives at a sample size of four hundred and eighty eight (488) units. Stratified sampling technique was also used in determining sample size proportions. The study made use of a six point questionnaire for collecting data and simple linear regression analysis was chosen to determine the relationship between identified hypotheses.

Chapter four presents the analysis, results and discussion of major findings. The analysis was done through descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis interpreted the respondent demographic information. The use of percentages and frequency distribution tables aided with the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) was used in analyzing and interpreting data. Inferential analysis was used to determine possible effect of variables of communication on variables of organisational performance in the selected manufacturing companies through the employment of simple linear regression analysis. Data generated from the questionnaire was sorted, arranged, coded, analyzed and substituted in the functional equations to obtain simple regression models and establish statistical significance of
communication and organisational performance variables and the final acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis were made.

From the analysis carried out the study reveals that 208 (53.3%) of the respondents were male, 160 (41.0%) were between the ages of 31-35 years, 156 (41.0%) had the MSc / MBA and 208 (53.3%) surveyed were married. The study established resultant effect of communication on organisational performance of the selected manufacturing companies. The result also showed that the two independent variables established a positive effect with the dependent variable. Here are the results of hypothesis testing:

i. Horizontal communication will significantly have effect on organisational performance in the manufacturing industry at a significant (sig =0.000 < 0.05), R²=0.384 and t-statistic=5.970

ii. Vertical communication will significantly have effect on organisational performance in the manufacturing industry at a significant (sig =0.000 < 0.05), R²=0.297. and t-statistic=6.670

iii. Diagonal communication will significantly have effect on organisational performance in the manufacturing industry at a significant (sig =0.000 < 0.05), R²=0.524. and t-statistic=20.647

5.1.1 Implication of Findings

The findings have implications for policy makers and management of Nigerian bottling company on the importance of communication and how best to manage the factors so as to achieve and maintain sustainable organisational performance over time.

5.1.2 Policy makers

Coordinated policies and strategies promote the comprehension and also the adaptability of manufacturing companies to approach organisational performance in a regulatory manner. It presents manufacturing companies opportunities to operate within the confines of governmental policies to favour both local and foreign manufacturing industries. These regulatory systems give every manufacturing company the same opportunity for their technology to facilitate their business operations, sustainable business advisory and training services, simplified regulations as well as affordable relevant infrastructure. Coordinated policies encourage research for the growth of any successful company.
5.1.3 Manufacturing company

This study provides for managing of manufacturing companies and business professionals; this study also provides an intriguing insight into communication that affects their ability to achieve organisational performance among competitors in the industry. Thus, manufacturing companies should place more emphasis in re-enforcing competencies to ensure their business environment, strategies, approach to work and staff quality are fully optimized so as to be a force to reckon within the company in which they operate. The aim of every organization should be to achieve organisational growth, gain adequate training, career advancement programs and opportunities to increase their staff quality.

5.1.4 Society

This study contributes to the extant literature on communication and organisational performance which serves as a basis for potential researchers in Nigerian higher education institutions.

5.2 CONCLUSION

The following conclusion can be derived from the analysis:

1. There is a significant relationship between horizontal communication and organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. The analysis carried out is evident in the positive relationship that was obtained from the analysis. The regression or coefficient of determination value that was obtained in the analysis also confirms our conclusion on the significant relationship between horizontal communication on organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria.

2. Vertical communication significantly impacts organisational performance in Nigerian bottling company, Abuja, Nigeria. The analysis carried out also showed that to a great extent that vertical communication is an important prerequisite to achieve organisational performance.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are to be considered and implemented by stakeholders:
1. To improve the guidance of employees towards organisational goals and mission, top management of manufacturing industries should emphasize the importance of latent and future needs.

2. Good managers in manufacturing and service companies should help to manage change, discuss the changes with employees, encourage participation and place adaptable people in key posts. They should always think about what really motivates and excite their employees.

3. The organization should be consistent and not conflicting about its communication because it creates better awareness, reinforces the message and helps in building a solid brand while conflicting messages confuses and scares customers away.

4. Firms should also create inter-departmental communications to ensure that each group is able to identify unexpected problems or challenges.

5. Proper training must be accorded to employees of manufacturing companies. This will yield better performance results.

5.4 CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

5.4.1 Concept

For concepts, the reviews of relevant literature provided a wealth of information and important background to different concepts related to communication and organizational performance performance. The study also looked at key communication variables such as horizontal communication and vertical communication and how they might affect organisational performance. This study therefore enhances the understanding of researchers and managers in companies about these variables which help to deliver clearer, consistent and compelling messages that can facilitate higher sales turnover. The study also introduced new definitions for the concept of communication and organisational performance.

5.4.2 Theories

Dynamic capability theory succeeds in getting the firms to speedily coordinate and reconfigure externally sourced competences in order to achieve short-term competitive advantage leading to organisational development and sustainability. Dynamic capability theory is an outgrowth of resource-based view theory. While resource-based view theory is concerned with how a firm can achieve competitive advantage, dynamic capability theory is
more concerned about short term competitive advantage that can be used to build longer term competitive advantage for development and sustainability.

5.4.3 Empirics

This study established the communication between horizontal communication and organisational performance. The findings also revealed that vertical communication relates to organisational performance and also has a positive impact on the other. This study contributes to the empirics by establishing that the impact of communication on organisational performance is key and should be evaluated by manufacturing companies to aid in achieving organisational growth and development.

5.5 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study experienced some shortcomings that limit the interpretations and generalization of the findings and as such serve as the basis for suggestions into further research. Some of the limitations identified in the study include:

Firstly, the use of subjective self-reported perceptual measures in assessing the study. Even though attempts were made to identify the best respondents, the accuracy of self-perceptions might be strongly influenced by the respondents experience and frame of references at a point in time. Another limitation is that the scope of the study is too narrow, as it considered just one manufacturing company as result of this, the findings of the study cannot be generalized in a larger context across the cultures of other countries, sectors and business environment, as these may give different relationships between communication and organisational performance of companies.

Lastly, the research model was validated based on cross-sectional data, the survey research is limited in its capacity due to access to funding and time to accurately reflect the prolonged formation of communication and their contribution to organizational performance. More rigorous research, therefore, can be conducted on longitudinal data.

5.6 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER STUDIES
To overcome the limitation of the study the researcher suggests the need for further investigations which are:

1. Future studies should adopt the use of reliable secondary data which are non-perceptual in nature and that could reflect firms activities and performance over time, rather than using subjective self-reported perceptual measures in assessing the study.

2. In the study, only one manufacturing company was examined within the sector, due to the fact that it’s possessed unique characteristics and is ranked high in the industry. Future research should examine the research variables in other research contexts, sectors, countries and business environments so as to increase the generalizability of the findings.

3. Lastly, one of the shortcomings of cross-sectional research design is that information or data are collected only once at different locations. Future research could carry out this study using longitudinal research design, which takes into cognizance performance over a period of time.
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Appendix A

COVER LETTER

Dear Respondent,

I am a student of Baze University, carrying out research on "Communication Channels and Organisational Performance of Nigerian bottling company in Abuja, Nigeria. The study is purely an academic exercise and your assistance is needed in the completion of the work by filling the questionnaire. All information given will be treated with strict confidence. Kindly return the questionnaire at your earliest convenient time.

Please answer the following questions by ticking the one you consider most appropriate among the alternatives.

Thank you for your sincere cooperation.

Name: Chukwuma Emmanuella

(Researcher)

ID Number: BU/15C/BS/1777
QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

PERSONAL DETAILS.

PLEASE KINDLY RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS BY TICKING THE APPROPRIATE OPTIONS

Demography

1. Gender
   Male {  } Female {  }

2. Age group
   25-30 {  } 31-35{  } 36-40{  } 41 and above {  }

3. Educational Qualification
   B.Sc {  }, M.Sc./MBA {  } PHD {  } Others {Please specify_____________________}

4. Marital Status
   Single {  } Married {  } Divorced {  }

Section B

Please the option as they appeal to you: VH = Very High, H = High, U = Undecided, L = Low, VL = Very Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Horizontal Communication</th>
<th>VH</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>How will you rate the following in terms of horizontal communication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication between employees at the same level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for taking your time to fill out the details of this questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vertical Communications</th>
<th>VH</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication of organisational goals and mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Task instructions and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication of task rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication about rules, policies, procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Performance and other feedback from subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diagonal Communications</th>
<th>VH</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication between managers and workers in different functional divisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication with new organizational procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication through other channels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communicate businesses within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication with direct superiors or subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organisational performance</th>
<th>VH</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>VL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Profitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Customer loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Positive image in the eyes of target audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B

## Frequency Table

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 YEARS</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 YEARS</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 YEARS</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 AND ABOVE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Sc</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Sc / MBA</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVORCED</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>390</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication between employees at the same level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>390</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Electronic communication technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>390</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Solution of interdepartmental problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication of organisational goals and mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VALID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task instructions and training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication of task rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication about rules, policies, procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance and other feedback from subordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Customer loyalty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive image in the eyes of target audience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY LOW</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY LOW</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY HIGH</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression

Variables Entered/Removed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HRZC</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP
b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.620a</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>2.77243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), HRZC

ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1862.633</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1862.633</td>
<td>242.330</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2982.303</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>7.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4844.936</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP
b. Predictors: (Constant), HRZC
Coefficients a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.055</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>5.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRZC</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VERC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ORGP

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>2.96327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), VERC

ANOVA a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1437.917</td>
<td>163.754</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>8.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linear Regression Analysis between diagonal communication and organisational performance

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.724(^a)</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>1.75810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), diagonal communication

**Anova**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1317.696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1317.696</td>
<td>426.31</td>
<td>.000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1199.281</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2516.977</td>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: organisational performance

\(^b\) Predictors: (Constant), diagonal communication
b. Predictors: (Constant), diagonal communication