Organizational Levels of Analysis of Communication Satisfaction and Identification in Relation to Job Satisfaction

Ipek Kalemci Tuzun

Abstract—The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between organizational levels of communication satisfaction, identification and job satisfaction. Current study attempted to link organizational and departmental communication satisfaction and strength of job satisfaction through organizational and departmental identification. The results indicate the positive connection between the levels of identification and job satisfaction. Study also found that multiple organizational levels of identification predict job satisfaction. As expected the identification act as a mediator in the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

Index Terms—Employee behavior, communication satisfaction, identification, job satisfaction, turkey.

I. LITERATURE REVIEW

Job satisfaction has been one of the most intensely recognized and studied attitudes in organizational behavior field. The definitions and conceptual maps of job satisfaction have been discussed widely before. One of the most extensively used theoretical definitions of job satisfaction is done by Locke, who theorized the concept as "pleasurable or positive emotional stage resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience" [1]. Locke and Latham, argued that job satisfaction arises when job offer what employees want or value [2] and moreover an employee who has a higher level of job satisfaction can develop positive attitudes toward their job and the organization he/she worked for. That is why; studying job satisfaction and its relationship with other variables facilitate better understanding of how these variables associates with job satisfaction.

Communication is one of the most crucial factors in organizational functioning and it is known that employees devote a considerable portion of their workday to collecting and disseminating information concerning crucial matters such as company policy, performance feedback, role expectations, and task instructions [3]. In organizational settings, communication satisfaction has been broadly defined as an individual's satisfaction with various aspects of communication in interpersonal, group, and organizational contexts [4], [5]. Employee satisfaction with the amount of information available to them may enhance their positive attitudes toward an organization. Additionally, employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs if they are satisfied with the amount of information they received on the job.

Locke and Latham associated job satisfaction with the characteristics of job itself and they stated that sources of job satisfaction vary from individual to individual [2]. In their comprehensive review of the literature on job satisfaction, they conclude that researches have largely validated the connection between job satisfaction and job characteristics. According to the results of the mentioned comprehensive study; work challenge, physical demand, personal interest, the rewards system, goal attainment, superiors, coworkers, subordinates, and fringe benefits are related to jobs satisfaction level of the employee. Moreover, high degree of job satisfaction takes place when the job is comprised by clear and complex goals [1], [2]. When the goals are considered as the outcomes to attain and standards for judging one's accomplishments, it can be said that employees will be more satisfied when they attain those goals and make meaningful progress toward them. Employee's judgment regarding communication satisfaction will take place when employees' goals are met and the messages that are perceived as appropriate and effective within the organizational context.

Within the communication literature there has been consistent support for a positive relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction [3], [6]-[9]. On the other hand, previous researches on communication satisfaction have not been paying too much attention on multidimensional construct in organizational contexts. But researchers have claimed that organizations have subsystems and the emphasis should be given on the importance of distinguishing several organizational levels which employees may have different perceptions regarding communication satisfaction [10], [11]. Employees would be more satisfied with the communication in the level they worked than the organization as a whole. Therefore, job satisfaction level of the employee may be related to both organizational and departmental communication satisfaction.

In examining the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction, it is important to investigate identification. An emerging stream of research has focused upon social identification as a means of gaining insight into the connection between individuals and a specific form of social group such as organization [12]. Much of the work examining organizational identification has been guided by social identity theory and the substantial body of literature related to group identification processes [13]. Organizational identification is defined as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual

defines him or herself in terms of the organization(s) which he or she is a member" [14]. It has been discussed before that, identification is a communicative process, so it can be considered that communication satisfaction of employees can be associated with the employees' identification with the organization [15]. On the other hand the influence of communication satisfaction on the identification process is still limited; however studies appear to indicate a positive relationship between various dimensions of communication and identification [11], [16]. For instance being well-informed about organizational issues will enable an employee to discover the salient characteristics that distinguish one organization from another [17], and enhance identification. It can be suggested that the more adequate the information employees receive about the company and the department the more employees will identify with the organization or department.

When considering the framework of social identity theory in the context of job satisfaction, it seems logical to assume that employees are satisfied with their organization and/or department when they identify with it. As people identify with groups, they gain self-esteem, which may bring emotional attachment and content to the group expressed through increased job satisfaction [18]. A sense of identification creates a perception in which a member associates oneself with the organization's goals and values [19]. Identification with the organization may also prevent employees from becoming alienated, and may be an important precondition for general feelings of job satisfaction [17]. A positive relationship between identification with the organization and job satisfaction has been well established by numerous studies [14], [20], [21]. Recently, increasing attention has also been devoted to the effects of multiple organizational levels of identification.

Previous researches indicate that communication satisfaction and identification should both be reliable predictors of job satisfaction. On the other hand, little research has specifically included measures of multiple organizational levels of communication satisfaction and identification. Different profiles of identification, in other words, different combinations of departmental and organizational identifications have different consequences. From a theoretical point of view, it seems logical that if multiple organizational levels of communication satisfaction influence job satisfaction, then multiple organizational levels of identification will more likely act as a mediator.

In the light of the above explanation research questions of this paper as follows;
1) How different organizational levels of communication satisfaction and identification influence job satisfaction?
2) How different organizational levels of identification act as a mediator in the relationship between different organizational levels of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction?

II. Method

A. Sample and Procedure

In order to test the hypotheses, this researcher administered a survey among employees of insurance companies in Turkey. Questionnaires were sent to 59 Turkish insurance companies but 23 of them accepted to participate to the study. Of the 950 questionnaires sent, 304 useful questionnaires were returned. Respondents fell within the following demographic characteristics: 55% were older than 30 years, the ratio of male/female was 3 to 1, 43% of respondents had been employed at the study organization for more than 5 years, and 74% held a university degree.

B. Measures

In addition to respondents' demographic background data, the questionnaire comprised of three parts (a) organizational identification, (b) communication satisfaction, and (c) job satisfaction. Respondents indicated the extent of agreement with each statement on a 7-point Likert type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*).

The strength of organizational identification is measured using Mael and Ashforth's survey scale [14]. It has been observed that Mael and Ashforth's measure is the most frequently used measure of identification [22]. Identification with work group department is measured by Doosje, Ellemers and Spears, scale [23].

Communication satisfaction was measured with 11-item scales based on Greenbaum, Clampitt and Willihnganz [24]. Communication satisfaction was subdivided into (a) communication satisfaction at the organizational level and (b) communication satisfaction at the department level. Job satisfaction was assessed using a questionnaire adapted from the comprehensive workplace scale developed by Tate, Whatley and Clugston [25].

C. Discriminant Validity of Constructs

Because of the similarity of wordings of items assessing the employee's ratings of the construct, confirmatory factor analysis has been conducted to examine whether organizational and departmental identification and organizational and departmental communication satisfaction are distinct. AMOS [26] software has been used to compare to fit of two nested models (a) a one factor model incorporating both constructs and (b) two factor model distinguishing organizational and departmental identification and organizational and departmental communication satisfaction. On the basis of a sequential chi square difference test [27] for the organizational and departmental communication satisfaction, two factor model, $x^2(44, N=304)$ = 224.72 fit the data significantly better than the one factor model $x^2(44, N=304)$ = 508.25. The two factor model of organizational and departmental communication satisfaction also showed better fit to the data according to the comparative fit index- CFI (two factor model= 0.88 one factor model= 0.69) normative fit index-NFI (two factor model= 0.84, one factor model= 0.67) and the Tucker-Lewis index-TLI (two factor model= 0.82, one factor model= 0.53). Therefore study treated organizational communication satisfaction and departmental communication satisfaction as two separate constructs in subsequent statistical analyses. Same analysis is done for the organizational and departmental identification measures. On the basis of a sequential chi square difference test [27] for the

organizational and departmental identification, two factor model, x^2(14, N=304) = 86.85 fit the data significantly better than the one factor model x^2(14, N=304) = 104.95. The two factor model of organizational and departmental identification also showed better fit to the data according to the CFI, (two factor model=0.84, one factor model= 0.79), NFI (two factor model= 0.86, one factor model= 0.74), and the TLI (two factor model= 0.80, one factor model=0.68). Therefore study treated organizational and departmental identification as two separate constructs in subsequent statistical analyses.

In the next step, to verify the factor structure of the constructs this researcher continued to conduct confirmatory factor analysis in order to verify the dimensionality of multivariate constructs used in this study. The constructs, which were found to have uni-dimensionality, were subjected to a correlation analysis to determine the directionality and magnitude of the relationship among the factors. Means, standard deviations, internal reliabilities and intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table I.

TABLE I: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONAS AND CORRELATIONS

	1	2	3	4	5
1. JS	(0.80)				
2.OCS	0.38**	(0.83)			
3.DCS	0.50**	0.50**	(0.78)		
4. OI	0.30**	0.16**	0.20**	(.70)	
5. DI	0.29 **	0.22**	0.34**	0.31**	(0.82)
MEAN	4.83	4.89	5.31	5.04	6.14
SD	1.25	1.39	1.37	0.88	1.12

Notes: N = 304. Alpha reliabilities are reported on the diagonal. ** correlations are significant at p<0.01 Acronyms *JS* job satisfaction *OCS* organizational communication satisfaction *DCS* departmenatl communication satisfaction *OI* organizational identification *DI* departmental identification

III. RESULTS

The results of this study indicated that organizational and departmental communication satisfaction have significant effect on employee job satisfaction (β=0.45, p<0.01), (β=0.52, p<0.01) respectively. Moreover organizational communication satisfaction has significant effect on organizational identification (β=0.45, p<0.01) and departmental communication satisfaction has significant effect on departmental identification (β=0.26, p<0.01).

Results also revealed that organizational and departmental identification have significant effect on employee job satisfaction (β=0.33, p<0.001), (β=0.47, p<0.001) respectively. Indirect effects of organizational and departmental communication satisfaction on job satisfaction through organizational and departmental identification were tested. Following Preacher and Hayes [28], this test was conducted in two steps; first the direct effect of organizational and departmental communication satisfaction on job satisfaction (without organizational and departmental identification) was tested. A direct effect of organizational

communication satisfaction on job satisfaction fit statistics of the model was an acceptable fit with the following indices, RMSEA at 0.07, NFI at 0.94, and CFI at 0.96. It must be noted that x^2 was significant (x^2=79, 8, p<0.05). Given the observed significant effect of organizational communication satisfaction on job satisfaction, the analyses preceded to the second step, which was the introduction of organizational identification as mediators in the model. The indirect effect of organizational communication satisfaction on job satisfaction fit statistics of the model was an acceptable fit indices with RMSEA at 0.06, while NFI and CFI were 0.90 and 0.93, respectively. Again, it must be noted that x^2 was significant (x^2=162, 2, p<0.05). Therefore study accept that organizational identification partially mediate the relationship between organizational communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

A direct effect of departmental communication satisfaction on job satisfaction fit statistics of the model was acceptable fit for indices with RMSEA at 0.09, while NFI and CFI were 0.90 and 0.92, respectively, although x^2 was significant (x^2=152, 4, p<0.05). Given the observed significant effect of departmental communication satisfaction on job satisfaction, the analyses preceded to the second step, which was the introduction of departmental identification as mediators in the model. An indirect effect of departmental communication satisfaction on job satisfaction fit statistics of the model was an acceptable fit for indices with RMSEA at 0.07, while NFI and CFI were 0.93 and 0.95, respectively, although x^2 was significant (x^2 = 196, 3, p<0.05). Therefore current study found that departmental identification partially mediate the relationship between departmental communication satisfaction and job satisfaction.

IV. CONCLUSION

One of the major conclusions of this research is that organizational identification and communication satisfaction are multiple organizational level concepts. Mentioned finding of this study confirms the results of the previous ones [11], [29], [30]. With regard to communication satisfaction, certain organizational levels do not have the same impact on job satisfaction. In other words, appraisal of a pleasant communication atmosphere in one's department does not necessarily imply that one is satisfies with the communication within the organization. Indeed, a positive relationship between communication satisfaction with the organization and department and job satisfaction does appear to exist. Departmental communication satisfaction appears to have a greater influence on job satisfaction. The results of the present study appear to show that not only the positive connections between identification and job satisfaction, but also organizational levels of identification within the organization may predict job satisfaction. Moreover, findings clearly demonstrate the relevance of social identity for job satisfaction in organizations [31]. While previous researches have focused primarily on identification with an organization, it appears that identification with one's department is also related to satisfaction. This supports the notion from the social identity theory that multiple identities are important to people. In our insurance employee case, multiple

work-related identities are important in determining satisfied employees.

As expected, the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction is mediated by identification. Apparently, the partially mediating effect of departmental identification is stronger than the mediating effect of organizational identification. Social identity and self-categorization theory make predictions about an individual behavior based on perceived group membership and salience of this membership. The organization may be perceived as an attractive target and cause employees to identify with the target. However, because most organizations are relatively large, one may often work with a smaller group. Thus, although all employees are simultaneously a member of the organization, people prefer to identify more with small, face-to-face groups compared to the larger entity [32]. Whereas social categorization would require that employees receive adequate information concerning what is central and distinctive about their organization, self-categorization can be facilitated when employees are provided useful information about their roles in organization [16].

The findings of this study are consistent with the proposal that intent of communication has relatively powerful and proximal influence on job satisfaction. Therefore, for organizations that wish to enhance job satisfaction, it would be worth focusing on efforts to enrich communication both within an organization and within a department level. As an employee's job satisfaction influences behavior that is conductive to the organization, it is vital that managers gain insight into the various antecedents of job satisfaction. In addition, managers should take into account the fact that an organization is composed of multi levels and variety of identities. Simply taking into the consideration the organization as a whole would create a misunderstanding of their employees' job satisfaction. Management should thus be aware of the presence of identities and employees' identification with different organizational levels, which all have a significant influence on job satisfaction. On the other hand, although "us versus them" mind set can be beneficial but it has to be controlled by management. Management should take corrective action, if there is contradiction between departmental and organizational identification or if there is a huge difference between organizational and departmental communication satisfaction. In such a situation management should encourage activities that promote shared experiences and common goals. Because common goals and values provide a flag that all departments can rally around, thus transcending organizational boundaries [33].

The present study makes useful additions to the current knowledge base by examining the effects of multiple communication satisfaction and identification and on job satisfaction of insurance employees. However there are some limitations to this study. The variables in this investigation were measured at one given moment. This implies that the present results represent in a specific situation in time. As it often the case with such questionnaire research, the nature of the collected data is restrictive. Additionally, all constructs were measured on the basis of the respondents self-reporting.

Future research should consider experimental or longitudinal methodology to capture the changing nature of the relationships among communication satisfaction, identification, and job satisfaction. One other limitation of this study is that it covered only one city in Turkey with 304 employees. Thus, future studies should use a less restricted sample to extend the applicability of the finding of this study.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Locke, "What is job satisfaction?" *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* vol. 4, pp. 309-336, 1969.

[2] E. Locke and G. P. Latham, "Work Motivation and Satisfaction: Light at the End of the Tunnel," *Psychological Science*, vol. 1, pp. 240–246, 1990.

[3] N. Frone and P. Major, "The effect of communication quality on job satisfaction among nurses," *Group and Organization Studies*, vol. 23, pp. 123-40, 1988.

[4] M. D. Crino and M. White, "Satisfaction in communication: an examination of the Downs-Hazen measure," *Psychological Reports,* vol. 49, pp. 831-838, 1981.

[5] C. W. Downs and M. D. Hazen, "A Factor Analytic Study of Communication Satisfaction," *The Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 14, pp. 63-73, 1977.

[6] M. Wagenheim and A. S. Rood, "The relationship between employee satisfaction with orgaizational communication and customer orientation," *Managing Leisure*, vol. 15, pp.83-95, 2010.

[7] J. D. Pincus, "Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction and job performance," *Human Communication Research*, vol. 12, pp. 395-419, 1986.

[8] D. J. Mount and K. J. Back, "A factor-analytic study of communication satisfaction in the lodging industry," *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, vol. 23, pp. 401-418, 1999.

[9] J. Lahiff and J. M. Penrose, *Business Communication Strategies and Skills,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall,1997.

[10] R. Falcione and E. Kaplan, "Organizational climate, communication, and culture," C*ommunication Yearbook,* vol. 8, pp. 285–309, 1984.

[11] J. Bartels, A. Pruyn, M. deJong, and I. Joustra, "Multiple organizational levels and the impact of perceived external prestige and communication climate," *Journal of Organizational,* vol. 28, pp. 173-190, 2007.

[12] M. G. Pratt, "To be or not to be: Central question in organizational identification," in *Identity in Organizations: Building Theory through Conversation,* D. A. Whetten and P. C. Godfrey (Eds). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

[13] B. E. Ashforth and F. Mael, "Social identity theory and the organizations," *Academy of Management Review,* vol. 14, pp. 20-39, 1989.

[14] F. Mael and B. E. Ashforth, "Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 13, pp. 103-123, 1992.

[15] K. Burke, A *Rhetoric of Motives.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

[16] A. Smidts, A. Pruyn, and C. B. M. van Riel, "The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 44, pp. 1051-1062, 2001.

[17] J. Dutton, J. Dukerich, and C. V. Harquail, "Organizational images and membership commitment," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 34, pp. 239-263, 1994.

[18] D. J. Terry and A. T. O'Brien "Status, legitimacy, and ingroup bias in the context of an organizational merger," *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, vol. 4, pp. 271-289, 2001.

[19] V. D. Miller, M. Allen, M. K. Casey and J. R. Johnson "Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire," *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 13, pp. 626-658, 2000.

[20] B. E. Ashforth and A. M.Saks, "Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 39, pp. 149-78, 1996.

[21] F. Mael and L. E. Tetrick, "Identifying organizational identification," *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* vol. 52, pp. 813-24, 1992.

[22] M. Riketta, "Organizational identification: A meta-analysis," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 66, pp. 358-84, 2005.

[23] B. Doosje, N. Ellemers, and R, Spears, "Perceived intragroup variability as a function of group status and identification," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 31, pp. 410-436, 1995.

[24] H. H. Greenbaum, P. Clampitt, and S. Willihnganz, "Organizational communication: An examination of four instruments," *Management Communication Quarterly*, vol. 12, pp. 245-282, 1988.

[25] U. Tate, A. Whatley, and M. Clugston, "Sources and outcomes of job tension: A three nation study," *International Journal of Management*, vol. 3, pp. 350-358, 1997.

[26] J. L. Arbuckle and W. Wothke, *AMOS users guide version 4.0.*, Chicago: Smallwaters, 1999.

[27] L. R. James, S. S. Mulaik, and J. M. Bret, *Casual analysis: Assumption models and data,* Beverly Hills, CA:Sage, 1982.

[28] K. J. Preacher and A. F. Hayes, "Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models," *Behavior Research Methods*, vol. 40, pp. 879-91, 2008.

[29] B. E. Ashforth and S. A. Johnson, "Which hat to wear? The relative salience of multiple identities in organizational context, *Social identity process in organizational contexts,* M. A. Hogg and D. J. Terry (Eds.), pp. 31-48, Philadephia: Psychology Press, 2001.

[30] J. Liponnen, K. Helkama, M. E. Olkkonen, and M. Juslin, "Predicting the different profiles of organizational identification: A case of shipyard subcontractors," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol.78, pp. 97-112, 2005.

[31] F. Mael and B. E. Ashforth, "Loyal from day one: Biodata organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 48, pp. 309-333, 1995.

[32] P. G. Clampitt, *Communicating for managerial effectiveness: Problems, strategies, solutions*, Sage: USA, 2009.

[33] D. van Knippenberg and E. C. M. van Schie, "Foci correlates of organizational identification," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 73, pp. 137-147, 2000.

Ipek Kalemci Tuzun received her PhD in Management from the Gazi University. She is an Associate Professor at Baskent University, Faculty of Commercial Sciences. She is currently lecturing organizational behavior and human resource management courses. Her areas of research include human resource management applications and employee behavior, social exchanges in organization and social identity theory.