6-9-2006

In Search of Communication Satisfaction at the State Bar of Georgia

Christopher Tyler Jones

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses

Recommended Citation

IN SEARCH OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AT THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA

by

CHRISTOPHER TYLER JONES

Under the Direction of Arla Bernstein

ABSTRACT

It has long been established that "communication is of fundamental importance in the operation of all organizations, and a knowledge of the efficiency of the general communication system is vital to achieve high levels of organizational effectiveness" (Greenbaum, Clampitt, & Willihnganz, 1988, p. 245). With this in mind, over the past forty years many organizations have turned to communication audits to identify strategies to improve their organizations' communication practices. One such organization is the State Bar of Georgia. Using Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire, this study assessed the health/effectiveness of the Bar's formal and informal communication channels, identified problems and made recommendations for improvement. In addition to gaining a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the Bar's existing communication channels, the audit showed how communication practices at the Bar relate to employee job satisfaction.

INDEX WORDS: Organizational Communication, Communication Audit, Communication Analysis, Employee Communication Surveys, Communication Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction

IN SEARCH OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AT THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA

by

CHRISTOPHER TYLER JONES

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2006

IN SEARCH OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION AT THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA

by

CHRISTOPHER TYLER JONES

Major Professor:	Arla Bernstein
Committee:	Greg Lisby
	Merrill Morris

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2006

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my immediate and extended family for their patience, assistance, understanding and support as I endeavored to earn my graduate degree.

My wife and children: Leisa, Kahlia and Ty

My parents: John and Rachel

My mother-in-law: Carla

My sister-in-law: Casey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX CONTENTS

Page

Introduction and Problem

"What we've got here is failure to communicate." This quote from the movie *Cool Hand Luke*, or some derivative of it, is likely uttered in many organizations and in many different languages throughout the world on a daily basis. In the business sector, when something goes wrong, communication, or a lack of it, is often to blame. If asked, most communication scholars, researchers or practitioners would argue that communication is one of, if not the most important component leading to an organization's success. Greenbaum, Clampitt, & Willihnganz (1988) support this notion by suggesting that "communication is of fundamental importance in the operation of all organizations, and a knowledge of the efficiency of the general communication system is vital to achieve high levels of organizational effectiveness" (p. 245). On the other hand, the lack of effective communication and "information exchange exacerbates uncertainty [and] increases alienation" among employees (Hargie & Tourish, 2000, p. 7). It follows that if an organization's employees are unhappy or dissatisfied, then it is likely that overall organizational effectiveness suffers. Because "there is a clear suggestion … that effective communication promotes organizational cohesion and effectiveness" (Hargie & Tourish, 2000, p. 13), over the past forty years many organizations have turned to communication audits to identify strategies to improve their organizations' communication practices. One organization looking at how communication, and specifically communication satisfaction, translates into improved operations and overall organizational effectiveness is the State Bar of Georgia.

Created by order of the Supreme Court of Georgia in 1964, the State Bar of Georgia is a mandatory organization comprised of more than 37,000 lawyers licensed to practice law in the state. The Bar is governed by rules and regulations, which serve as a guide for Bar members,

officers, and staff. According to the bylaws of the organization, the state Bar exists "to foster

among the members of the Bar of this state the principles of duty and service to the public; to

improve the administration of justice; and to advance the science of law." All persons authorized

to practice law in Georgia are required to be members. The State Bar of Georgia has strict codes

of ethics and discipline that are enforced by the Supreme Court of Georgia through the State

Bar's Office of the General Counsel. Through membership dues and other contributions, the Bar

maintains programs that mutually benefit its members and the general public. Currently, the Bar

has an $8 million budget and a staff of more than seventy full-time employees to administer all

its programs. The Bar's headquarters is located in Atlanta, with a South Georgia satellite office

located in Tifton.

Since its creation more than forty years ago there is no evidence that a communication

audit has ever been conducted. Because of this, the Bar may be operating on borrowed time.

According to Goldhaber and Krivonos (1977), "Just as accountants' and physicians' check-ups

provide clients information necessary to retain the 'health' needed for survival, so too does a

'communication audit' provide an organization with advance information which may prevent

major breakdowns that limit overall effectiveness" (p. 41).

Like clockwork, the State Bar conducts a financial audit each year, but overlooks the

communication audit. Although the Bar's communicative health could be as fit as that of a

marathoner's body, it could also be as poor as that of the person "biggie sizing" his or her fast

food order. The problem is, no one knows for sure.

For the purposes of full disclosure, it is important to note that the author of this study is

an employee of the State Bar of Georgia.

Purpose

The purposes of conducting a communication audit are to gauge the health/effectiveness of the State Bar of Georgia's formal and informal communication channels, to identify problems and to make recommendations for improvement. This will be achieved by administering, to Bar staff, an online version of Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) (see Appendix 1 for questionnaire).

Clampitt and Downs (1993) contend that the CSQ is not only "one of the most widely used instruments" for conducting communication audits, but it is also "arguably the best measure of communication satisfaction in the organizational arena" (p. 6). According to Gray and Laidlaw (2004), what separates the CSQ from other survey instruments is its comprehensiveness – "it assesses the direction of information flow, the formal and informal channels of communication flow, relationships with various members of the organization, and the forms of communication" (p. 428). By conducting an audit, Bar leaders should not only gain a clearer understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the organization's existing communication channels, but also receive valuable feedback from employees on whether the work environment at the Bar is one that fosters job satisfaction.

<div align="center">

Literature Review

</div>

Even though organizational success has been shown to be tied to effective communication, it is ironic that "as an academic field of study, organizational communication is … a relatively newcomer upon the scene" (Tompkins & Redding, 1988, p. 5). In fact, according to Redding and Tompkins (1988) the term "organizational communication" did not gain traction, replacing "business and industrial communication" until the late 1960s to early 1970s (p. 6). It was during this time that a paradigm shift occurred, where communication researchers and

practitioners moved from a narrow focus to a "much broader range of concepts drawn from contemporary rhetorical theory, the social sciences, and philosophy of science" (Tompkins & Redding, 1988, p. 11). Although this was an exciting time of growth for the field of organizational communication, it also proved to be a challenging time as researchers tried to distinguish the field from other areas of study (Thompkin & Wanca-Thibault, 2001). Even today, scholars are struggling to "define and redefine the focus, boundaries, and future of the field" (Thompkin & Wanca-Thibault, 2001, xvii).

Part of the struggle can be attributed to the apparent difficulty researchers and others have in defining the term "organizational communication." Depending on whom you ask, the term means many different things. In fact, Deetz (2001) contends that any definition of the term would be arbitrary and potentially cause others to be blind to future insights. Instead, he argues that a better way to understand the term is to ask, "What do we see or what are we able to do if we think of organizational communication in one way versus another." Fortunately, there are other scholars willing to offer definitions for comparative analysis. According to Corman, Banks, Bantz and Mayer (1990), organizational communication "involves the study of how organization in social collectives is produced and affected by communication" (p. 1). A clearer definition, and one that is more relevant to this thesis, is Greenbaum's (1974), where he defined organizational communication as a system identified by purpose, operational procedures and structure. More specifically, he believed that:

> The purpose of organizational communication is to facilitate the achievement of organizational goals. The operational procedures involve the utilization of functional communication networks related to organizational goals; the adoption of communication policies appropriate to communication objectives; and the implementation of such policies through suitable communication activities. The structural elements include (a) the organization unit, (b) functional communication networks, (c) communication policies, and (d) communication activities (p. 740).

One way to gain a better understanding of organizational communication, and how the different systems function independently and as a whole, is by conducting a communication audit. According to Hargie and Tourish (2000), "A communication audit strips away myths, fears and illusions about the communication climate within organizations, and about the wider culture within which organizations work. In their place, it provides an accurate diagnosis of the organization's communicative health" (p. 26). To gain better insight into the nature of communication audits, their value to scholars and practitioners, and the connection between employee job satisfaction and effective organizational communication, this paper discusses the history of communication audits, provides an in-depth overview of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire, reviews literature focusing on employee job satisfaction, and analyzes the nature of communication networks, paying special attention to formal and informal channels.

History of The Communication Audit

Along with the development of organizational communication as a legitimate field of study came the creation of instruments designed to evaluate or measure organizational communication. In 1954, Odiorne was one of the first to be credited with using the phrase "communication audit" (Goldhaber & Krivonos, 1977). According to Shelby and Reinsch (1996), Odiorne developed "a questionnaire with 16 dichotomous items to survey top managers and project engineers" (p. 97), which focused on message content and communication climate.

Goldhaber and Krivonos (1977) identified numerous problems with early communication audits utilizing instruments like Odiorne's, these included:

1. Most researchers relied upon only one instrument to gather their data, thus limiting the representativeness of their findings.
2. Most studies gathered their data in a single organization, thus limiting the generalizability of their findings.

3. Most studies reported very small samples, usually composed of managers and other professionals, again limiting the representativeness.
4. Due to the lack of standardized procedures and instruments, no norms describing communication behavior in different organizations exist, thus preventing comparative analysis and limiting external validity.
5. Most studies assess attitudes and perceptions with only limited measurement of actual behaviors, thus limiting our conclusions to how people feel and think communication is occurring.
6. With few exceptions, most researchers have not measured communication over time, thus producing "snapshots" instead of "movies" of organizational communication performance.
7. Little predictive validity exists for the instruments discussed due to limited amount of data collected about organizational performance (p. 42).

These weaknesses led to the creation and development of many of the communication audit instruments in use today. In the early 1990s, Downs, DeWine, and Greenbaum (1994) conducted a comprehensive analysis of the communication instruments that have been used over the last three decades. In order to be included in their list, among other things, instruments were required to: comprehensively examine communication in organizations, be developed by communication scholars, and demonstrate reliability and validity. Four primary comprehensive instruments were identified, which examine communication throughout entire organizations, they are: the International Communication Association Audit, the Organizational Communication Scale, the Organizational Communication Development Audit Questionnaire, and the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The ICA Audit Survey developed by Goldhaber and a team of scholars from the International Communication Association in 1976, consists of 122 questions divided into eight major sections: (1) Amount of information received about various topics versus amount desired, (2) Amount of information sent about various topics versus amount desired, (3) Amount of follow-up versus amount desired, (4) Amount of information received from various sources versus amount desired, (5) Amount of information received from various channels versus

amount desired, (6) Timeliness of information, (7) Organizational relationships, and (8) Satisfaction with organizational outcomes (Hargie & Tourish, 2000).

The Organizational Communication Scale developed by Roberts and O'Reilly in 1973, is comprised of 35 questions using a seven-point Likert scale to assess: "Trust for supervisor, influence of supervisor, importance of upward mobility, desire for interaction, accuracy, summarization, gate keeping and overload" (Hargie & Tourish, 2000, p. 51).

The Organizational Communication Development Audit Questionnaire developed by Osmo Wiio and his colleagues in 1974 was designed to: "determine how well the communication system helps the organization to translate its goals into desired end-results" (Greenbaum, Clampitt & Willhnganz, 1988, p. 259). The OCD contains 76 items grouped into 12 dimensions: (1) Overall communication satisfaction, (2) amount of information received from different sources—now, (3) amount of information received from different sources—ideal, (4) amount of information received about specific job items—now (5) amount of information received about specific job items—ideal, (6) areas of communication that need improvement, (7) job satisfaction, (8) availability of computer information system, (9) allocation of time in a working day, (10) respondent's general communication behavior, (11) organization-specific questions, and (12) information-seeking patterns (Greenbaum et. al, 1988).

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire, developed by Downs and Hazen in 1977, is comprises 51 questions covering eight communication factors: (1) Communication Climate, (2) Supervisory Communication, (3) Organizational Integration, (4) Media Quality, (5) Co-worker Communication, (6) Corporate Information, (7) Personal Feedback, (8) Subordinate Communication (Greenbaum et. al, 1988). The CSQ will be addressed in more detail later in the paper.

Clearly each of these instruments has its own unique strength, but ultimately they are all designed to measure overall communication effectiveness (Scott, Shaw, Timmerman, Frank and Quinn, 1999). Depending on the instrument used, communication audits can "provide organizations with various functional benefits, including program impacts, communication costs, verification of facts, diagnosis, feedback, communication changes, and training" (Scott et. al, 1999, p. 55). The end result of a communication audit is "improved productivity, better use of communication/information technology, more efficient use of time, discovery of hidden information resources, improved morale, and a more vibrant organizational culture" (Scott et al., 1999, p. 55). Another advantage of the communication audit, according to Coffman (2004), is that it is evaluative in that it provides a "snapshot" of an organizations current communication processes, and it is formative in that it "points to areas in which the organization can strengthen its performance" (p. 1).

In highlighting the value of organizational communication evaluation (OCE) processes or as this paper has referred to them – communication audits, Greenbaum, Hellweg and Falcione (1988) argue for four main reasons why OCEs should be conducted. First, they develop benchmarks for management to measure against. Second, OCEs improve internal communication systems by outlining strengths and weaknesses and offering suggestions for improving the existing communication channels. Third, OCEs assists managers in improving organizational operations. Last, OCEs identify ways to bridge existing organizational communication gaps.

Despite the valuable information that an organizational communication evaluation or audit can yield regarding an organizations overall communicative health, auditors may sometimes face resistance from those in the organization who enjoy the status quo or follow the

old adage that "ignorance is bliss." This resistance often comes from the already overworked

and understaffed communications departments, whose employees do not want more work or

criticism thrown at them, or the managers, who fear an audit may be critical of, or show

weaknesses in, their leadership style. Badaracco (1988) contends that "the results of a

communication audit are always subject to political interpretation, to the 'boomerang' effect,

where the symptoms yield not solutions but a 'shoot the messenger' syndrome that rejects the

cure" (p. 27). Because of this, many public relations practitioners have suggested that

conducting communication audits in today's corporate climate is a high-risk activity and should

be undertaken with care (Badaracco, 1988). However, most would agree that the pros far

outweigh the cons when it comes to the valuable information an audit can provide.

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

Developed around the same time as the ICA survey, the CSQ, though less

comprehensive, is an efficient and proven instrument used to audit the communication systems

and practices of organizations (Downs & Adrian, 2004). To date, the CSQ "has been the basis

for more than 30 PhD dissertations and MA theses," and has been used in a variety of

organizations, "including manufacturing plants, television stations, school districts, consulting

firms, banks, hotels, mental health centers, advertising agencies, airlines, hospitals, and police

departments" (Downs & Adrian, 2004, pp. 139-140).

Downs, who co-developed the CSQ, was also a member of the group who researched and

developed the ICA survey. One significant difference in the development of the two audit

instruments is that the ICA survey was based on "a theoretical compilation of all those areas that

the (ICA survey) team thought might be significant to measure in an organization"; whereas,

CSQ items "were selected on the basis of factor analysis out of an original pool of many

questions" (Downs & Adrian, 2004, p. 139). Specifically, Downs and Hazen's factor analysis was based on the results of a questionnaire that was administered to 225 employees from a variety of organizations (Downs & Adrian, 2004). Based on the survey results, Downs and Hazen made adjustments and created an updated questionnaire, which was administered to four additional organizations. After the results were factor analyzed, eight stable dimensions of communication satisfaction were identified: personal feedback, supervisory communication, subordinate communication, co-worker or horizontal communication, organizational integration, corporate information, communication climate, and media quality (Downs & Adrian, 2004).

In brief, personal feedback deals with an employee's desire to know how his/her work is judged and his/her performance appraised. Subordinate communication deals with supervisors' confidence in employees' comfort in initiating upward communication. Supervisory communication includes satisfaction with two-way (upward and downward) communication with supervisors (i.e. do employees feel that supervisors value their input) (Greenbaum et. al, 1988). "These three dimensions (personal feedback, supervisory communication, and subordinate communication) represent communication outcomes in interpersonal contexts" (Mueller & Lee, 2002, p. 222). Co-worker or horizontal communication deals with employees' informal communication satisfaction with and between co-workers. Organizational integration deals with employees' satisfaction regarding the amount of information they receive about their immediate environment (i.e. information about departmental plans and job requirements) (Greenbaum et. al, 1988). According to Mueller and Lee (2002), "Co-worker communication and organizational integration dimensions reflect communication experiences in group contexts" (p. 222). Corporate information deals with employees' feelings regarding the amount of information, as a whole, they receive from the organization, to include information regarding the organization's

goals, policies, and financial health. Communication climate deals with employees' perception

of the overall health of the communication atmosphere, to include satisfaction with

organizational and personal communication. Media quality deals with the perception that the

amount of communication employees receive (i.e. in meetings and through email) is about the

right amount (Greenbaum et. al, 1988). "These three dimensions (corporate communication,

communication climate, and media quality) represent communication experiences in

organizational contexts" (Mueller & Lee, 2002, p. 222).

Downs and Hazen (1977) concluded that "it is possible that the various dimensions of

communication satisfaction can provide a barometer of organizational functioning, and the

concept of communication satisfaction can be a useful tool in an audit of organizational

communication" (p. 72).

Employee Job Satisfaction

With 40 hours as the standard workweek in the United States, it is safe to say that,

excluding sleep time, Americans spend as much, if not more, time at work during the week as

they do at home. With this being the case, it seems logical that employees would seek job

satisfaction anyway they can get it. Research has shown that one of the easiest ways to help

employees find job satisfaction is to ensure they are happy with organizational communication

(Pincus, Knipp, & Rayfield, 1990). Pettit, Goris, and Vaught (1997) suggest that employees'

perception of the organization's communication system and their "supervisor's communication

style, credibility, and content … influence the amount of satisfaction (morale) he or she receives

from the job" (p. 81). Because of this, research question 1 seeks to discover:

> RQ1: What is the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction
> for Bar employees?

In his 1986 field study of 327 hospital nurses, Pincus found that employee-immediate supervisor communication is of vital importance when it comes to employee job satisfaction. On the other hand, where organizational communication is poor, researchers tend to find lower staff commitment, reduced production, greater absenteeism, and higher turnover (Hargie & Tourish, 2000).

To gain a better understanding of the term satisfaction, as it relates to workers, Downs, Clampitt, and Pfeifer (1988) suggest that Locke's 1976 definition is a good starting point. Locke defined satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experiences" (as cited in Downs et. al, 1988, p. 197). However, Downs et al. (1988) also point out that as with numerous other academic subjects, researchers' theoretical discussions have led to the development of a variety of variations of the definition. Although researchers do not agree on an exact definition, Downs et al. (1988) point to four areas of consensus, which include:

> First, job satisfaction deals primarily with affective or feeling states. The concern is with emotional reactions or evaluations to the job. Second, job satisfaction is exclusively used as an individualistic concept. That is, the major concern is with how an individual, as opposed to a group or company, reacts to the job… Third, the concept of job satisfaction has a central focal point. Evaluations must relate to some object or concern. In this case, the evaluation is related to the work, task, or job the employee does… Finally, job satisfaction is primarily an evaluation of the present or past feelings about the job (p. 197).

Citing a variety of sources, Anderson and Martin (1995) contend that satisfaction can also be understood by looking at: "(1) needs theory or the extent to which needs are met, (2) discrepancy theory or what employees actually receive versus what they believe they should receive, (3) equity theory or a combination of input-output balance, or (4) Herzberg's intrinsic (recognition) or extrinsic (pay) factors" (p. 253). Yet another way of understanding what impacts employee satisfaction is by looking at relationship management theory. Unlike many

traditional public relations theories, which have focused on ways to manipulate public behavior, the relationship management approach focuses on establishing and maintaining "mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends" (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998, p. 56). According to the theory, relationships are developed by focusing on trust, openness, involvement, investment and commitment (Ledingham, 2003). Ultimately, Ledingham (2003) argues that relationship management theory is about developing symmetry, by "effectively managing organizational–public relationships around common interests and shared goals, over time, [which] results in mutual understanding and benefit for interacting organizations and publics" (Ledingham, 2003, p. 190).

To be successful, Ledingham and Bruning (1998) suggest that "organizations must (1) focus on the relationships with their key publics, and (2) communicate involvement of those activities/programs that build the organization–public relationship to members of their key publics" (p. 63). One key public often overlooked, or taken for granted, by organizations, are employees. Acknowledging this issue, D'Aprix has been quoted as saying, "one of the great ironies in the practice of public relations is our tendency to shortchange the employee audience in our organization" (Wright, 1995, p. 183). Taking this one step further, Cutlip, Center, and Broom (1985) posited that "no organizational relationships are as important as those with employees" (as cited in Wright, 1995, p. 182). So, it raises the question why has this vitally important key public been overlooked?

From D'Aprix's point of view, organizational devaluing of employees is at an all time high. The renowned organizational communication expert said, "The leadership of more companies than I can count has declared war on the workforce. In today's global economy, employees have often become dispensable" (Gorman, 2003, p. 13). From a public relations

perspective, Wright (1995) contends that "The public relations function appears to have spent time attending to relationships with external publics at the expense of internal audiences" (p. 184). Wright (1995) points to two issues that have contributed to why "the major emphasis of American public relations—teaching, practice and research—has involved external communications" (p. 182). The first is because most colleges and universities that teach public relations are "housed in journalism and mass communication departments… where neither Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) accreditation nor Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) certification recommends… separate course in employee (or internal) communications" (Wright, 1995, p. 182). The second reason is because most of the employee communication positions in organizational public relations departments are staffed by "junior staff employees who perform mainly basic technician-related tasks such as writing and editing the company newsletter" (Wright, 1995, p. 182). Clearly there is room for improvement when it comes to an organization's treatment and attitude toward its employees. Wright (1995) was on the right track when he said, "The key to success in employee relations in the future will involve building relationships much more than it will involve disseminating information" (p. 192). But if employees, arguably one of, if not the most important public, in any organization are going to achieve the job satisfaction they seek, then college and university public relations and business programs must start putting more of a focus on the value and strategic importance of internal publics and how to effectively communicate with them.

Communication Networks

Internal publics typically send and receive information through communication networks, comprised of formal and informal channels, which according to Guetzkow "serve as the matrix"

which holds an organization together (1965, as cited in Hirokawa, 1979, p. 83). The primary

difference between these channels is the structured and predictable nature of formal channels, as

represented by an organizational chart, which typically outlines official or expected upward and

downward communication channels (Monge & Contractor, 2001). Informal channels or the

"grapevine" are typically comprised of horizontal communication networks (Hirokawa, 1979, p.

89).

Formal Channels

Formal channels represent "the legitimate authority of the organization…through which

orders are transmitted downward and information is transmitted upward" (Monge & Contractor,

2001, p. 445). Rogers and Agarwala-Rogers "suggest that downward communication is the most

frequently occurring form of vertical communication in most organizations" (1976, as cited in

Hirokawa, 1979, p. 84). According to Hirokawa (1979), downward communication channels

typically consist of:

> (1) information concerning the current/future status of specific aspects of the
> organizations, new organizational policies, recent administrative decisions, and recent
> changes in the standard-operating-procedures; and (2) information of a task-related nature
> which generally provides subordinates with the technical know-how to accomplish their
> tasks or assignments with greater efficiency and productivity (p. 84).

Specifically, these downward communication messages take "the forms of orders, company

publications, performance judgments, job instructions, company orientations, and training for the

job," and are created by organizational leaders to travel "down the chain of command from

managers to subordinates" (Downs & Adrian, 2004, p. 54). According to Hirokawa (1979),

"The most persistent problem with downward communication concerns the accuracy and

adequacy of information reaching lower levels of the organization" (p. 84). Additionally, Downs

and Adrian (2004) point out that this information is often distorted, filtered or arrives too late for

it to be of significant benefit to lower-level employees. This obviously creates feelings of frustration for employees and management. Employees wonder why they are not receiving the information they need to perform their jobs, and upper management wonders why their directives are going unfulfilled.

If there are communication flow issues with downward communication, then it should not be that surprising to find communication flow issues with upward communication as well. "Upward communication generally refers to messages which flow from subordinates to superiors, usually for the purpose of asking questions, providing information, providing feedback, and voicing opinions or suggestions" (Hirokawa, 1979, p. 86). Downs and Adrian (2004) contend that despite arguments suggesting that quality downward communication is the best indication of organizational communication effectiveness, "some of the most important information processing goes from employees at one level to their supervisors" (p. 54). Citing studies from the 1950s and 1960s, Putnam and Cheney (1990) suggest one of the problems with the upward flow of information is that lower-level employees have the tendency "to distort messages they send" up the chain of command (p. 48). Research has shown that people with high achievement drive are more likely to distort messages (Putnam & Cheney, 1990). Hirokawa (1979) attributes this behavior to the tendency of subordinates to only convey the information that shows them in the most favorable light. Another reason distortion takes place is that employees "generally see the possession of information as power, and the relinquishing of it as a loss of power. Thus subordinates often hoard as much information as possible for as long as possible before sending it up the hierarchy" (Hirokawa, 1979, p. 87).

Informal Channels

Clearly, there are numerous impediments to the efficient and accurate flow of information up and down the chain of command. This is likely one of the reasons for the development of informal or horizontal channels, which many employees find "to be the lifeblood of their organizations" (Downs & Adrian, 2004, p. 59). Conrad and Poole (2002) argue that informal networks may actually produce more accurate information than formal channels because the communication is voluntary and not based on power or status. Therefore "mutual give and take is less inhibited … so communicators provide more detail in their messages and are more willing to give and receive feedback" (Conrad & Poole, 2002, p. 74).

Hirokawa (1979) has identified four functions of horizontal communication in organizations: task or project coordination, problem solving, sharing of information, and conflict resolution. Through task or project coordination, employees share and discuss their thoughts and feelings on how respective members are contributing to the group's overall objectives (Hirokawa, 1979). In regards to problem solving, employees feel comfortable brainstorming ideas on ways to solve the different challenges facing the organization (Hirokawa, 1979). Through the sharing of information, employees gain knowledge that is sometimes filtered out of downward communication (Hirokawa, 1979). It is the open and free-flowing nature of horizontal communication that allows employees to resolve conflicts, often times without having to bring it to the attention of their supervisors (Hirokawa, 1979). If employees, especially those in different departments had to follow formal channels to resolve conflict, their issue may never be solved. Imagine if you will an employee having to explain an issue to his or her supervisor, who in turn must explain the same situation to his or her supervisor, all the way up the chain of command and back down to the other employee's immediate supervisor then all the way back up

and down the chain again. This process would be a colossal waste of time and effort—taking away from time that could be spent on achieving the organization's goals and objectives.

Overall, it appears that formal and informal communication channels are vital to an organization's success. Conrad and Poole (2002) contend that employees who participate in "informal networks have higher morale, job satisfaction, and commitment to their organization … and are better able to meet other peoples' communication needs than employees who are not actively involved" (p.73). The strength of formal communication channels can be found in their predictable structure, which gives employees an efficient and dependable way to handle routine situations (Conrad & Poole, 2002, p. 74). Due to the importance of both formal and informal channels, research question 2 seeks to discover:

> RQ2: What is the relationship between formal and informal communication channels and job satisfaction for Bar employees?

Research Objectives

In today's technologically advanced society where employees are continually bombarded with information from internal and external audiences through email messages, faxes, internal memos, work-related phone calls, personal phone calls, instant messaging, face-to-face interactions, etc., managers have to work harder than ever to ensure employees receive, understand, and prioritize the messages they are sending to them. It is challenging enough for employees to sift through the volume and variety of communication stimuli they receive on a daily basis, but to complicate matters further, Downs and Adrian (2004) warn "that messages sent throughout organizations are not necessarily the ones received, because original messages are filtered through the motivations, listening habits, and perceptions of their receivers" (p. 4). There is an old saying about knowledge being power. If this is truly the case, then the more organizational leaders know about communication processes, especially as they relate

specifically to their organization, the better prepared they will be to succeed. Downs and Adrian (2004) contend that "organizations need to monitor how well employees communicate because the organization's very survival often depends on workers' ability to exchange and coordinate information" (p. 2). This is especially true at the State Bar of Georgia with its highly decentralized structure, as can be seen in its relatively flat organizational chart (see appendix 2a and 2b). Unlike in centralized organizations, where "only those employees at the top would make decisions" (Conrad & Poole, p. 66, 2002), in decentralized environments, organizational hierarchies are flat, decision-making is pushed down and lower-level employees are empowered (Conrad & Poole, 2002). Jablin (1987) points out that decentralization allows subordinates to participate in the decision-making process. In researching the relationship between centralization/decentralization and organizational communication, Hage et al. (1971) found that "if power is dispersed in an organization, not only does volume of communication increase, but the flow of communication across departmental boundaries is also increased" (p. 869). The organizational structure of the Bar creates an environment where employees in each of the eleven departments must communicate regularly because they depend on one another to accomplish the Bar's objective of effectively and efficiently serving its members.

Due to intra-departmental dependency and because a communication audit has never been conducted at the Bar, this study seeks to gain better understanding of the State Bar of Georgia's formal and informal communication channels, to identify problems and make recommendations for improvement, and to discover the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction for Bar employees. Results from the CSQ should provide an accurate picture of the Bar's overall communication climate and specifically answer the following questions:

RQ1. What is the relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction for Bar employees?

RQ2. What is the relationship between formal and informal communication channels and job satisfaction for Bar employees?

Rationale for Research Question 1

In evaluating the intersection between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction at the State Bar of Georgia, for the purposes of this study, communication satisfaction (the independent variable) is defined as how fulfilled employees are with information exchange and the various communication channels within his or her work environment. The dimensions for measuring communication satisfaction are comprised of Downs and Hazen's eight communication satisfaction elements (see Table 1 for definitions), which include: personal feedback, supervisory communication, subordinate communication, horizontal communication, organizational integration, corporate information and communication climate. The dependent variable, job satisfaction, is defined as one's feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of their work. Survey results should indicate which, if any, of the eight communication satisfaction dimensions are significantly tied to employee job satisfaction.

Of the eight factors, Downs and Hazen (1977) found that "the most important communication dimensions interacting with job satisfaction are personal feedback, relation with supervisor, and communication climate" (p. 72). Citing studies that have used the CSQ, among other things, Varona (1996) discovered that: (1) In regards to communication, there are definite areas of greatest employee satisfaction (supervisory communication and subordinate communication) and least employee satisfaction (personal feedback); (2) Employees in managerial roles tend to be more satisfied with communication than those who are not; (3) Demographic variables do not appear to be closely related to an employees level of

communication satisfaction. It will be interesting to see if the answers Bar employees provide

show similar results.

Table 1
Communication Satisfaction Elements

Context	Dimension/Corresponding Survey Questions	Definition
Interpersonal	Personal Feedback *Questions: 11, 12, 13, 18, 22*	How is employee work judged and performance appraised
	Supervisor Communication *Questions: 24, 26, 29, 33, 38*	How willing and comfortable are employees initiating upward communication
	Subordinate Communication *Questions: 43, 44, 45, 46, 47*	How satisfied are employees with two-way (upward and downward) communication with supervisors
Group	Horizontal Communication *Questions: 32, 34, 35, 36, 41*	How comfortable are employees using informal communication channels to discuss issues with co-workers
	Organizational Integration *Questions: 8, 9, 14, 15, 19*	How much information do employees receive about their immediate environment (departmental plans and job requirements)
Organizational	Corporate Information *Questions: 10, 16, 17, 20, 21*	Whether the amount of information, as a whole, employees receive regarding the organization's goals, policies and financial health is sufficient
	Communication Climate *Questions: 23, 25, 27, 30, 31*	How do employees view the overall communication health, to include satisfaction with organizational and personal communication
	Media Quality *Questions: 28, 37, 39, 40, 42*	Whether the amount of communication employees receive (i.e. in meetings and through email) is about the right amount to help them adequately perform their job

Rationale for Research Question 2

One sign of a healthy organizational communication climate is the presence of formal

and informal communication channels (Conrad & Poole, 2002). Typically, formal channels

work well when it comes to the everyday process of supervisors giving orders and workers

providing feedback and status updates, but prove inefficient when it comes to "meeting

unanticipated communications needs, for managing crises, for dealing with complex or detailed

problems, sharing personal information, or exchanging information rapidly" (Conrad & Poole,

2002, p. 74). This is where informal networks help organizations the most, "by compensating

for the weaknesses in formal communication" channels (Conrad & Poole, 2002, p. 74).

 The Bar's formal communication channels are composed of chain of command email

messages, chain of command phone conversations, the Bar's bi-monthly newsletter, a bulletin

board, group meetings and one-on-one employee/supervisor discussions. The Bar's informal

channels include email messages, phone conversations, face-to-face peer meetings and one-on-

one peer/peer discussions. In addition to analyzing responses to the open-ended question, in

order to gauge the effectiveness of the flow of information through the Bar's formal and informal

channels, special attention will be paid to the survey questions, which deal with formal channels

(questions 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 37, 39, 40, 42) and informal channels (questions 32, 34, 35, 36,

41) (see Table 2 for details).

Table 2
Formal/Informal Channel Evaluation

Channel	Survey Items
Formal	**Corporate Information Items** 10. Information about company policies and goals. 16. Information about government regulations affecting the State Bar of Georgia. 17. Information about changes in the State Bar. 20. Information about profits and/or financial standing. 21. Information about achievements and/or failures of the Bar.
Formal	**Media Quality Items** 28. Extent to which the Bar communications are interesting and helpful. 37. Extent to which our meetings are well organized. 39. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise. 40. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication at the Bar are basically healthy. 42. Extent to which the amount of communication at the Bar is about right.
Informal	**Horizontal Communication Items** 32. Extent to which the grapevine is active in the Bar. 34. Extent to which communication with other employees at my level is accurate and free flowing. 35. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies. 36. Extent to which my work group is compatible. 41. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.

Methodology

An email was sent to all seventy-four Bar employees via the Bar's employee email distribution list. The email contained a hyperlink to an electronic version of the CSQ, and provided information on what the data will be used for, while ensuring participant anonymity. The email also explained how participation was voluntary but would be greatly appreciated.

The basic aim of survey research is to describe and explain statistically the variability of certain features of a population (Baxter & Babbie, 2004). What makes the survey method appropriate as a data gathering and data-analysis technique for this study is its strength as a tool to quantitatively measure answers to questions concerning a group's attitudes, beliefs, and

behavior (Church & Waclawski, 1998) about the Bar's communication climate. According to

Austin and Pinkleton (2001):

> Organizations commonly turn to survey research when they want to understand their
> target audiences' awareness, opinions, attitudes, knowledge, behavioral motivations,
> media use, and other information necessary for successful campaign implementation or
> evaluation (p. 135).

Baxter and Babbie (2004) contend that, "the heart of trustworthy survey research rests with the

reliability and validity of the questions asked" (p. 168). The questions for this survey were

derived from the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire that was developed by Downs &

Hazen (1977). The questionnaire was constructed to indicate level of satisfaction of respondents

using a one-to-seven point Likert scale that ranges between 1= "very dissatisfied" and 7= "very

satisfied". Although some questions have been raised about the stability of the eight original

dimensions, researchers have confirmed the reliability and statistical validity of the CSQ. Rubin

et al. (1994) reported:

> Test-retest (2-week interval) reliability of the CSQ was reported at .94 (C. W. Downs &
> Hazen, 1977). Coefficient alpha reliabilities for the eight dimensions have been
> consistently high, ranging from .72 to .96 for studies in the United States (Potvin,
> 1991/1992) and Australia (A. Downs, 1991). …Evidence of concurrent validity exists.
> CSQ factors have been found to be highly correlated with job satisfaction (C. W. Downs
> & Hazen, 1977) (pps.115-116).

Crino and White (1981) reported that in addition to the coefficient alpha being high, the average

correlations among subscale items were high as well, suggesting that the subscales could be used

with confidence (see Table 3).

Table 3
Estimates of CSQ Internal Consistency Measure

	Coefficient
General Organizational Perspective *(Corporate Information)*	.80
Organizational Integration	.76
Personal Feedback	.86
Relation with Superior *(Supervisory Communication)*	.84
Horizontal Informal Communication	.75
Relation with Subordinate *(Subordinate Communication)*	.85
Media Quality	.81
Communication Climate	.79

(Crino & White, 1981, p. 837)

Another advantage of the CSQ is it also yields qualitative data through responses to an open-ended question. According to Hargie and Tourish (2000) the advantage to posing open-ended questions "is the low level of influence imposed on participants – where they can present their opinions, attitudes, thoughts, feelings and understandings unrestricted by the interviewer" (p. 76). The answers to the questions should provide more insight into the Bar's communication environment. Downs and Adrian (2004) warn that although "one of the most enlightening aspects of the audit is reading through the responses to the open-ended questions," auditors must avoid giving too much weight to "one particularly insightful or impressive comment" because it "may become overly persuasive in weighing the actual evidence" (p. 150).

Data Analysis

Data from the questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS statistical software. First, descriptive analysis and frequency calculations were computed to report the distribution of the

respondent demographics. Then, factor analysis (with principal component extraction) was performed as a data reduction method to identify a smaller number of factors explaining the variance observed in the eight communication satisfaction dimensions. Cronbach's alpha was computed to test internal reliability to determine if the communication satisfaction dimensions were measured in a useful way. Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to measure the relationships between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Downs and Adrian (2004) suggest another way to understand the data, as it relates to the 40 communication satisfaction items, is to rank-order them "on the basis of the means from 1 to 40… to determine conceptual patterns within each group" (pp. 146-147). Ultimately, "mean scores that fall well below the conceptual midpoint (a 5 on a 0-10 scale or a 4 on a 1-7 scale) can be thought of as weaknesses" (Downs & Adrian, 2004, p. 145). The CSQ questions and dimensions were rank-ordered to identify which were strongest and weakest at the Bar. Responses to the open-ended question were analyzed for themes to better understand the qualitative data's significance.

Results

The purposes of this study were to gauge the health/effectiveness of the State Bar of Georgia's formal and informal communication channels in relation to job satisfaction, to identify problems and make recommendations for improvement by analyzing Bar staff responses to an online version of Downs and Hazen's (1977) Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. This section begins by reporting the demographics of the respondents and then continues by reporting the statistical analyses for each of the research questions posed.

Demographic Analysis

A total of forty-two Bar employees responded to the electronic questionnaire for a participation rate of 57 percent. Of these, eight were male employees (19 percent) and thirty-four were female employees (81 percent). In actuality, 66 percent of Bar employees are female.

Age

Nine employees (21 percent) were between the ages of 21 to 29, twelve employees (28 percent) were between the ages of 30 to 39, ten employees (24 percent) were between the ages of 40 to 49, seven employees (17 percent) were between the ages of 50 to 59, and four employees (10 percent) were over 60.

Education

Four employees (9.5 percent) had only a high school diploma, another four employees (9.5 percent) had taken some college classes, twenty-three employees (55 percent) held a bachelor's degree, and eleven employees (26 percent) held a post baccalaureate degree.

Term of Employment

One employee (2 percent) had been employed at the Bar for less than a year, seventeen employees (41 percent) had been employed 1 to 4 years, ten employees (24 percent) had been employed 5 to 8 years, and fourteen employees (33 percent) had been employed for more than 9 years.

Time in Current Position

Three employees (7 percent) had been in their current position at the Bar for less than a year, twenty employees (48 percent) had been in their current position 1 to 4 years, six employees (14 percent) had been in their current position 5 to 8 years, and thirteen employees (31 percent) had been in their current position for more than 9 years.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 sought to examine the relationship between communication

satisfaction and job satisfaction for Bar employees. For questions pertaining to the dimensions

measuring communication satisfaction variables (where respondents were asked to select

responses from a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied") a

confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. An item was considered to load significantly on a

dimension if it had a primary component loading of .60 or above. Only one item, question 38 –

Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right – which falls under the

supervisor communication dimension, failed to load above the .60 threshold. An internal

consistency analysis was conducted to ensure that CSQ dimensions computed at Cronbach's

alpha of .70 or above (see Table 4).

Table 4
Reliability - Communication Satisfaction Dimensions

Factor/Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha
Supervisor Communication	.843
Subordinate Communication	.898
Organizational Integration	.738
Media Quality	.859
Horizontal Communication	.819
Communication Climate	.876
Personal Feedback	.896
Corporate Information	.876

Overall 94 percent of Bar employees who took the survey responded that they were either

somewhat satisfied, satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. Only two employees (6 percent)

indicated that they were somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their jobs. When asked,

"In the past 6 months, what has happened to your level of satisfaction," twenty-nine employees

(69 percent) indicated that their satisfaction had stayed the same, eight employees (19 percent)

indicated that their level of job satisfaction had gone up, and five employees (12 percent) indicated that their level of job satisfaction had gone down.

SPSS statistical software was used to determine the means of the forty communication satisfaction questions and the eight communication satisfaction dimensions. These mean scores were then rank-ordered to identify which survey questions (see Table 5) and dimensions (see Table 6) employees indicated were strongest and weakest at the Bar. The overall mean score for the forty questions was 5.62, while the overall mean score for the eight dimensions was 5.63.

Table 5
Rank Order of Means on a 1-7 Scale

Rank	Mean	Question
1	6.40	Q29. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me.
2	6.33	Q38. Extent to which the amount of supervision given me is about right.
3	6.31	Q43. Extent to which my staff are responsive to downward-directive communication.
4	6.29	Q33. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas.
5	6.24	Q24. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays attention to me.
6	6.15	Q15. Information about the requirements of my job.
7	6.02	Q36. Extent to which my work group is compatible.
8	6.00	Q26. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance for solving job-related problems.
9	5.93	Q30. Extent to which I receive in time the information needed to do my job.
10	5.88	Q10. Information about company policies and goals.
11	5.88	Q19. Information about employee benefits and pay.
12	5.86	Q34. Extent to which communication with other employees at my level is accurate and free flowing.
13	5.81	Q14. Information about departmental policies and goals.
14	5.80	Q46. Extent to which my staff are receptive to evaluations, suggestions and criticisms.
15	5.76	Q39. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise.
16	5.75	Q44. Extent to which to which my staff anticipate my needs for information.
17	5.72	Q45. Extent to which I can avoid having communication overload.
18	5.71	Q9. Personnel news.
19	5.69	Q22. Extent to which my managers/supervisors understand the problems faced by staff.
20	5.69	Q41. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.

Table 5 (Continued)

Rank	Mean	Question
21	5.67	Q40. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication at the Bar are basically healthy.
22	5.65	Q47. Extent to which my staff feel responsible for initiating accurate upward communication.
23	5.64	Q37. Extent to which our meetings are well organized.
24	5.52	Q28. Extent to which the Bar communications are interesting and helpful.
25	5.50	Q42. Extent to which the amount of communication at the Bar is about right.
26	5.40	Q8. Information about my progress in my job.
27	5.39	Q31. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels.
28	5.36	Q23. Extent to which the Bar's communication motivates me to meet its goals.
29	5.33	Q18. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled.
30	5.33	Q27. Extent to which communication in the Bar makes me identify with it or feel a vital part of it
31	5.33	Q35. Extent to which communication practices are adaptable to emergencies.
32	5.24	Q25. Extent to which Bar employees have great ability as communicators.
33	5.19	Q13. Recognition of my efforts.
34	5.19	Q17. Information about changes in the State Bar.
35	5.07	Q12. Information about how I am being judged.
36	5.07	Q20. Information about profits and/or financial standing.
37	5.07	Q32. Extent to which the grapevine is active in the Bar.
38	4.93	Q11. Information about how my job compares with others.
39	4.93	Q16. Information about how government regulations affect the State Bar of Georgia.
40	4.93	Q21. Information about achievements and/or failures of the Bar.

Identifying the composite mean for each CSQ dimension showed that supervisory communication ranked the highest, or was the strongest, followed by subordinate communication, organizational integration, media quality, horizontal communication, communication climate, personal feedback and corporate information. Analysis of the rank-

ordered means question list showed, with only one exception, that the eight CSQ dimensions

grouped together in some form or fashion. For instance, five of the top eight means scores

belonged to the questions that fell under the supervisory communication dimension. Likewise,

the questions that supported subordinate communication, organizational integration, media

quality, communication climate, personal feedback and corporate information grouped together

fairly tightly as well. The only CSQ dimension that did not cluster in any particular grouping

was horizontal communication, whose questions ranked 7, 12, 20, 31 and 37.

Table 6
CSQ Dimension Rankings

Rank	Dimension	Composite Mean
1	Supervisor Communication	6.23
2	Subordinate Communication	5.95
3	Organizational Integration	5.79
4	Media Quality	5.62
5	Horizontal Communication	5.59
6	Communication Climate	5.39
7	Personal Feedback	5.24
8	Corporate Information	5.20

A post hoc analysis was conducted to identify any gender differences in the relationships

between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Table 7 reports the Pearson's

correlation coefficients for males, females, and all Bar employees calculated together.

Interestingly, male employees showed a statistically significant relationship between all

communication satisfaction dimensions (supervisor communication ($r = .876$, $p < .01$),

organizational integration ($r = .819$, $p < .05$), media quality ($r = .888$, $p < .01$), horizontal

communication (*r* =.949, p <.01), communication climate (*r* =.800, p <.05), personal feedback (*r* =.907, *p* <.01), and corporate information (*r* =.825, *p* <.05)), and job satisfaction, with the exception of subordinate communication.

Table 7
Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Between Job Satisfaction and CSQ Dimensions

CSQ Dimensions	Pearson (Males)	Pearson (Females)	Pearson (All)
Supervisory Communication	**.876****	.036	.276
Subordinate Communication	-.148	-.427	-.406
Organizational Integration	**.819***	-.072	.123
Media Quality	**.888****	-.216	.022
Horizontal Communication	**.949****	-.166	.072
Communication Climate	**.800***	-.189	.133
Personal Feedback	**.907****	-.047	.228
Corporate Information	**.825***	-.258	.041

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Because of this striking difference between the statistical significance between male and female Bar employees' levels of communication/job satisfaction, Pearson's correlation coefficients were run comparing male managers to female managers (see Table 8). Like the other female employees, there was no statistically significant relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction for female managers. For male managers, there were fewer statistically significant relationships between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. Specifically, when compared to all male employees who took the survey, male managers only showed statistically significant relationships in organizational integration (*r* =.949, *p* <.05), horizontal communication (*r* =.905, *p* <.05), and corporate information (*r* =.936, *p* <.05).

Table 8
Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Between Job Satisfaction and CSQ Dimensions for Male and Female Managers

CSQ Dimensions	Pearson (Male Managers)	Pearson (Female Managers)
Supervisory Communication	.000	-.168
Subordinate Communication	-.148	-.427
Organizational Integration	**.949***	-.583
Media Quality	.310	-.553
Horizontal Communication	**.905***	-.495
Communication Climate	.858	-.523
Personal Feedback	.865	-.538
Corporate Information	**.936***	-.534

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Research Question 2

Research question 2 sought to examine the relationship between formal and informal communication channels and job satisfaction for Bar employees, specifically by analyzing the survey questions which dealt with formal channels (Questions 10, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 37, 39, 40, 42) and informal channels (Questions 32, 34, 35, 36, 41), and by reviewing responses to the open-ended question. Although Table 7 showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between the formal (media quality and corporate information) and informal (horizontal) communication channels and job satisfaction for male employees, the sample was so small (19 percent of the survey participants), that one cannot help but wonder if this is indicative of all male employees at the Bar. Regardless, there are some other observations worth noting. When the mean score for each of the five questions for the respective CSQ dimensions were tallied, the formal channel dimensions, media quality and corporate information, finished fourth and eighth respectively, and horizontal communication, the informal channel dimension, finished fifth.

When rank-ordered by mean score, four of the questions from the corporate information dimension, the dimension that was weakest at the Bar, fell in the bottom seven of the rankings,

with Questions 16 – Information about how government regulations affect the State Bar of Georgia and 22 – Information about achievements and/or failures of the Bar, ranking 39 and 40. These are two of the three items on the survey whose mean score was below five (4.93 for all three).

In regard to the open-ended question, despite only seven employees (17 percent) responding, because of the specific nature of many of the responses, Bar leaders may want to further investigate the communication weaknesses that were identified, such as: each group/department of the Bar is too separate and not able to understand the issues facing other groups, departments do not feel they get the recognition they always deserve in the employee newsletter, and supervisors do not always handle staff conflicts in the most efficient or appropriate manner. Complete comments appear in Table 9.

Table 9
Open-ended Question Responses

CSQ Employee Type	Response
Manager	I am not sure this was directly addressed in any of the questions but I feel each group within the Bar is too separate. We do not understand the issues facing other groups or how we could assist them. Other Bars have expressed to me that their departments share personnel when one department has a busy period of time. I would like to see us develop a plan to share personnel in the manner. I believe it would be a wonderful opportunity to learn and to find ways to work better together. Thanks for asking!
Manager	Supervisors would listen better and act in response to communication. The longer someone works at the Bar the less likely they are to accept change and be motivated to make changes (try new things). More supervisor responsibilities accepted by more supervisors (view supervising as an important part of their duties), would cause the supervisors to have to listen and react.
Manager	I am very satisfied with the current communications.
Non-Manager	I do not feel that my department receives the recognition that it deserves. We are very hard workers--I feel that no one else in the BAR could handle or want to handle it. I feel that maybe one day--someone over here will be on the cover of the employee news/review!
Non-Manager	Less gossip would be great, but I understand that's just human nature.
Non-Manager	It could be improved if individuals would 1) respond to emails whether there was an immediate answer or not 2) turn on their vacation rule when they were not going to be in the office.
Non-Manager	My satisfaction level with my job would increase if my supervisors would: 1-deal with issues among staff when they are notified of the problem and plan a meeting to address the issues, instead of waiting around to see if the problem works itself out (this creates more tension and breeds animosity among the staffers); 2-If the problem concerns impropriety of one staffer, who has been identified, supervisors need to address that staffer, instead of calling a meeting to talk to the entire staff to save face for the wrong-doer (this too breeds animosity and dissention among the ranks).

Discussion

In addition to showing that a statistically significant relationship exists between the communication satisfaction dimensions and job satisfaction for male employees, this survey has provided insight into the nature of the Bar's existing communication channels by affording Bar employees an opportunity to anonymously and honestly assess the health/effectiveness of the State Bar of Georgia's formal and informal communication channels. Additionally, rank-

ordering the mean scores provided additional insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the

Bar's existing communication processes and practices. Therefore, important points of discussion

to describe larger meanings of the results will be presented in this section.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 sought to examine the relationship between communication

satisfaction and job satisfaction for Bar employees. Interestingly, female employees' level of job

satisfaction showed no statistically significant relationship to any of the communication

satisfaction dimensions, but male employees did, with the supervisor communication, media

quality, horizontal communication and personal feedback dimensions correlating at a 99 percent

significance level. This at least partially supports Downs and Hazen's (1977) notion that "the

most important communication dimensions interacting with job satisfaction are personal

feedback, relation with supervisor, and communication climate" (p. 72).

Because males are so significantly outnumbered by female employees at the Bar, it seems

logical that horizontal communication would correlate highly with job satisfaction, because the

males may feel they have to stick together against such odds. But for the male employees' level

of communication/job satisfaction to be statistically significant in the other dimensions, and the

females not, would lead one to think the Bar is a male-dominated workplace, when, in fact, it is

just the opposite. Of seventy-four Bar employees, approximately 70 percent are female, with

many serving in management roles. Eight of the thirty-four females who took the survey were

managers and five of the eight males who took the survey were managers. Thinking there may

be a positive correlation between some of the communication satisfaction dimensions and job

satisfaction in regards to the sex of managers, Pearson's correlation coefficients were run

separately for male and female managers and then compared for statistically significant

relationships (see Table 8). Like the other female employees, there was no statistically

significant relationship between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction for female

managers. For male managers, when compared to all male employees, the number of

statistically significant relationships dropped, with these relationships only being identified in the

organizational integration, horizontal communication, and corporate information dimensions.

The relationships, discussed below, provide observations and offer further insights into

the statistical significance between the communication satisfaction dimensions and their

relationship to Bar employees' levels of job satisfaction. The dimensions, which comprise

formal and informal channels of communication (media quality, horizontal communication and

corporate information), will be discussed under research question 2.

Satisfaction with Supervisor Communication. The survey questions pertaining to this

dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with both upward and

downward communication exchanges with their supervisors. Although survey results indicated

that male and female Bar employees are overwhelmingly satisfied with their respective

supervisor's communication practices, only male employees showed a statistically significant

relationship between supervisor communication and job satisfaction. In other words, male

employees feel a sense of job satisfaction related to how open their supervisors are to ideas, how

much their respective supervisors listen to them, pay attention to them, offer guidance for solving

job-related problems, and trust them. At the most basic level, a supervisor's job is simply to

assign tasks and let subordinates know whether they are meeting desired job expectations. Based

on responses to the survey, it is clear supervisors at the Bar exceed these minimum requirements

and relate to their subordinates on a more personal level. In fact, it is apparent that the Bar

fosters what Mueller and Lee (2002) call a high quality leader-member exchange (LMX)

environment, where "subordinates are afforded greater amounts of trust, confidence, attention, inside information, negotiating latitude, and influence without recourse to authority" (p. 224). Additionally, Pettit, Goris, and Vaught (1997) suggest that supervisors who provide subordinates with "proper, correct, and clear information" promote job satisfaction among their employees (p. 93). This is true at the Bar, at least for male employees.

 Satisfaction with Subordinate Communication. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show supervisors' level of satisfaction with both upward and downward communication exchanges with their subordinates. As might be expected by the high marks employees gave supervisors, supervisors indicated that staff members are responsive to directives, anticipate their need for information, and are receptive to evaluations, suggestions and criticisms. However, no statistically significant relationships were identified between job satisfaction and the subordinate communication dimension. In other words, supervisors' levels of job satisfaction were not significantly related to communication interactions with their subordinates. It is unsurprising that there is no statistically significant relationship between a supervisor's level of job satisfaction and the subordinate communication dimension. The onus is on supervisors to effectively communicate their intentions to their subordinates and make sure their directives are understood. Typically, what subordinates are communicating back is in direct response to the supervisor's request in the first place. Another reason for the lack of a statistically significant relationship is the fact that subordinates do not have any power over their supervisors, so the supervisor has a choice over what he or she does with the information provided by a subordinate. On the other hand, when a subordinate receives a command or directive from a supervisor, there is pressure to respond to that directive in a timely manner. So it is vital that the subordinate clearly understands the message.

Satisfaction with Organizational Integration. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the information they receive about the Bar, their respective departments and their benefits. Survey results indicated that male and female Bar employees are satisfied with the amount of information provided about benefits and pay, job requirements, departmental policies and goals, personnel news and information related to their job progress. Only male employees derived a sense of job satisfaction from the organizational integration dimension. According to Downs and Adrian (2004), organizational information makes employees feel like they are "a vital part of the organization" (p. 140). At the Bar employees receive yearly job evaluations, updates regarding benefits and pay and a review of their job requirements; so it is not surprising that employees indicated that they were satisfied with this information.

Satisfaction with Communication Climate. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the information they receive about personal and organizational issues. Specifically, Bar employees indicated that they were satisfied with the timely dissemination of information needed to do their jobs and somewhat satisfied with the way conflicts are handled through proper communication channels, how communication practices at the Bar motivate them to meet Bar goals, how communication makes them feel like a vital part of the Bar team, and employees' great ability as communicators. Once again, although all employees gave this dimension relatively high marks, statistically speaking, only male employees were found to have a significant relationship between communication climate and job satisfaction. It is surprising that the communication climate dimension ranked sixth out of the eight dimensions tested, because the Bar's communication climate is comprised of all the elements Redding (1972) identified as part of an ideal

communication climate. These elements include, "supportiveness; participative decision-making; trust, confidence and credibility; openness and candor; and high performance goals" (Hargie & Tourish, 2000, p. 26).

Satisfaction with Personal Feedback. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the feedback they receive about their job performance and how they are being judged. Once again, only male employees showed a statistically significant relationship between this dimension and job satisfaction. Specifically, male employees derive job satisfaction in relation to supervisors' understanding the problems they face, because of the way job problems are handled, because their efforts are properly recognized, because they received adequate information about how they are being judged, and because they receive information about how their job compares with others. Although female employees receive the same information and feedback that their male counterparts receive, their responses showed no statistically significant relationship between this dimension and job satisfaction.

It is also worth pointing out that the composite mean for each of the CSQ dimensions were all above the conceptual midpoint of four, indicating that Bar employees are at least "somewhat satisfied" with each of the CSQ dimensions. In fact, the three lowest-ranked questions (Question 11 – Information about how my job compares with others, Question 16 – Information about government regulations affect on the State Bar of Georgia, and Question 21 – Information about achievements and/or failures of the Bar) all had a mean average of 4.93. According to Hargie and Tourish (2000), "The major drawback of the rank-order method is that strengths and weaknesses are a necessary by-product of the technique" (p. 60). So although all

mean scores are above the conceptual midpoint, the corporate information dimension is still

considered a weakness at the Bar, at least in relation to the other seven CSQ dimensions.

It is important to note that although no significant relationships were found between these

five communication satisfaction dimensions and job satisfaction for female employees, further

investigation in future research could explore deeper meaning through qualitative interviews.

Perhaps there are gender differences in interpretations of the survey questions.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 sought to examine the relationship between formal and informal

communication channels and job satisfaction for Bar employees. Overall, based on their

responses, Bar employees appear to be satisfied with their access to formal channels, which

consist of the media quality and corporate information dimensions, and informal channels, as

identified by the horizontal communication dimension. However, when it comes to statistically

significant relationships, research showed that these communication channels were associated

with only male employees' level of job satisfaction.

The relationships, discussed below, provide observations and offer insights into the

statistical significance between the dimensions, which comprise formal and informal channels of

communication, and their relationship to Bar employees' levels of job satisfaction.

Satisfaction with Media Quality. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were

designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of the Bar's different

communication mediums and messages. All employees rated the items, which fall under this

dimension, relatively high, but once again, it was only the male employees who derive job

satisfaction from written directives and reports being clear and concise, from meetings being

well organized, from Bar communications being interesting and helpful, from employees' having

healthy attitudes toward communication at the Bar and from the general sense that communication at the Bar is about right. With few exceptions, most employees at the Bar appear satisfied with the different communication media (email messages, internal memos, conference calls, face-to-face meetings, employee newsletter, bulletin board) used to distribute information. The current mediums help Bar employees to effectively service the needs of the state's attorneys, while supporting the organization's mission of fostering among the members of the Bar of this state the principles of duty and service to the public, improving the administration of justice, and advancing the science of law.

  Satisfaction with Corporate Information. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the amount of information they receive regarding the overall functioning of the Bar. Although this dimension was the lowest ranked by mean score, for male employees it correlated to job satisfaction at a 99 percent significance level. Ultimately, the study showed that male employees derive job satisfaction from the information they receive about the Bar's policies and goals, changes going on at the Bar, the Bar's financial status, government regulations affecting the Bar and information about the Bar's achievements and failures. It was interesting to note that this communication satisfaction dimension was last, considering the Bar's policies and goals are printed yearly in a directory and are continuously updated on the Bar's website. Additionally, each year a financial audit is conducted and the results of that audit are made public and posted to the Bar's website.

  Satisfaction with Horizontal Communication. The survey questions pertaining to this dimension were designed to show employees' level of satisfaction with the Bar's informal communication channels or grapevine. Specifically, male employees were shown to derive job

satisfaction from how compatible their work groups are, from how active the grapevine is and how informal messages are free flowing. This does seem counterintuitive because typically, females seem to derive more satisfaction from grapevine interactions than their male counterparts. It is not uncommon at the Bar to see same-level employees from different departments eating lunch together, working out together, and taking breaks together on a regular basis. Typically, these same-level employees segregate themselves by sexes. It would be interesting to note the different informal conversations these gender-based groups are having, especially given the vast discrepancy between the statistical significance of male employees' level of job satisfaction in regards to the horizontal communication satisfaction dimension and the female employees' level.

It is important to note that although no significant relationships were found between these three communication satisfaction dimensions and job satisfaction for female employees, further investigation in future research could explore deeper meaning through qualitative interviews. Perhaps there are gender differences in interpretations of the survey questions.

In regard to the open-ended question, due to the specific nature of many of the responses, Bar leaders may want to further investigate the communication weaknesses that were identified in some of the Bar's formal communication channels—lack of meeting format and structure for department heads, newsletter content that is not inclusive of all departments; and lack of standard conflict-resolution procedure manual.

Limitations

As with any research study, this study has limitations. One limitation of this study was the sample size. More employee participation may have yielded statistically significant

relationships between communication satisfaction and job satisfaction for female employees. Maybe extending the time allocated to take the survey from five to ten days would have increased participation.

Another limitation was that only seven survey participants answered the open-ended question. In hindsight, it would have been beneficial to design this study to include follow up interviews with all employees, or at a minimum all supervisors, to learn about specific communication problems or issues, and ask for suggestions on ways to improve internal communications processes at the Bar.

One other potential limitation is that the study was conducted by a Bar employee. It is possible, therefore, that the author's co-workers may have tended to provide answers they thought the researcher preferred. However, it is also possible that respondents were honest and sincere in their responses.

Conclusions

In today's technologically advanced society where employees are continually bombarded with information from internal and external audiences, managers and organizational leaders must be more adept than ever at communicating information to employees. Through the years, researchers have continually shown that communication is vital to achieve organizational success. Unfortunately, many organizations take communication for granted and ignore its importance until they are in the midst of a crisis. Therefore it behooves organizations of all sizes to continually evaluate and monitor their communication practices and procedures. Downs and Adrian (2004) argue that "Organizational members need a realistic determination of which organizational processes are operating effectively as well as where potential problems are

developing" (p. 2). One such way to do this is by conducting an organizational communication audit.

Results of the CSQ administered to State Bar of Georgia employees showed that by far one of the Bar's most significant strengths is its managers and their ability to effectively communicate with their subordinates. The Bar also appears to be a good place to work with more than 55 percent of employees who took the survey staying at the Bar for more than five years. Additionally, Bar employees are highly educated, with more than 80 percent of employees who took the survey having earned a bachelor's degree or higher.

One peculiar finding the survey yielded is the fact that none of the CSQ dimensions were statistically significantly connected to job satisfaction for female employees, when all of them, except the subordinate communication dimension, were for male employees. Despite this puzzle, the study should provide Bar leaders with a baseline to measure its communication practices and procedures against in the future.

Although employees appear relatively satisfied with the Bar's communication practices, no organization is without its weaknesses. Comments from employees showed that some of the weaknesses include: each group/department of the Bar is too separate and not able to understand the issues facing other groups, employees in some departments do not feel their department gets the recognition they deserve in the employee newsletter, and supervisors do not always handle staff conflicts in the most appropriate manner. Other weaknesses identified under the corporate information dimension include a lack of information on changes happening at the Bar, a lack of information regarding the Bar's financial standing, a lack of information on government regulations that affect the Bar, and a lack of information regarding the Bar's achievements and

failures. Another weakness identified in the survey under the personal feedback dimension was employees' lack of information regarding how their specific job compares with others.

Despite the weaknesses that were identified, more than 70 percent of Bar employees who took the survey indicated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with, under the supervisor communication dimension, the extent to which their supervisor trusts them, listen and pay attention to them, offer guidance for solving job-related problems, and are open to ideas. Under the organizational integration dimension, more than 70 percent of the employees who took the survey were either satisfied or very satisfied with information they receive regarding personnel news, department policies and goals, job requirements, and information on benefits and pay. Under the media quality dimension, more than 70 percent of employees were either satisfied or very satisfied with the fact that written directives are clear and concise. Under the horizontal communication dimension, more than 70 percent of employees were either satisfied or very satisfied with the compatibility of work groups, with the active and accurate nature of informal communication channels, and with how informal communication with same-level employees is accurate and free flowing. Under the personal feedback dimension, more than 70 percent of employees were either satisfied or very satisfied with the timely dissemination of information needed to do their job and with their supervisor's ability to understand problems faced by them. Under the corporate information dimension, more than 70 percent of employees were either satisfied or very satisfied with information regarding the Bar's policies and goals.

<div align="center">

Recommendations

</div>

Ultimately, this study identified some of the strengths and weaknesses Bar employees identified within the Bar's current communication environment. Based on survey responses,

including responses to the open-ended question, following are some steps Bar leaders could take to potentially improve communication and job satisfaction at the Bar. Under the corporate information communication satisfaction dimension, which had the lowest composite mean score, the following questions ranked among the lowest out of the forty questions: Question 17 – Information about changes in the State Bar, Question 20 – Information about profits and/or financial standing, Question 16 – Information about how government regulations affect the State Bar of Georgia, and Question 21 – Information about achievements and/or failures of the Bar. Based on employee survey responses, it is recommended that Bar leaders devise a way to keep employees better informed about changes taking place at the Bar, better informed about the Bar's financial standing, better informed about how government regulations affect the Bar, and better informed about the Bar's achievements and failures. This could be achieved a number of ways. One recommendation would be to have the executive director or chief operating officer send out a monthly or quarterly email message to all Bar staff that provides updates on changes taking place at the Bar, information on the Bar's financial standing, information on government regulations that affect the Bar, and information regarding the Bar's achievements and failures. This information could also be regularly distributed via the employee newsletter or during regularly scheduled staff meetings.

Another area that needs improvement falls under the personal feedback dimension, and deals with employees' desire to know how their job compares with others. On the survey, Question 11 – Information about how my job compares with others, tied for last with a 4.93 mean ranking. To address employees' desire for more information about how their respective job compares to other employees, it is recommended that Bar leaders authorize employee job descriptions to be placed in one folder on one of the Bar's internal servers where all employees

have access. Although this may be impractical at the organizational level, it is something that should be relatively easy for each departmental director to do.

Additionally, Bar leaders my want to consider addressing specific issues/weaknesses identified in the open-ended questions by setting up regularly scheduled (monthly) meetings between department heads to see how/if they can assist each other, providing training for supervisors on strategies for dealing with staff conflicts, and recognizing each Bar department on a rotating basis in the employee newsletter.

Analysis of the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire has shown, as with all organizations, that the State Bar of Georgia has its own unique set of communication practices, policies, and issues. As Downs and Hazen (1977) suggested, analysis of employee responses to the CSQ have provided Bar leaders with a barometer of the Bar's communication functions. Specifically, the audit has identified some of the strengths and weaknesses of the Bar's existing communication channels and provided valuable data for Bar leaders to use when identifying ways to improve the organization's current communication policies and practices and when creating future communication objectives.

References

Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995). Why employees speak to coworkers and bosses: Motives, gender, and organizational satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 32 (3),* 249-265.

Austin, E. W., & Pinkleton, B. E. (2001). *Strategic public relations management: Planning and managing effective communication programs.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Badaracco, C. (1998). The politics of communication audits. *Public Relations Quarterly, 33 (3)*, 27-31.

Baxter, L. A., & Babbie, E. (2004). *The basics of communication research.* Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (1998). *Designing and using organizational surveys.* Brookfield, VT: Gower.

Clampitt, P. G., & Downs, C. W. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relationship between communication and productivity: A field study. *The Journal of Business Communication, (30) 1,* 5-28.

Coffman, J. (2004). *Strategic communications audits.* Prepared for the Communications Consortium Media Center. Retrieved October 12, 2005, from http://www.mediaevaluationproject.org/WorkingPaper1.pdf

Conrad, C., & Poole, M. S. (2002) *Strategic organizational communication in a global economy.* Orlando: Harcourt.

Corman, S.R., Banks, S.P., Bantz C.R. & Mayer, M.E. (Eds.). (1990). *Foundations of organizational communication.* White Plains: Longman.

Crino, M. D., & White, M. C. (1981). Satisfaction in communication: An examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. *Psychological Reports, 49,* 831-838.

Deetz, S. (2001). Conceptual foundations. In Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication,* (pp. 3-46). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication, 14 (3),* 63-73.

Downs, C. W., Clampitt, P. G., & Pfeiffer, A. L. (1988). Communication and organizational outcomes. In Goldhaber, G. M., & Barnett, G. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Communication,* (pp. 171-212). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Downs, C. W., DeWine, S., & Greenbaum, H.H. (1994). Measures of organizational communication. In Rubin, R.B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (Eds.), *Communication Research Measures* (pp. 57–78). New York: Guilford Press.

Downs, C. W., & Adrian, A. D. (2004). *Assessing organizational communication: Strategic communication audits.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Goldhaber, G. M. & Krivonos, P. D. (1977). The ICA communication audit: Process, status, critique. *The Journal of Business Communication, (15) 1,* 41-55.

Gorman, B. (2003). Employee engagement after two decades of change. *Strategic Communication Management, 7 (1),* 12-15.

Gray, J. & Laidlaw, H. (2004). Improving the measurement of communication satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17 (3),* 425-448.

Greenbaum, H. Clampitt, P., & Willhnganz, S. (1988) Organizational communication:

    An examination of four instruments. *Management Communication Quarterly,*

    2 (2), 245-282.

Greenbaum, H.H. (1974). The audit of organizational communication. *Academy of*

    Management Journal, 17, 739–754.

Greenbaum, H. H., Hellweg, S. A., & Falcione, R. L. (1988). Organizational

    communication evaluation: An overview, 1950-1981. In G. M. Goldhaber &

    G. A. Barnett (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 275-317).

    Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hage, J., Aiken, M., & Marrett, C.B. (1971). Organization structure and communications.

    American Sociological Review, 36, 860–871.

Hargie, O., & Tourish, D. (2000). *Handbook of communication audits for*

    organisations. Routledge: New York.

Hirokawa, R. Y. (1979). Communication and the managerial function: Some suggestions

    for improving organizational communication. *Communication, 8 (1),* 83-95.

Jablin, F. M. (1987). Formal organization structure. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H.

    Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An*

    interdisciplinary perspective (pp. 389-419). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management and public

    relations: Dimensions of an organization–public relationship. *Public Relations Review,*

    24, 55–65.

Ledingham, J. A. (2003). Explicating relationship management as a general theory of

    public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 15(2),* 181–198.

Mueller, B. H., Lee, J. (2002). Leader-member exchange and organizational communication satisfaction in multiple contexts. *Journal of Business Communication, 39 (2),* 220-244.

Monge, P. R., & Contractor, N. S. (2001). Emergence of communication networks. In Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication,* (pp. 3-46). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Pettit, J. D., Jr., Goris, J. R., & Vaught, B. C. (1997). An examination of organizational Communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication, 34 (1),* 81-98.

Pincus, D. (1986). Communication satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job performance. *Human Communication Research, 12,* 395-419.

Pincus, J. D., Knipp, J. E., & Rayfield, R. E. (1990). Internal communication and job satisfaction revisited: The impact of organizational trust and influence on commercial bank supervisors. *Public Relations Research Annual, 2,* 173-192.

Putnam, L. L., & Cheney, G. (1990). Organizational communication: Historical development and future directions. In Corman, S.R., Banks, S.P., Bantz C.R. & Mayer, M.E. (Eds.), *Foundations of organizational communication* (pp. 44–64). White Plains: Longman.

Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication research measures*. New York: Guilford Press.

Scott, R. S., Shaw, S. P., Timmerman, C. E., Frank, V., & Quinn, L. (1999). Using communication audits to teach organizational communication students and employees. *Business Communication Quarterly, 62 (4),* 53-70.

Shelby, A. N., & Reinsch, N. L., Jr. (1996). The communication audit: A framework for

      teaching management communication. *Business Communication Quarterly,*

      59 (2), 95-108.

Tompkins, P. K., & Redding, W. C. (1988). Organizational communication: Past and

      present tenses. In Goldhaber, G. M., & Barnett, G. A. (Eds.), *Handbook of*

      Organizational Communication, (pp. 5-34). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Tompkins, P. K., & Wanca-Thibault, M. (2001). Organizational communication: Prelude

      and prospects. In Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of*

      Organizational Communication, (pp. xvii-xxxi). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Varona, Federico. (1996). Relationship between communication satisfaction

      and organizational commitment in three Guatemalan organizations. *The Journal*

      of Business Communication, 33(2), 111-140.

Wright, D. K. (1995). The role of corporate public relations executives in the future of

      employee communications. *Public Relations Review, 21 (3),* 181-198.

Appendix 1

Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

1. What is your age? Under 20, 21-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+

2. What is your sex? M or F

3. How long have you been in your current position? Less than 1 year, 1 – 4 years, 5 –8 years, 9+ years

4. How long have you worked for the organization? Less than 1 year, 1 – 4 years, 5 –8 years, 9+ years

5. Please indicate which best indicates your formal education. A. Did not finish high school, B. High school, C. Completed some college, D. College degree, E. Post-baccalaureate degree

6. How satisfied are you with your job? (Check one)

    1. Very dissatisfied
    2. Dissatisfied
    3. Somewhat dissatisfied
    4. Indifferent
    5. Somewhat satisfied
    6. Satisfied
    7. Very Satisfied

7. In the past 6 months, what has happened to your level of satisfaction? (Check one)

    1. Stayed the same
    2. Gone up
    3. Gone down

A. Listed below are several kinds of information often associated with a person's job. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the amount and/or quality of each kind of information by circling the appropriate number at the right.

1 = Very dissatisfied   2 = Dissatisfied   3 = Somewhat dissatisfied   4 = Indifferent
5 = Somewhat satisfied   6 = Satisfied   7 = Very satisfied

8. Information about my progress in my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Personnel news.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Information about company policies and goals.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Information about how my job compares with others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Information about how I am being judged.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Recognition of my efforts.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Information about departmental policies and goals.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

15. Information about the requirements of my job.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

16. Information about government regulations

　　affecting the State Bar of Georgia.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

17. Information about changes in the State Bar.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

18. Reports on how problems in my job are being handled.　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

19. Information about employee benefits and pay.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

20. Information about profits and/or financial standing.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

21. Info. about achievements and/or failures of the Bar.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

B. Please indicate how satisfied you are with the following by circling the appropriate number at the right.

22. Extent to which my managers/supervisors understand

　　the problems faced by staff.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

23. Extent to which the Bar's communication motivates

　　me to meet its goals.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

24. Extent to which my supervisor listens and pays

　　attention to me.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

25. Extent to which Bar employees have great ability

　　as communicators.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

26. Extent to which my supervisor offers guidance

　　for solving job-related problems.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

27. Extent to which communication in the Bar makes

　　me identify with it or feel a vital part of it.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

28. Extent to which the Bar communications are

　　interesting and helpful.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

29. Extent to which my supervisor trusts me.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

30. Extent to which I receive in time the information

　　needed to do my job.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

31. Extent to which **conflicts** are handled appropriately

　　through proper communication channels.　　1　2　3　4　5　6　7

32. Extent to which the grapevine is active in the Bar.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

33. Extent to which my supervisor is open to ideas.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

34. Extent to which communication with other employees
    at my level is accurate and free flowing.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

35. Extent to which communication practices are
    adaptable to emergencies.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

36. Extent to which my work group is compatible.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

37. Extent to which our meetings are well organized.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

38. Extent to which the amount of supervision given
    me is about right.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

39. Extent to which written directives and reports
    are clear and concise.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

40. Extent to which the attitudes toward communication
    at the Bar are basically healthy.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

41. Extent to which informal communication is
    active and accurate.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

42. Extent to which the amount of communication
    at the Bar is about right.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

*C. For the next five questions, indicate your satisfaction with the following only if you are
responsible for staff as a manger or supervisor.*

43. Extent to which my staff are responsive to
    downward-directive communication.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

44. Extent to which to which my staff anticipate
    my needs for information.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

45. Extent to which I can avoid having
    communication overload.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

46. Extent to which my staff are receptive to evaluations,
    suggestions and criticisms.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

47. Extent to which my staff feel responsible for
    initiating accurate upward communication.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

48. If the communication associated with your job could be changed in any way to make you more satisfied, please indicate how.

Appendix 2a

State Bar of Georgia
Organization Chart
Excluding General Counsel's Office

SUPREME COURT

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

OFFICERS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Cliff Brashier
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dee Dee Worley
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT
ASST. DIR. CLE

Amy Smith
Administrator

Crystal
Mosley
Admin.

Delores
Hayes
Sen. Adm.

Pamela
Bryson
Admin.

Ron Turner
Chief Financial Officer

MEMBER-SHIP

Gayle Baker
Director

Brinda
Loewom
Asst. Dir.

Toni
Peterson
Admin.

Barbara
Howell-
Pressley
Admin.

MIS

Lamont
Burwell
Director

Judy Hill
Network

ACC'T.

Carrie
Raynor
Accountant

Vanessa
Bloodworth
Asst. Clerk

Sharon Bryant
Chief Operating Officer

Pauline
Childress
Asst. to COO

CAP

Lynda
Hulsey
Director

Steven
Conner
Asst. Dir.

Ebony Smith
Admin.

Donna Davis
Admin.

Barbara
Bailey
Admin.

LAP
*Resource
Center*

BASICS
Ed Nightlie
*Director**

COMM

G. Tyler Jones
Director

Johanna
Merrill
*Section
Liaison*

Sarah
Bartleson
Asst. Dir.

Jennifer
Riley
Admin.

DIVERSITY

Marian
Dockery
Director

FEE ARB

Rita Payne
Director

Jill Murdi
Coordinator

DeAnna
Massey
Admin.

LPM

Natalie
Thornwell
Director

Pamela
Myers
*Resource
Advisor*

Jacqui
Fitzgerald
Casemaker

Kimberly
Henry
Admin.

MEETINGS

Michelle
Priester
Director

MENTOR

Doug
Ashworth
Director

Felisha
Hanley
Admin.

OFFICE

Carolyn
McKnight
Off. Mgr.

Kory Morley
Mail Coor.

Faye
Morgan
Receptionist

Carol
Carson
Receptionist

Faye First
*Conf. Center
Manager*

Kyle Gause
Admin./AV

Rudy
Ross
Porter

SOUTH GA.

Bonnie Gella
Off. Mgr.

Sherry
Gatewood
Admin.

UPL

Steven
Kaczkowski
Director

John Marty
*Assist UPL
Counsel*

Thomas
Porter
Investigator

James
Pangborn
Investigator

Robert
Tyson
Investigator

Lorraine Bell
Legal Sec.

Kathya St.
Louis
Legal Sec.

YLD

Stacy Rieke
*Mock Trial
Coordinator**

Debra
Sanderson
Director

* = *Contract*

Appendix 2b

State Bar of Georgia
Organization Chart
Office of General Counsel

SUPREME COURT

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

OFFICERS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

William P. Smith, III
GENERAL COUNSEL

Paula J. Frederick
Deputy GC
Disciplinary Unit

Robert McCormack
Deputy GC
Bar Counsel Unit

Jenny K. Mittelman
Senior Assistant General Counsel

Jonathan Hewett
Senior Assistant General Counsel

K. Gene Chapman
Assistant General Counsel

Rebecca Hall
Assistant General Counsel

Kellyn McGee
Assistant General Counsel

Carmen Rojas Rafter
Grievance Counsel

John Shiptenko
Assistant General Counsel

Connie Henry
Clerk, SDB

Carolyn Williams
Paralegal

Regina Kelly
Trust Account Paralegal

Dan O'Sullivan
Investigator

Betty Derrickson
Paralegal

Deborah Grant
Legal Secretary

Bobbie Kendall
Legal Secretary

Cathe Payne
Legal Secretary Grievance Office

Deloise Mathews
Legal Secretary

Valerie Daniel
Receptionist

Appendix 3

STATE BAR
OF GEORGIA _____

Lawyers Serving the Public and the Justice System

February 28, 2006

To Whom It May Concern,

I have given Georgia State University graduate student Christopher Tyler Jones permission to administer to State Bar of Georgia employees a survey dealing with the bar's communications practices. I understand that this survey will be conducted electronically and that this research will be used for his thesis project. If you have any questions, feel free to reach me at 404-527-8776.

Sincerely,

Sharon Bryant
Chief Operations Officer, State Bar of Georgia

HEADQUARTERS
104 Marietta Street, Suite 100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 527-8700 ◻ (800) 334-6865
FAX (404) 527-8717
www.gabar.org

SOUTH GEORGIA
244 E. Second Street (Zip 31794)
P.O. Box 1390
Tifton, Georgia 31793-1390
(229) 387-0446 ◻ (800) 330-0446
FAX (229) 382-7435