EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND CULTURE ON

EMPLOYEE COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS IN CHINESE ORGANIZATIONS

_____

A Master's Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

By

Feng Jiang

December, 2011

EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND CULTURE ON EMPLOYEE

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS IN CHINESE ORGANIZATIONS

_____

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

By

Feng Jiang

December, 2011

ABSTRACT

Organizations realize the importance of employee communication behaviors (ECBs) in public relations contexts. Recently scholars conceptually advanced two types of ECBs- Megaphoning and Scouting. This empirical study examined effects of organizational structure (organicness) and individual cultural characteristics (collectivism and power distance) on positive and negative megaphoning, and scouting.

A total of 277 Chinese respondents in various public relations professions participated in this exploratory research. Findings from this research showed that organicness of organizational structure positively affects employees' positive megaphoning and scouting behaviors; power distance positively affects negative megaphoning, and scouting behaviors, but negatively affects positive megaphoning. On the other hand, individualistic or collectivistic cultural characteristics did not significantly influence ECBs.

Overall, findings suggested that public relations practitioners should pay attention not only to how ECBs affect the excellence of public relations, but also how organizational elements influence ECBs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

Introduction

Employee communication behaviors (ECBs) are important part of scholarly inquiry

in various disciplines (e.g., Kim & Rhee, 2011; Kim, Rosen, & Lee, 2009; Rhee & Kim,

2009). Existing studies on ECBs have explored superior-subordinate relationships

(Brandts & Cooper, 2007; Kim, Rosen, & Lee, 2009), employee satisfaction

(Bakanauskienė, Bendaravičienė, & Krikštolaitis, 2010; Czaplewski, 2001; Wagenheim

& Rood, 2010), and communication skills (Huegli & Tschirgi, 1974; Petelle & And,

1991).

More recently, ECBs have received scholarly attention in public relations. For

example, Kim and Rhee (2011) introduced two unique features of ECBs that are likely to

affect practices of public relations: megaphoning and scouting effects. Megaphoning

effect refers to "employees' positive or negative external communication behaviors about

their organization" (Kim & Rhee, 2011, p. 246). Employees are likely to forward or share

information about organizational strengths and weaknesses with others they encounters in

and off their daily work. Some empirical studies have indicated that employees'

interactive behavior greatly affects customers' satisfaction with the organization, and the

organizational performance (e.g., Arif, Jan, Marwat, & Ullah, 2009; Yang & Grunig,

2005).

While megaphoning effect illustrates a process of bringing information from inside

to outside, scouting addresses "employees' voluntary communication efforts to bring

relevant information to the organization" (Kim & Rhee, 2011, p. 247). Employees are a

reliable source of business information under some circumstances when they directly

1

communicate with external publics and get feedback. For modern organizations, information is so important that some have specifically set department of user experience to analyze the needs of their customers (Fallman & Waterworth, 2010).

In public relations, employee behaviors of megaphoning and scouting are initially conceptualized as boundary spanning, which constitutes the primary role that public relations practitioners play in organizations (Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Rhee & Kim, 2009). Through building mutually beneficial organization-public relationships, organization effectiveness can be greatly enhanced because strategic publics are more likely to support organizations to pursue their goals (Grunig, Grunig, & Dozier, 2002).

In an original exploration of megaphoning and scouting, Kim and Rhee (2011) found that symmetrical internal communication serves as an antecedent to positive ECBs via improved quality of organization-employee relationships. They also strongly recommended other potential antecedents that should be examined in future studies.

One of the suggested antecedents is organizational structure. Organizational structure influences the activities of every organization, including job performance (Cummings & Berger, 1976), perceived environmental uncertainty (Leifer & Huber, 1977), job satisfaction and occupational mobility (Sollund, 2006), employee trust (Alston & Tippett, 2009), and perceived fairness (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Schminke et al, 2002). A few studies in the public relations literature focused on the link between structure and employees' communication behaviors (e.g., Grunig, Grunig, & Dozior, 2002; Jiang, Sun & Law, 2011). For example, Ambrose and Schminke (2003) explored the effect of organizational structure on justice perceptions and found that the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational support is stronger in

2

mechanistic organizations and that the relationship between interactional justice and supervisory trust is stronger in organic organizations. Grunig and his colleagues (2002) applying their four models of public relations reported that organizations with organic structures have symmetrical communication systems, whereas organizations with mechanistic structures have asymmetrical communication systems. Conversely, symmetrical communication behaviors can help to create organic structure in organizations. Jiang and his associates (2011) indicated that organization structure, specifically the organicity (i.e. organicness), moderates the effects of empowerment on organizational citizenship behaviors.

Another potential antecedent suggested is cultural characteristics. There are a few studies that explored the effects of culture on ECBs. The closedown of a Starbucks café inside the Forbidden City illustrated the intricate role of culture in international public relations within an internet-based employee communication environment (Han & Zhang, 2009). My personal experience may also illustrate what the concepts of megaphoning and scouting entail. When I was an intern in a Chinese company, my supervisor assigned me to go take official photographs for clients because our chief photographer had to cover breaking news. In order to keep the reputation of my company, I pretended to be professional as much as possible. As expected, I noticed displeasure on clients' faces. I immediately reported feedback to my supervisor. This resulted in my company's sending the chief photographer to the clients in another day and got everything done without any additional distress. In this example, I played the role of an employee who not only communicated with external publics (i.e. megaphoning), but also brought relevant information to the organization voluntarily (i.e. scouting).

However, the study on Korean public relations practitioners suggested that the social traditionalism values more important in explaining organizational communication than cultural dimensions (Kim & Kim, 2010).

In cross-cultural environment, although U.S. public relations practices and assumptions could not be wholly applied to Asian cultures or countries, the importance of relationship building was the same (Wu, 2005). The cultural differences can also explain how U.S. and South Korean public relations practitioners identified preferred leadership communication styles in routine and non-routine circumstances (Shin, Heath, & Lee, 2011).

Some researchers who investigated effects of culture on public relations and organizational communication have claimed the possibility of applying various communication strategies in specific cultural environments (Chen, 2008; Han & Zhang, 2009; Lin, 2008; Ni, 2003) or in cross-culture circumstances (Wu, 2005; Shin, Heath, & Lee, 2011). These findings confirm that cultural characteristics are likely to affect employee communication behaviors in organizations.

China is one of the interesting cultural carriers. With the long history, China not only presents the typical cultural characteristics of East Asian countries, but also cultivates some unique features that are unlike its neighbors. According to Hofstede (2001), Chinese have the greater patience, lower individualism, higher power distance than any other Asian countries. Such characteristics may affect the aspiration and standpoint of communication, and therefore affect the communication behaviors.

Since Kim and Rhee (2011) strongly recommend to explore impacts of structural and cultural characteristics on ECBs, this study will research how structural

4

characteristics (e.g., mechanistic vs. organic forms) affect megaphoning and scouting behaviors of employees. In addition, this research will investigate the potential effects of cultural characteristics on megaphoning and scouting behaviors by involving Chinese employees.

As a rapid changing society, China appears to juggle with traditional rules and imported perspectives constantly. Examining structures of modern Chinese organizations may bring an opportunity of recognizing the standpoint on which communication is conducted among internal and external publics.

Furthermore, earlier research involved very limited number of industry in their studies (e.g., sports industry, government) and, thus, cannot represent all Chinese organizations. The complex forms of Chinese organizations probably cultivate distinct communication behaviors. Thus, assessing the effects of culture on ECBs in a broader range of industry will help build an integral recognition of Chinese organizations.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

In this chapter, I describe relevant areas to this research. I first present concepts of megaphoning and scouting effects of ECBs. I will then define organizational structure, present types of organizational structure, and discuss antecedents and effects of structure in organizational contexts. Further, I will review public relations practices in Chinese cultural environments. Finally, I propose hypotheses and research questions regarding relationships between organizational structure, cultural characteristics and ECBs in Chinese organizations.

Employee communication behaviors (ECBs)

Employee communication behaviors refer to employees' interaction with their stakeholders in working environment (Kim & Rhee, 2011). The effects of ECBs have been studied in various fields. ECBs have been found to affect various aspects of public relations. For example, the quality of communication between employees and customers affected customers' satisfaction with the organization (Jung & Yoon, 2011; Wagenheim & Rood, 2010), which may further influences organizational performance (Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998). Dozier (1986) reported that employees as internal publics are able to conduct functions of collecting external information and distributing them internally. Based on such information, organizations were able to take specific strategies to maintain the reputation of their products or services.

Although the importance of ECBs has been verified by researchers and practitioners, little literature has examined the relationships between ECB and public relations practices. To address this issue, Kim and Rhee (2011) introduced megaphoning and scouting effects

as two types of ECBs that can affect boundary spanning, which is considered as an important aspect of public relations practice.

Megaphoning effect

In Kim and Rhee's (2011) study, megaphoning effect was defined as "employees' positive or negative external communication behaviors about their organization" (p. 246); it reflects the "likelihood of employees' voluntary information forwarding or information sharing about organizational strength (accomplishments) or weaknesses (problems)" (p. 246). To conceptualize this effect, they adopted the situational theory of problem solving (Kim & Grunig, 2011) in which information seeking, information forwarding, and information forefending were proposed as active communication behaviors, whereas information attending, information sharing, and information permitting were treated as passive or reactive communication behaviors.

Information seeking is defined as "the planned scanning of the environment for messages about a specified topic" (Grunig, 1997, p. 9); information forwarding examines the extent of planned, self-propelled information giving to others; and information forefending is defined as the extent to which a problem solver fends off certain information in advance by judging its value and relevance for a given problem-solving task (Kim & Grunig, 2011). Correspondingly, the definition of information attending is an "unplanned discovery of a message followed by continued processing of it" (Grunig, 1997, p. 9); information sharing considers the extent of sharing information reactively only when someone requests one's opinion, idea, or expertise about the problem (Kim & Grunig, 2011); and information permitting is the extent to which a problem solver accepts any information related to a given problem-solving task (Kim & Grunig, 2011).

These sorts of information processing activities represent the diversity of communication behaviors that employees may conduct. Some may be positive as well as some negative. Some employees may complain their organizations in front of customers (i.e., negative megaphoning) whereas others are more willing to present the best side of organizations to external publics (i.e., positive megaphoning). On the whole, megaphoning explores the communication process that employees distribute information on organization to external publics. For those regular employees who communicate with external publics, their voluntary communication efforts of collecting information from outside (i.e., scouting) is also crucial to the well-being of organizations.

Scouting effect

The definition of scouting is derived from Dozier's (1986) notion of environmental scanning function of public relations practitioners. Environmental scanning refers to "the gathering of information about publics, about reactions of publics toward the organization, and about public opinion toward issues important to the organization" (p. 1). Comparing to megaphoning effect, it is a reversed process of information distributing. According to Dozier (1990), there are two types of environmental scanning behaviors: formal and informal. Formal scanning tends to collect information about publics that can be more useful for management (Dozier, 1990). Public relations practitioners purposely gather information from stakeholders by scientific measurement and professional analysis, which is used as fundamental data for research on stakeholders. Most environmental scanning literature in public relations tends to focus on formal, systematic, and continuous scanning of organizations' environments by the department of public relations (Broom & Dozier, Lauzen, 1995; Lauzen & Dozier, 1994).

Nevertheless, Kim and Rhee (2011) examined informal environmental scanning as supplements of formal scanning. They believed the desirability and feasibility of non-specialized employees play the environmental scanning roles because it could "decrease the cost of information gathering, expand the scope and boundaries of information gathering, and increase the quality of information because each individual employee tends to identify information related to their own areas of expertise" (p. 247-248). Other studies (Stoffels, 1994; Chang, 2000) also confirmed that most environmental information comes from personal sources, which are more useful than impersonal sources because employees, especially the front-line employees, who actually conduct long-term environmental scanning behaviors, are perhaps more reliable sources of strategic information. Hence, information collected by non-public relations practitioners is as crucial as via formal procedures by public relations practitioners.

Megaphoning and scouting have integrated many possible forms of communication behaviors that employees may conduct as boundary spanners. For public relations practitioners, on the one side, they should be committed to make employees distribute positive information of organization to external publics. On the other side, analysis of information brought in by employees help recognize publics' feedback to organization and take strategies correspondingly. Then one question is to figure out what factors determine employees' motivation of conducing megaphoning and scouting behaviors. In the model of megaphoning and scouting effects, Kim and Rhee (2011) suggested that the positive relationships between employees and organizations increase the likelihood of employees to voluntarily seek, forward, and share of information. Their empirical

findings showed that organizational structure and cultural characteristics may affect employees' megaphoning and scouting behaviors.

Organizational structure

Researchers defined organizational structure in many different ways or perspectives. For example, Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) defined structure as some aspects of behavior that are influenced by "pre-existing programs and controls" in organizations. Similarly, Pugh (1990) claimed that organizational structure consists of activities such as task allocation, coordination and supervision that are geared toward organizational goals. Katz and Kahn (1978) believed that structure is found in an interrelated set of events which return to complete and renew a cycle of activities.

Stroh, Northcraft, and Neale (2002) emphasized that organizational structure represents the relationships among different roles played by units within an organization. These diverse points of views of definitions indicate that the term "organizational structure" is not necessarily concentrated on any univocal characteristic, but rather, more likely to contain various dimensions.

Dimensions of organizational structure

There are a couple of notable claims about dimensions of organizational structure. Early on, Burns and Stalker (1961) introduced a popular method of examining the potential dimensions of organizational structure: "mechanistic and organic" systems of organization. According to their classification, a mechanical structure is an appropriate management system to stable conditions. It is characterized by:

(a) The specialized differentiation of functional tasks into which the problems and tasks facing the concern as a whole are broken down;

(b) The abstract nature of each individual task, which is pursued with techniques and purposed more or less distinct from those of the concern as a whole; i.e., the functionaries tend to pursue the technical improvement of means, rather than the accomplishment of the ends of the concern;

(c) The reconciliation, for each level in the hierarchy, of those distinct performance by the immediate superiors, who are also, in turn, responsible for seeing that each is relevant in his own special part of the main task;

(d) The precise definition of right and obligations and technical methods attached to each functional role;

(e) The translation of rights and obligations and methods into the responsibilities of a functional role;

(f) Hierarchic structure of control, authority, and communication;

(g) A reinforcement of the hierarchic structure by the location of knowledge of actualities exclusively at the top of the hierarchy, where the final reconciliation of distinct tasks and assessment of relevance is made;

(h) A tendency for interaction between members of the concern to be vertical, i.e., between superior and subordinate;

(i) A tendency for operations and working behavior to be governed by the instructions and decisions issued superiors;

(j) Insistence on loyalty to the concern and obedience to superiors as a condition of membership;

(k) A greater importance and prestige attaching to internal (local) than to general (cosmopolitan) knowledge, experience, and the skill.

In contrast, the organizations with an organic form or structure is appropriate to changing conditions with fresh problems and unforeseen requirements for action that cannot be broken down or distributed automatically through the functional roles within a hierarchical structure. It is characterized by:

(a) The contributive nature of special knowledge and experience to the common task of the concern;

(b) The "realistic" nature of the individual task, which is seen as set by the total situation of the concern;

(c) The adjustment and continual re-definition of individual tasks through interaction with others;

(d) The shedding of "responsibility" as a limited field of rights, obligations and methods;

(e) The spread of commitment to the concern beyond any technical definition;

(f) A network structure of control, authority, and communication. the sanctions which apply to the individual's conduct in his working role derive more from presumed community of interest with the rest of the working organization in the survival and growth of the firm, and less from a contractual relationship between himself and a non-personal corporation, represented for him by an immediate superior;

(g) Omniscience no longer imputed to the head of the concern; knowledge about the technical or commercial nature of the here and now task may be located anywhere in the network; this location becoming the ad hoc center of control

authority and communication;

(h) A lateral rather than a vertical direction of communication through the organization, communication between people of different rank, also, resembling consultation rather than command;

(i) A content of communication which consists of information and advice rather than instructions and decisions;

(j) Commitment to the concern's tasks and to the "technological ethos" of material progress and expansion is more highly valued than loyalty and obedience;

(k) Importance and prestige attach to affiliations and expertise valid in the industrial and technical and commercial milieux external to the firm (pp. 120-122).

Based on Burns and Stalker's introductions, researchers proposed some dimensions that can further distinguish different organizational structures. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, and Turner (1968) defined and operationalized five dimensions of organizational structure: specialization, standardization, formalization, centralization, and configuration. Jackson and Morgan's (1982) added a sixth dimension, traditionalism. Duncan (1971) proposed five primary features of organic structure or "organicness": participation in work decisions, formalization, hierarchy of authority, impersonality, and division of labor. Leifer and Huber (1977) added another: "the extent of the subject's participation in strategic decisions."

Damanpour (1991) offered a longer list of structural characteristics including specialization, functional differentiation, professionalism, formalization, centralization, managerial attitude toward change, managerial tenure, technological knowledge

resources, administrative intensity, external communication, internal communication, and vertical differentiation, in their probe into organizational determinants. Similarly, Daft (2003) provided a list that includes formalization, specialization, standardization, hierarchy of authority, complexity, centralization, professionalism, and personnel ratios.

Among these varied dimensions of organizational structure, some dimensions are frequently discussed or described in more detail: formalization, centralization, hierarchy, and specialization. Formalization describes the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written down. The organization theory literatures primarily identify two levels of formalization: high and low. A high level of formalization is related to a mechanistic structure, whereas a low level of formalization is related to an organic structure (e.g., Nahm Vonderembse, & Koufteros, 2003).

Centralization emphasizes the locus of decision making. It determines the authority which makes legitimate decisions that affect the organization. The process of decision making characterized by a top-down mechanism and a wide discussion based on networking results in a mechanistic and organic structure of organization, respectively (e.g., Daft, 2003; Germain, 1996; Walton, 1985).

Hierarchy represents a system in which people are organized into different levels of importance from highest to lowest. Researchers generally depend on the numbers of layers within the organization to indicate the levels of management. Burns and Stalker (1961) stated that organic organizations have few layers in their hierarchy.

Specialization is the extent of complexity an organization has educated, professionalized employees who fill specialist roles. One of the foundations of mechanistic/organic structure system is whether a whole task can be broken down or not.

Burns and Stalker believed mechanistic structure is of highly divided tasks, whereas organic structure with integrated roles.

In earlier studies, researchers attempted to figure out what structures are utilized by various organizations, whether these structures are appropriate or not, and what factors determine these structures (e.g., Burns & Stalker, 1966; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Leifer & Huber, 1977; Ford & Slocum, 1977). Recent studies tend to view organizational structure as a potential source of organizational competitiveness. For example, Hannan, Rankin and Towry (2010) explored the influence of organizational structure on the effectiveness of participatory budgeting. Toh (2008) related organization structure to innovation and claimed that a stable "structure-scope matching" helps explain why some firms have difficulties in adjusting their organizational structure to adapt to new environments or strategies. Goswami and Goswami (2010) examined the relationship between organizational structure and marketing mix.

Effects of organizational structure

The organizational structure has been found to impact a great number of organizational behaviors and activities. The design of organizational structure frequently determines whether an organization is adaptive to its internal and external environments, thereby influencing its competitiveness. Organizations that face the changes internally and externally (e.g., market share, customer's taste, technology) have to alter their structures to adapt to the new condition (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). Miller and Friesen (1977, 1978) claimed that organizations are required to adjust their structures in conjunction with other organizational strategies. For those manufacturers, organizational structure may need to be shifted to support new products and processes (Ettlie et al, 1984).

Structure also influenced perceived environmental uncertainty (Leifer & Huber, 1977).

Other important organizational variables are also impacted by organizational structure, including job satisfaction and occupational mobility (Sollund, 2006), employee trust (Alston & Tippett, 2009), and perceived fairness (Schminke et al, 2002).

A large portion of literatures examined the relationship between organizational structure and job performance (Cummings & Berger, 1976). Findings indicated weak associations, for example, between dimensions of organizational structure such as specialization (Baldridge & Burnham, 1975; Beck & Betz, 1975; Hage & Dewar, 1973) and formalization (Hage & Dewar, 1973; Schuler, 1975; Vredenburgh & Alutto, 1977) and organization performance. However, some dimensions have stronger relationship; for example, the degree of centralization was negatively relatively strongly related to organization performance (Harrison, 1974; McMahon, 1976; Miller, 1967; Beck & Betz, 1975; Luke, Block, Davey, & Averch, 1973; Pennings, 1976; Sorensen & Baum, 1975; Tannenbaum, 1961).

Organization size is an interesting factor in that it is not only a determinant factor but also a characteristic of organizational structure. Despite the various definitions of performance, many studies (Indik & Seashore, 1961; Katzell, Barrett, & Parker, 1961; Marriott, 1949; Thomas, 1959) present an inverse association between size and performance. Other results included curvilinear relationships (Herbst, 1957; Revan, 1958) and no systematic relationship (e.g., Bidwell & Kasarda, 1975; Conwin, 1970). Nevertheless, not all performances were positive and helpful. There are some behaviors that probably hinder organizations from achieving their goals. For instance, Cleland (1955) illustrated large companies are more likely to suffer protests than small ones.

Similarly, Shorter and Tilley (1971) reported a positive relationship between size of organization and incidence of strikes based on their long-term study of French industry. Turnovers is another aspect gauged by researchers, most investigations support a positive relationship between size and working turnovers (Baumgartel & Sobol, 1959; Hewitt & Parfitt, 1953; Indik & Seashore, 1961; Kerr, Koppelmeier, & Sullivan, 1951; Metzner & Mann, 1953; Revans, 1958), whereas no association occasionally (Argyle, Gardner, & Cioffi, 1958).

Self-perceptions of organizational members are also getting attention. Sollund (2006) examined the influences of mechanistic and organic organization on female employees' work satisfaction and suggested that "the organic form of organization has assets the mechanistic type of organization lacks, which facilitates offers of promotion, and other work values which produce work satisfaction and organizational commitment" (p. 287). Within the same working environment of hotel, Shamir (1978) further claimed the flexibility between mechanistic and organic structures. That is, various accepted practices of coping with unpredicted pressures are organic in nature, although the nominal organizational structure is mechanistic.

More specifically, Schminke, Cropanzano and Rupp (2002) explored the relationship between organizational structure and perceptions of fairness, which is part of job satisfaction. They examined four dimensions of structure (centralization, formalization, size, and vertical complexity) and three types of justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness). The survey result supported their prediction that less centralization and higher formalization were associated with higher levels of all these three dimensions of fairness.

17

Additionally, Alston and Tippett's (2009) reported a positive relationship between the extent of perceived organicness and the level of trust employee has in their organization. Since trust is also a component of job satisfaction, the organicness of organization is proved to influence the job satisfaction.

Based on various studies, the following research hypotheses are proposed:

H1: Employees who work for organizations with more organicness are more likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational accomplishments to external publics (positive megaphoning effect).

H2: Employees who work for organizations with less organicness (more mechanism) are more likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational problems to external publics (negative megaphoning effect).

H3: Employees who work for organizations with more organicness are more likely to engaging in scouting.

Societal Culture of China

One useful way to discuss cultural characteristics is based on five dimensions proposed by Hofstede (2001). They are: power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity, and long-term/short-term orientation. Power distance describes the extent to which power is distributed unequally within a society and the degree that society accepts this distribution. A culture with high power distance prefers hierarchical bureaucracies, strong leaders and a high regard for authority, whereas a low power distance culture tends to favor personal responsibility and autonomy.

Individualism/collectivism represents the degree to which individuals alter their attitude and behavior depending on self-interest or the interests of the group. In an individualism culture, freedom is highly valued. Conversely, a collectivism culture proposes that personal needs are less important than the needs of the collective.

Uncertainty avoidance deals with a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. It indicates to what extent a culture fosters individuals to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unknown situations. Uncertainty avoiding culture minimizes the uncertainty by comprehensive laws, security guarantee, and various faith and beliefs. People living in such culture are believed to be more emotional, and motivated by inner nervous energy. On the other hand, uncertainty accepting cultures are more tolerant of opinions different from what they are used to. Such societies allow the diversity of philosophical and religious tendency, as well as set few rules. People within these cultures are more likely to take risks and innovations.

Masculinity/femininity refers to the distribution of roles between the genders when people are trying to solute any social issue. While women's values differ less among societies, men's values from one country to another contain a continuum from very assertive and competitive (masculinity) to as modest and caring (femininity) as women's values. Women in feminine countries have the similar modest, caring values as men, but in the masculine countries, are less assertive and competitive than men. As a result, these countries show a gap between men's values and women's values.

Long-term/short-term orientation presents if a society does or does not value long-term commitments and respect for tradition. Values associated with long-term orientation are

thrift and perseverance. Values associated with short-term orientation are respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations, and protecting so called "face".

Specifically applying these dimensions to China, Hofstede (2003) found China has a significantly high power distance, which indicates that a high level of inequality of power and wealth within the society. As expected, China is of low extent of individualism, which, Hofstede believes, may be attributed to the high level of emphasis on a collectivist society by the Communist rule, as compared to one of individualism. Also, the study illustrated a high level of long-term orientation among Chinese. This result shows an attitude of persevering that even overcomes obstacles with time. Within the dimensions of uncertainty avoidance and masculinity/femininity, China has a similar performance as world's average level.

However, the contemporary Chinese culture may be changing and increasingly diverse. For example, the studies of Hong Kong samples (Fiske, 2002) showed no appreciable differences from samples from North America. Even some studied found a reversed result. For instance, the study of sense of belonging showed North Americans to be slightly but significantly more collectivistic than Hong Kong samples (Fiske, 2002). Taking Hong Kong as subject of Chinese culture may be lacking of convincing because of its approximate 150 years' domination under the Britain. Other discussions of scholars from mainland China and Taiwan are more widely accepted.

Hung (2002) described some specific aspects of culture in China. Generally speaking, Chinese consider "family" to be the basic unit in the society, and have a clear distinction between the "insider" and the "outsider." According to Cai (2001), guanxi is an unique term to China; it involves the quality of "transitivity," as a result of which "social networks are characterized by long links and strong webs of intertwining relationships" (p. 217). The

20

relationships between individuals are likely to be extended, and carry responsibility. Also, face and favors are exchanged and are regarded as "commodities" to some extent. In addition, intermediaries who can connect people within the transitive networks seem to be more important than those who gradually build trust among strangers (Cai, 2001).

These specific aspects of Chinese culture affect public relations practitioners and other employees' decision when they deal with publics. Hofstede (1980) found that the culture of a country is an indicator of different attitude and behaviors among employees. Sriramesh, Grunig and Dozier (1996) also argued that organizational culture is associated with societal culture. In their study, although culture was found to be neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for excellence in public relations, excellent public relations also can occur in an authoritarian culture. Adler's (2002) study showed that both managers and employees take their ethnicity into the work. Also, students who are from Singapore, Malaysia and Australia majoring in public relations interpreted and understood public relations theories and its application to practice according to their perspective cultures (Chia, 2009).

In China, though changes in the cultural systems have been observed, the deep-rooted cultural tradition and political system are bound to have a great influence on the way in which communication is structured and conducted. The long tradition of "ordinary people" obeying the dictates of higher authorities, either imperial courts, or the dominating parties, or elders remain (Chen, 2004). Those at the top make and enforce the decisions without participation from below, with the subordinates only helping to carry out instructions. Such an organizational culture and process usually produce imbalanced and asymmetrical effects.

Some researchers focus on the role of public relations practitioners in China. A great deal of research has concluded that the roles tend to fall into two categories: communication managers and communication technicians (Grunig & Repper, 1992). Lin (2008) revealed that the communication technician role was assumed by Taiwanese sport public relations practitioners. The same conclusion was provided by Chen (2008) that Chinese corporate communicators do play the role of communication technician more than that of communication manager. Also, in earlier studies, she found that very few Chinese public relations practitioners were part of the dominant coalition. They largely react to proposals formulated by supervisors or assess the impact of public reaction, rather than participate in the decision making process (Chen, 1992). To address this issue, Ni (2008) proposed the integration of employee/internal communication into managerial structure and practice, asserting that corporate communicators shall become part of the organization's dominant coalition so as to insure communication excellence.

Grunig and colleagues' (Grunig & Hunt, 1984) four models of public relations explained the possible communication behaviors applied by public relations practitioners. Some studies on Chinese organizations revealed the effects of culture on communication behaviors. Lin (2008) specifically focusing on sports public relations in Taiwan pointed out that the public agentry model was employed by Taiwanese sports public relations practitioners, for both internal and external publics. Ni's (2003) study on Chinese government showed that while the interview participants tended to define government public relations as an ideal in terms of relationship building associated with the two-way symmetric model, in practice, they often handled the media relations by following only the one-way or asymmetric model. Chen (2008) also confirmed that the mode of

internal/employee communication in Chinese corporations is one-way in nature, and two-way asymmetrical with unbalanced effect at best.

Although little literature refers to the relationships between Chinese culture and employees' communication behavior, cultural characteristics may potentially affect ECBs. Among the five cultural dimensions, this study will focus on two dimensions: power distance and collectivism/individualism. Power distance was identified as the largest ecological dimension that best differentiated most countries (Hofstede, 1980, 1983). Individualism is perhaps the dimension that is most often utilized in cross-cultural studies (e.g., Triandis, 1987).

China is undergoing a transition from planned to market economy. Nonetheless, many organizations have not discarded the long-term formed sense of highly "up-down" relationships (i.e., high power distance). In some governmental departments and nation-owned units, for example, the long-term ideology of "official standard" may make employees retain the perception that the relationships between the organization and external publics are akin to superior-subordinate relationships. As a result, employees consider communication with publics as, to some extent, "charity," and therefore are reluctant to share any information with publics. Additionally, the power distance inside the organizations prohibits employees from sharing information to external publics. On the one hand, employees fear of being accountable for negative feedback heard by superiors. On the other hand, in most cases, they do not believe external publics are able to change anything. Accordingly, the following research hypotheses are proposed:

H4a: Employees who work for organizations with higher power distance are less likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational accomplishments to external publics (positive megaphoning effect).

H4b: Employees who work for organizations with higher power distance are more likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational problems to external publics (negative megaphoning effect).

Another highly suggested dimension of Chinese culture is collectivism (Hofstede, 1980). A typical example of high collectivism is to advocate the "reputation of the collective." Studies in South Korea reported that Korean organizations tend to apply the concept of family in managing their employees (e.g., Lee, 2000). The slow consensus decisions and reaction time of crisis were also attributed to Japan's collectivistic communication style (Cooper-Chen & Tanaka, 2008). Chinese organizations also follow the instruction, "Do not wash your dirty linen in public." Employees are frequently taught not to distribute any negative information to masses and media, the outsiders. Hence, collectivism should be an indicator of employees' communication with external publics.

H5a: Employees who work for organizations with higher collectivism are more likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational accomplishments to external publics (positive megaphoning effect).

H5b: Employees who work for organizations with higher collectivism are less likely to engaging in forwarding and sharing organizational problems to external publics (negative megaphoning effect).

The reversed information process should also be interesting. Kim and Rhee (2011) asked for further exploration of the positive associations found among employee–

24

organization relationship quality and ECBs in Korea. They believed ECBs are likely to reflect the culture background. Managers in high power distance cultures usually take charge of making decisions unilaterally, and therefore provide few opportunities for upward communication process, which makes information collected by employees not valued. As a result, employees may not be strongly motivated to report feedback to managers (i.e. less scouting).

H6a: Employees who work for organizations with higher power distance are less likely to engaging in scouting.

Similarly, although the emphasis on the reputation of organizations encourages employees to get feedback from external publics for their organizations, individuals may assume that others may have done the job, and then pay less attention to it. When everyone holds the same idea, little scouting behavior will happen.

H6b: Employees who work for organizations with higher collectivism are less likely to engaging in scouting.

Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter presents detailed information on sample, research design, operationalization of variables, procedures, and data analysis. The sample is first described.

Sample

This study used a research design of survey in which participants in various organizations were asked to respond to a serious of questions regarding their employee communication behaviors (ECBs) of megaphoning and scouting, perceived organizational structures, and individual cultural characteristics. Two hundred and seventy-seven employees who work in public relations agencies, public relations department of their organizations, or other units without a public relations title but practicing public relations functions of Top 500 Chinese firms participate in this research. The Top 500 Chinese firms were identified based on Fortune 500 China.

The potential participants were recruited via snowball method. I first contacted the alumni of my university in China who worked either in independent public relations agencies or departments of public relations within large corporations or similar units that conduct public relations functions practically (e.g., public/governmental affairs, external relations, business development, etc.). Second, if the alumni were public relations agents, their clients that are from Top 500 enterprises were acquired as a sample, whereas if the alumni themselves are employees of Top 500 enterprises, they themselves were invited to participate in this research. Those alumni were also encouraged to introduce other Top

500 firms' employees to the researcher until there have been enough numbers of participant.

I choose these large top companies because, first, the Top 500 firms include various industries that are able to represent the general organizational environment of China. Top 500 firms of China was defined as the "2011 Fortune 500 China" released by Fortune China in July, 2011 (see fortunechina.com, 2011); second, there might be of different structures among these organizations so that a broad range or variation of organicness would exist in the sampled organizations/employees; third, most of these companies set up units that deal with public relations. Large top organizations are more likely to conduct public relations activities than smaller companies, with their own independent public relations units or departments. The sample size of two hundred and seventy-seven employees was deemed adequate for the subsequent statistical analysis.

Of the subjects, 40.1% ($n = 111$) were male, and 59.9% ($n = 166$) were female. Their ages were typically a little over 25 years (*Mean = 25.51 years, SD = 2.79*), ranging from 18 to 37 years old. About 59% of participants had a Bachelor's degree ($n = 162$), 24.9% Master's Degree ($n = 69$), 11.9% some college education ($n = 33$), and 4.6% lower education level/degree including high school and associate level ($n = 13$), respectively. Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 show detailed gender, age and education distributions of the subjects, respectively.

Table 3.1 Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	111	40.1
Female	166	59.9

Total	277	100.0

Table 3.2 Age

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
18	1	.4	.4
19	1	.4	.7
20	1	.4	1.1
21	3	1.1	2.2
22	17	6.1	8.3
23	22	7.9	16.2
24	58	20.9	37.2
25	73	26.4	63.5
26	34	12.3	75.8
27	27	9.7	85.6
28	6	2.2	87.7
29	6	2.2	89.9
30	12	4.3	94.2
31	5	1.8	96.0
32	1	.4	96.4
33	4	1.4	97.8
34	1	.4	98.2
35	2	.7	98.9
36	1	.4	99.3
37	2	.7	100.0
Total	277	100.0	

Table 3.3 Education Level

	Frequency	Percent
High school	9	3.2
Associate level	4	1.4
Community college or junior college	33	11.9
Bachelor's degree	162	58.5
Master's degree (including double bachelor's degree)	69	24.9
Total	277	100.0

About 53% of the participants worked for state-owned/government-owned organizations ($n = 146$), 24% private-owned ($n = 67$), 15% joint venture ($n = 42$), and 2% NGO ($n = 6$), respectively. The participants were also asked the gender of their direct supervisors. About 69% ($n = 190$) of their direct supervisors were male, and 31.4% ($n = 87$) were female. Information on the numbers of employees in organizations and work units was also requested. The average employee number of organizations was about 250 ($Mean = 249.49$, $SD = 267.25$). The total number of employees ranged from 20 to 1500. The average employee number of work units was about 22 ($Mean = 22.25$, $SD = 21.77$), ranging from 3 to 130. Tables 3.4 and 3.5 show detailed information on organization type and supervisor's gender.

Table 3.4 Organization Type

	Frequency	Percent
State-owned/government-owned	146	52.7
Private-owned	67	24.2
Joint venture	42	15.2
NGO	6	2.2
Other	16	5.8
Total	277	100.0

Table 3.5 Supervisor's Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	190	68.6
Female	87	31.4
Total	277	100.0

Procedures

The survey questionnaire was posted to a survey site (i.e., SoJump.com, a Chinese online survey software and questionnaire tool similar to SurveyMonkey.com). The potential participants were asked to go to the website and fill out the questionnaire between October 1st and October 31th of 2011. Participants ware received an email that

consisted of an Internet address for the questionnaire, and were automatically linked to the page of informed consent by clicking the hyperlink address. Messages were sent several times to encourage non-respondents to reply. Participants were also encouraged to distribute the questionnaires to their colleagues to enhance the sample size for this study.

Prior to collecting data, the survey questionnaire was cleared by the University of Houston Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects or IRB. Also, an English version of the questionnaire was first developed, and then the researcher translated it to Chinese version. A research assistant who is a fluent bilingual in English and Chinese translated the English version to Chinese one independently. The two translators met together and compared two translations. If there were any differences, we discussed and resolved them. Then we invited a group of Chinese students at the University of Houston ($n = 17$) and pre-tested the questionnaire (web and hard-copy versions) by asking them to fill out and offer comments about the questionnaire in any way the researcher could improve the questionnaire (e.g. clarity in wording, length, etc.). After the pretest, the final version was posted on the web and was available to the prospective participants.

Measures of variables

Megaphoning and scouting

This study adopted the items of Kim and Rhee's (2011) research to measure positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting behaviors. Seven items were used to measure the intention of participants who will voluntarily distribute positive information to outsiders (positive megaphoning). Five items were used to observe the extent to which participants will share negative aspect of their organizations to others. Ten items were used to examine to what extent participants are willing to gather critical information from

30

outside to their organizations. All items were observed on five-point scales ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). In addition, two multiple-choice questions were included to measure the subjects and media through which participant exchange external information (see Appendix B). They were reported to be reliable and valid.

Generally speaking, research participants were likely to practice positive megaphoning behaviors to their organizations (*Mean* = 3.24, *SD* = 0.67). The reliability score was fairly high (Cronbach's alpha = .74). On the other hand, participants had relatively low intention to distribute negative information of their organizations to publics (*Mean* = 2.75, *SD* = 0.71). The reliability score was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = .73). On average, participants were willing to gather external information (scouting behaviors) for their organizations (*Mean* = 3.16, *SD* = 0.60). The reliability score was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = .70) after eliminating one item. Most participants preferred to communicate with peers or co-workers (*n* = 255) other than supervisors (*n* = 66) and subordinates (*n* = 66). Moreover, also most participants reported they tend to share information with one specific group of people (either supervisor, or subordinates, or peers/coworkers) in their organizations (*n* = 175). About thirty percent of participants (*n* = 82) reported sharing information with two or more groups in organization. Face-to-face was the most preferred communication medium (*n* = 204) followed by Internet/online messages (*n* = 102). More than half of the participants (*n* = 150, 54.2%) used one primary communication medium, about 24% and 20% using two and three media, respectively.

Organizational structure

To observe organizational structure, the seven-item measure created by Khandwalla (1996/1997) was used. Participants indicated on a seven-point scale the degree (strongly

disagree to strongly agree) to which paired statements described the structure of their organization. Following Covin and Slevin (1989) and Slevin and Covin (1997), items were reversed scored that higher values represented a more organic structure (see Appendix C). Research participants indicated a little low extent of organicness of their organizations (*Mean* = 3.95, *SD* = 1.01). The reliability score was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = .74).

Societal culture

Items from Dorfman and Howell (1988) and McCoy (2002) were adopted to operationalize individualism-collectivism and power distance among Chinese employees on the individual level. Hofstede's (2001) stated that their measure is only used to compare similarities and differences on national level because it asked participants to respond from the standpoint of how they believe most people think, but not how they think as individuals. Hence, a practical method is needed to reflect cultural perceptions of individual employees. Dorfman and Howell (1988) provided an individual-level instrument based on the original Hofstede dimensions and has been tested by other researchers (e.g., McCoy, 2002). There are six items created to measure individualism/collectivism, and six items for power distance, respectively. All items are seven-point scales, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). They were reported to be reliable and valid (see Appendix D).

On average, participants reported a moderately high level of collectivism (*Mean* = 4.25, *SD* = .87). The reliability score was fairly high (Cronbach's alpha = .74). For another indicator, participants believed the power distance level of their organizations

were moderate (*Mean* = 4.25, *SD* = .87). The reliability score was acceptable (Cronbach's alpha = .70) after eliminating two items.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 19.0. Prior to analysis, data were examined through various SPSS programs for data entry, missing value, and fit between their distributions.

Chapter Four

Results

This study explored the effects of organizational structure and individual cultural characteristic on employees' communication behaviors (ECBs) of positive and negative megaphoning and scouting in Chinese organizations. This chapter reports the results of data analysis by examining the effects of organicness of organization and two individual cultural characteristics (i.e. individualism/collectivism and power distance) on three ECBs (i.e. positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting). A correlation analysis was conducted. Three independent variables were organizational structure, individualism/collectivism, and power distance.

Main analysis

To test the hypotheses, Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated for the relationships between organizational structure, individualism/collectivism, power distance, and ECBs of positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting.

Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 predicted significant association of organizational structure (i.e. the extent of organicness) with ECBs. More specifically, employees who work for organizations with more organicness were more likely to engaging in positive megaphoning and scoutings behaviors, and less likely to engaging in negative megaphoning behaviors.

The correlation analysis revealed that the Pearson's correlation coefficients were $r(277) = .47, p < .01$, $r(277) = .28, p < .01$, and $r(277) = .06, p > .05$ for the effects of organicness on positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting, respectively. These results indicated that first hypothesis was supported. That is, organic

34

organizational structure had a significant positive correlation with the positive

megaphoning. Second hypothesis was not supported. Although it was a significant

correlation between organicness and negative megaphoning, the result indicated an

opposite direction, which implied a positive correlation between organic structure and

negative megaphoning behaviors. The third hypothesis was not supported, either because

there was not a significant correlation between organicness and scouting behaviors,

although the result presented a positive direction, which was consistent with the

hypothesis. Table 4.1 displays the Pearson's correlation coefficients and 1- tailed

significant level, and the number of participants.

Table 4.1. Pearson correlation, 1- tailed significant level, and the number of participants
across organicness for ECBs

		Positive Megaphoning	Negative Megaphoning	Scouting
Organicness	Pearson Correlation	.47**	.28**	.06
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.00	.00	.17
	N	277	277	277

*Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

Hypothesis 4a, 4b and 6a predicted employees who work for organizations with

higher power distance would be less likely to engaging in positive megaphoning and

scouting behavior, but more likely to conduct negative megaphoning behaviors.

The correlation test supported hypothesis 4a with Pearson's correlation coefficient

$r(277) = - .21, p < .01$. The result indicated a significant negative correlation between

power distance and positive megaphoning; that employees who personally perceive

higher power distance levels in organizations are less likely to forward and share

organizational accomplishments to external publics. Hypothesis 4b was also supported.

The Pearson's correlation coefficient was $r(277) = .19$, $p < .01$. That is, power distance has a significant positive correlation with negative megaphoning behaviors. The Pearson's correlation coefficient of hypothesis 6b was $r(277) = -.28$, $p < .01$. The result revealed a significant and negative correlation, which is consistent with the hypothesis, between power distance and scouting behaviors. Therefore, the hypothesis 6b was also supported. Table 4.2 displays the Pearson's correlation coefficients and 1- tailed significant level, and the number of participants.

Table 4.2. Pearson correlation, 1- tailed significant level, and the number of participants across power distance for ECBs

		Positive Megaphoning	Negative Megaphoning	Scouting
Power distance	Pearson Correlation	-.21[**]	.19[**]	-.28[**]
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.00	.00	.00
	N	277	277	277

*Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

Hypotheses 5a, 5b, and 6b predicted employees who work for organizations with higher collectivism would be more likely to engaging in positive megaphoning, but less likely to conduct negative megaphoning and scouting behaviors.

Hypothesis 5a was not supported. The Pearson's correlation coefficient was $r(277) = .04$, $p > .05$. There was not a significant correlation between collectivism and employees' behavior of forwarding and sharing organizational accomplishments to external publics, although the result had a positive direction, which was consistent with the hypothesis. The Pearson's correlation coefficient for hypothesis 5b was $r(277) = .15$, $p < .01$, which indicated a significant positive correlation between collectivism and

employees' forwarding as well as sharing problems of organizations to external publics. Since the direction of association was opposite to the original hypothesis, hypothesis 5b was not supported. Hypothesis 6b was not supported, either. The Pearson's correlation coefficient was $r(277) = .30$, $p < .01$. The result revealed a significant but positive correlation between collectivism and scouting behaviors, which was the opposite direction of the hypothesis again. Table 4.3 displays the Pearson's correlation coefficients and 1- tailed significant level, and the number of participants.

Table 4.3. Pearson correlation, 1- tailed significant level, and the number of participants across individualism/collectivism for ECBs

		Positive Megaphoning	Negative Megaphoning	Scouting
Collectivism-Individualism	Pearson Correlation	.04	.15[**]	.30[**]
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.26	.01	.00
	N	277	277	277

*Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

Post-hoc Analyses

A few post-hoc analyses were conducted primarily referring to demographic and organizational background. The stepwise regressions were conducted to explore if participants' age, education level, organizations' and units' size, the choices of communication partner and media, organizational structure (i.e. organicness), individual cultural characteristics (i.e. individualism/collectivism, power distance) have any particular effects on three ECB variables (i.e. positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting). First, results of the multiple regression tests on positive megaphoning indicated communication partnership, organicness, unit employee number,

education level, communication media, and individualism/collectivism as the significant

predictors of positive megaphoning behavior. Table 4.4 displays R, R square, adjusted R

square, change statistics, unstandardized and standardized coefficients, significant level,

and collinearity statistics for positive megaphoning as a dependent variable.

Table 4.4 Stepwise regression test of demographic information organizational
background on positive megaphoning behaviors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
6	.746	.557	.546	.44256

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
6	(Constant)	-1.282	.459		-2.791	.006
	1. People one communicated with	.432	.051	.414	8.500	.000
	Organicness	.450	.037	.694	12.295	.000
	2. Number of Employees in Unit	-.007	.001	-.242	-5.041	.000
	3. Education	.360	.056	.334	6.412	.000
	4. Media one used to communicate with	-.213	.039	-.278	-5.527	.000
	5. Collectivism-Individualism	.103	.033	.139	3.105	.002

Second, results of the multiple regression tests on negative megaphoning indicated that the number of employees in organization, age, organicness, individualism/collectivism, and scouting as the significant predictors of negative megaphoning behavior. Table 4.5 displays R, R square, adjusted R square, change statistics, unstandardized and standardized coefficients, significant level, and collinearity statistics for negative megaphoning as a dependent variable.

Table 4.5 Stepwise regression test of demographic information organizational background on negative megaphoning behaviors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
9	.579	.335	.322	.60739

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
9	(Constant)	3.555	.464		7.667	.000
	1. Number of Employees in Organization	.001	.000	.229	4.150	.000
	2. Age	-.070	.015	-.257	-4.778	.000
	3. Organicness	.220	.039	.303	5.712	.000
	4. Collectivism-Individualism	.291	.046	.349	6.359	.000
	5. Scouting	-.399	.067	-.321	-5.926	.000

Third, results of the multiple regression procedure on scouting indicated that education, individualism/collectivism, power distance, organicness, and negative megaphoning were the significant predictors of negative scouting behavior. Table 4.6 displays R, R square, adjusted R square, change statistics, unstandardized and standardized coefficients, significant level, and collinearity statistics for scouting as a dependent variable.

Table 4.6 Stepwise regression test of demographic information organizational background on scouting megaphoning behaviors

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.458[a]	.210	.207	.52905
2	.576[b]	.332	.327	.48735
3	.712[c]	.508	.502	.41926
4	.749[d]	.561	.554	.39667
5	.777[e]	.604	.596	.37771

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
5	(Constant)	-1.170	.408		-2.868	.004
	1. Education	.503	.046	.516	10.960	.000
	2. Collectivism-Individualism	.423	.031	.629	13.765	.000
	3. Power distance	-.248	.027	-.422	-9.165	.000
	4. Organicness	.190	.028	.324	6.881	.000
	5. Negative Megaphoning	-.183	.035	-.227	-5.170	.000

The differences of participants' and supervisors' gender on positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting were also explored by a MANOVA procedure. Results showed that there was no significant difference between participants' gender for either positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, or scouting, *Pillai's Trace* = .01, *multivariate F* (3, 273) = .48, *p* > .05. Table 4.7 displays genders, means, standard deviations, and numbers of participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting.

Table 4.7. Genders, means, standard deviations, and numbers of participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Positive Megaphoning	Male	3.17	0.67	111
	Female	3.29	0.66	166
	Total	3.24	0.67	277
Negative Megaphoning	Male	2.73	0.93	111
	Female	2.76	0.52	166
	Total	2.75	0.71	277
Scouting	Male	3.14	0.56	111
	Female	3.18	0.64	166
	Total	3.16	0.61	277

However, significant different effects of supervisors' gender on ECBs were revealed, *Pillai's Trace* = .10, *Multivariate F* (3, 273) = 10.05, *p* < .001. Male supervisors had more effects on employees' positive megaphoning behaviors than female supervisors, *F* (1, 275) = 5.76, *p* < .05. Results also indicted that employees are more likely to conduct negative megaphoning behaviors when their supervisors are males rather than females, *F* (1, 275) = 9.87, *p* < .005. Moreover, male supervisors were also more likely to encourage employees to conduct scouting than female supervisors, *F* (1, 275) = 9.56, *p* < .005. Table 4.8 displays supervisors' genders, means, standard deviations, and numbers of

participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting (all sig.

< .01).

Table 4.8. Supervisor's genders, means, standard deviations, and numbers of participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting

	Supervisor's Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Positive Megaphoning[*]	Male	3.31	0.64	190
	Female	3.10	0.71	87
	Total	3.24	0.67	277
Negative Megaphoning[*]	Male	2.84	0.81	190
	Female	2.55	0.37	87
	Total	2.75	0.71	277
Scouting[*]	Male	3.24	0.59	190
	Female	3.00	0.61	87
	Total	3.16	0.61	277

Note.. *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).*

The differences of organizational type were also explored by a MANOVA procedure. Five categories were recoded into two variables, exclusively and not-exclusively state/government owned organizations. Option one was recoded as exclusively state/government owned organizations, whereas options two was recoded as not-exclusively state/government owned organizations. Results of the test indicated there was as overall significant difference between exclusively and not-exclusively state/government owned organizations for all kinds of ECBs, *Pillai's Trace* = .19, *Multivariate F* (3, 273) = 21.37, *p* < .001. Employees from not-exclusively state/government owned organizations were more likely to engage in positive megaphoning than their state/government owned counterparts, *F* (1, 275) = 5.38, *p* < .05. Reversely, employees of exclusively state/government owned organizations were equally

(no significant different) likely to conduct negative megaphoning behaviors than not-exclusively state/government owned employees, $F(1, 275) = .07$, $p > .05$. Employees of exclusively state/government owned organizations also conducted more scouting behaviors than not-exclusively state/government owned employees, $F(1, 275) = 32.53$, $p < .001$. Table 4.9 displays organizational type, means, standard deviations, and numbers of participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting

Table 4.9 Organizational type, means, standard deviations, and numbers of participants for positive megaphoning, negative megaphoning, and scouting

	Recoded Organizational Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Positive Megaphoning*	Exclusive State/Gov. owned	3.15	0.64	146
	No exclusive state/Gov. owned	3.34	0.69	131
	Total	3.24	0.67	277
Negative Megaphoning	Exclusive State/Gov. owned	2.76	0.51	146
	No exclusive state/Gov. owned	2.74	0.89	131
	Total	2.75	0.71	277
Scouting*	Exclusive State/Gov. owned	3.35	0.45	146
	No exclusive state/Gov. owned	2.95	0.69	131
	Total	3.16	0.61	277

Note.*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Chapter Five

Discussion

This chapter presents the discussion. It first describes the summary of the research, followed by a discussion of findings, implications, limitations and suggestions for future research. Conclusion is provided in the end.

Summary of Research

Previous studies have argued that developing mutually beneficial relationships with employees can bring strategic advantages to organizations in business environment. Employees may, for example, voluntarily engage in promoting, advocating, and monitoring behaviors through positive megaphoning and scouting. If not, employees may select and disperse negative information to external publics, which will amplify organizational problems, especially during a crisis and scandal. Symmetrical internal communication efforts have been indicated as a critical way to initiate and maintain positive relationships with employees and benefit from employees' communicative actions (Kim & Rhee, 2011).

To explore other factors that may affect employee communication behaviors (ECBs), this empirical research focused on organizational structure and cultural characteristics of employees. Organicness of organizational structure was hypothesized to influence employees' internal and external communication behaviors including megaphoning and scouting.

Societal culture fundamentally dictates behaviors of people who live in a specific country or region. Studies of Chinese culture have suggested China has a cultural orientation of high power distance and low extent of individualism. Power distance

presents the difference *between* high regard for authority *and* personal responsibility and autonomy. Individualism/collectivism describes the degree to which individuals alter their attitude and behavior depending on self-interest or the interests of the group. These cultural dimensions of power distance and individualism/collectivism were also hypothesized to impact ECBs of megaphoning and scouting.

Discussion

Results of the current study indicated that organicness has a positive relationship with megaphoning behaviors, but is negatively associated with negative megaphoning or scouting behaviors. In other words, people who work in organizations that facilitate communication flows in all directions (both upward and downward) and focus on informal relationships are potentially more conducive to forward and share organizational accomplishments with external publics (positive megaphoning). However, results implied that these people work in organizations with greater organicness also conduct more negative megaphoning behaviors. One explanation could be that the organic structure of organizations provides a relaxed communication environment, which encourages employees to express their perspectives and emotions of organizational life to all the communication targets, partners, and publics. In organic organizations, because information flowing is quite free and easy to spread, it is more easily for employees to explore potential problems not only in their own work, but also in some strategic units such as finance, research and development (Kim & Rhee, 2011). Moreover, the management style of organic organizations provided an open channel of communication about even the important information. Managers primarily focus on how to get things done, as well as take an informal control of employees' communication behaviors inside

of the organization. Information and communication channel are both accessible to employees. Hence, the organic structure of organization encourages employees to share information (even negative) of their organization with external publics. The test of effects of structure on scouting also supported this viewpoint.

Nevertheless, how employees define negative megaphoning needs more consideration. For some employees, the purpose of distributing negative information of organization to the publics is to help address defects because sometimes they cannot bring about any meaningful changes by themselves (Kim & Grunig, 2011). In such circumstances, they may draw support from external public to exert pressure on their organizations since they believe the "negative megaphoning" are actually positive behaviors. Additionally, behaviors such as talking about problems to family and friends can possibly be a way of releasing the high working pressure or stress prevalent in organic organizations, but not a purposely aspersion.

Findings of this research provided evidence that the extent of individualism or collectivism is not a significant predictor of any megaphoning or scouting behavior. High collectivism was found to have a positive, but not significant, correlation with positive megaphoning. It is consistent with the hypothesis direction-wise. However, results indicated that higher collectivism correlated with more negative megaphoning, but more scouting. Although do not support the hypotheses, these results are consistent with some of previous studies in which the measurements of different items showed contradict extent of individualism/collectivism. Indeed, due to the dire economic condition as well as the large population when the country was initially established, Chinese people are chronically taught to value group welfare and success more important than individual

rewards, and to sacrifice individual benefits when it is contradictive with collective well-being, and these collectivistic propaganda do helped China go through the difficult times. However, since the participants of this research are all from China's top organizations, they are beneficiaries of the rapid economic development in recent thirty years. The reality does not enforce the new generation to make a tough choice between the individual and the collective any longer because there are better ways of maximizing individual and group benefits simultaneously. For example, there might be only limited number of machines in one working team so that all employees had to share the machines. If one of these employees earned the prize of excellent working performance, he/she must attribute the success to the whole working group. But today, employees do not need to worry about the lack of materials. They can pursue personal achievements and guarantee the productivity of the whole organization at the same time. As a result, it comes out with a conflict between education of collectivism and practice of individualism that may confuses employees (Fiske, 2002).

The hypotheses referring to the effects of power distance are all supported. The results are also consistent with previous studies that indicated China had a high level of power distance, which involves of hierarchical bureaucracies, strong leaders and a high regard for authority. It is reasonable since a large portion of organizations of this research are state-owned/government-owned. Although have been transformed into, for instance, joint-stock corporate, the structure of these organizations are still the same as governments. Some of the mangers in these organizations receive the same welfare of officials who hold the governmental titles as long as they are identified as the same administrative level. For example, the general manager of a province-level state-owned

47

corporate supposes to be treated as same as the governor of that province. Hence, the incomplete separation between government and enterprises results in the high power distance inside those state-owned/government-owned organizations.

Implications

This research makes an important contribution toward understanding the effects of an organization's structure and employees' cultural characteristics on their communication behaviors toward internal and external publics. Findings from the current study generally support the overall relationships between organizational structure and employee communication behaviors (ECBs), and partially verify the previous conclusions of cultural characteristics. In addition, findings suggested how other factors such as employee and their supervisor's gender, education level, organizational type and size could affect ECBs.

Theoretically, previous studies had conceptualized megaphoning and scouting with the subsequent verification of the impact that internal symmetrical communication has on these ECBs. In this study, two additional aspects, organizational structure and cultural environment, are also found to have effects on ECBs of megaphoning and scouting. Since communication behaviors are influenced by so many aspects, there should be other empirically validated antecedent variables affecting ECBs.

Findings of this research also have important practical implications. Modern organizations are facing severe competition so that they have to react to the fast changing circumstances despite how much they value the solid management principles. According to this study, employees from organic organization are more likely to share information both with internal and external publics. That is, employees actually practice two-way

48

symmetrical communication, which is extremely recommended by excellent public

relations (e.g., Grunig et al., 2002). If organizations have an organic structure, they may

have more feedback and faster reflection from publics than others. More feedback

provide a broader range of views on the potential issues that may occur as well as what

aspects that need to be improved, whereas fast reflection of publics helps organizations

prevent small issue from becoming big crisis as early as possible. Even the negative

megaphoning can urge to ameliorations of organizations if managers recognize the value

of criticism. In a sum, organic structure implies a more effective and excellent

organization in this research. Power distance exerts adverse effects on ECBs in this study,

which is consistent with all the hypotheses and previous studies.

There were a significant difference with respect to power distance between

employees of organizations owned by State or Government (Mean = 3.21, SD = .92, N =

146) and their counterparts of organizations owned by non-State or Government (Mean =

3.54, SD=1.03, N = 131), t(275) = -2.82, p < .005. Since Chinese organizations have the

tradition of relatively high power distance for thousands of years, it is difficult to reverse

the perceptions in a short term. Some efforts should be done based on this research. On

the one side, government and enterprises should be separated more completely and

clearly. Any corporate which faces sufficient market competition will realize the

weakness of high power distance. In order to become more competitive, Chinese

organizations should try to jump off the wing of the government. On another, managers

of Chinese organizations also need to abandon the perceptions that link the relationship

between superior/subordinate to monarch/subject. Since high power distance obstruct the

communication between superiors and subordinates, organizations cannot reflect to any

issue even if employees have got information from external publics. Hence, this study suggests a low power distance inside of Chinese organizations.

Individualism and collectivism have found limited effects on ECBs. Chinese employees are in the dilemma between collective propaganda and individualistic practices. For participants of this study, it might be acceptable to achieve their personal goals and collective benefits simultaneously because their organizations are able to provide some room for individual development. However, since most private-owned organizations are of small size and vulnerable to market risks, the conflicts between individualism and collectivism among Chinese organizations might last for some years more.

Limitations and Future Studies

There are some limitations in this study. Due to the sampling process, the number of participants in every organization cannot be predicted accurately. In some organizations, the first participant was encouraged to invite his/her colleagues in this research. However, this soft request cannot guarantee three or more employees in a single organization. As a result, the sampling process reduced the representativeness of the perceived organizational structure. Although the cultural characteristics were individual-oriented, too few participants from one organization increase the risk of including non-representative participants. Also, it is difficult to identify the qualification of participants who selected by the snowball method. Although public relations practitioners were asked to invite their colleagues in the same working unit, it could not be excluded that those colleagues actually exercised totally different functions, for example, financial support. Additionally, there was not a recommended time schedule for participants to finish the

questionnaire. It is observed that, in average, participants who finished the questionnaire in working time spent less time than those who went through it during spare time (the time spent by each participant was also recorded on the survey site). The limitation of time spent on the questionnaire may affect the reliability of responses. Hence, the sampling and procedure of this research may reduce the reliability of the research. For future studies, researcher may focus on one specific industry through which more employees in each organization can be involved. Researchers are also encouraged to exercise on-site survey so that the reliability of the answers can be more ensured.

Since the participants of this research were public relations practitioners, their ECBs and individual-level cultural characteristics may have consensus in some specific aspects. First, on the average, the results have shown that participants tended to conduct more positive megaphoning behaviors than negative ones. This result could include two considerations. On the one hand, ECBs of public relations practitioners may be as same as employees from other working unit. On the other hand, however, positive megaphoning and scouting are the important part of their job responsibility. Although the definition of megaphoning and scouting had emphasized ECBs were voluntary actions, sometimes it is difficult to differentiate the motives of these behaviors. In other words, the responses of public relations practitioners have combined both the spontaneous and job-required actions. To solve the issue, a comparison test may be conducted in future study. ECBs of employees out of public relations field should be measured to distinguish from public relations practitioners.

This study reveals the correlations between organizational structure, cultural characteristics and ECBs, but only provides some possibilities that link these variables.

Future studies may explore the causal relationships of how organizational structure and culture lead to the changes of ECBs, or other aspects that may also have effects on ECBs, or any mediate factors between organizational elements and communication behaviors.

Conclusion

ECBs of megaphoning and scouting are a critical and complicated issue for organizations. Previous studies amply proved that the effects of such ECBs on public relations practices and demonstrated internal symmetrical communication as an important antecedent of such ECBs. Findings of this study indicated that organizational structure and cultural environment also affect ECBs. In particular, by improving the organicness and reducing the power distance, organizations are able to gain more positive megaphoning and scouting behaviors, as well as less negative megaphoning behaviors from their employees. Public practitioners should pay attention to individual-level cultural characteristics of employees, whereas management level should accommodate more organic structures in organizations.

Appendix A

Informed Consent

You are being invited to participate in a research project conducted by Feng Jiang from the School of Communication at the University of Houston. This project is part of thesis, which is conducted under the supervision of Dr. Jaesub Lee.

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any question.

This study will explore effects of Chinese culture and organizational structures on employees' communication behavior (ECB) in China. Specifically, this study aims to examine how two cultural dimensions influence and two typical organizational structures affect two ECB aspects. This study is important because it provides a comprehensive viewpoint of the ECB in terms of both organizational and cultural stages collected from representative organizational members in China. Findings from this study will help public relations practitioners, organizational management team, and cultural researchers who are concerned with multiple (both cultural and organizational) factors that influence the practice of public relations in China.

You will be one of approximately 250 subjects to be asked to participate in this project. You will be first asked to read the cover letter that describes the purpose of this study, and then respond to a series of questions regarding the structures of your organization, your own cultural characteristics, and ECBs in your organization. Questions include several demographic questions, and a few 5- or 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from for example, "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7), or "utmost importance (1) to very little importance (7)". It will take about 20 minutes to complete the survey. There is no follow-up.

Your participation in this project is anonymous. Please do not write your name on any of the research materials to be returned to the principal investigator.

There are no forseeable risks associated with your participation in this project.

While you will not directly benefit from participation, your participation may help investigators better understand the analyzed structures and public relations models applied in your organization, as well as your own cultural characteristics through a standardized test.

Participation in this project is voluntary and the only alternative to this project is non-participation.

The results of this study may be published in professional and/or scientific journals. It may also be used for educational purposes or for professional presentations. However, no individual subject will be identified.

If you have any questions, you may contact Feng Jiang at University of Houston (281-794-0149). You may also contact Dr. Jae Lee, faculty sponsor, at 713-743-2885.

Employee communication behaviours (ECBs) measure

In this section, your answer will help to recognize your communication behaviour.

Please mark/check the number that most accurately describes the extent to which you

agree (or disagree) with each of the statements below based on the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Undecided**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

Positive megaphoning items

1. Write positive comments or advocating posting for my organization on the Internet.

   1   2   3   4   5

2. Say good things to friends and neighbours about positive aspects of the management

   and company.

   1   2   3   4   5

3. Routinely recommend my organization and its service/products to people.

   1   2   3   4   5

4. Attempt to persuade people who have negative opinions about my organization.

   1   2   3   4   5

5. Refute prejudiced or stereotyped opinions about my organization.

   1   2   3   4   5

6. In the past, fought with those who criticized my organization and business.

   1   2   3   4   5

7. Become upset and tend to speak up when encountering ignorant or biased opinions

about my organization.

1   2   3   4   5

Negative megaphoning items

8. Post negative things about my organization on the Internet.

1   2   3   4   5

9. Talk about the mistakes and problems of our management to family and friends.

1   2   3   4   5

10. State to friends and family that my organization is run more poorly than competitors.

1   2   3   4   5

11. Talk to people about the problems of our service/products.

1   2   3   4   5

12. Agree with people who criticize my organization.

1   2   3   4   5

Scouting

13. Meet and check with suppliers and government officials to collect new information.

1   2   3   4   5

14. Voluntarily meet and check with those people who have grievances with organization.

1   2   3   4   5

15. Voluntarily check people's feedback on organizational events.

1   2   3   4   5

16. Search for new information and subscribe to Listserv, newsletters, publications for

organization.

1   2   3   4   5

17. Make extra effort to cultivate and maintain relationships with external stakeholders

and strategic publics.

1   2   3   4   5

18. Meet people who work for similar businesses and check rumors and news about

organization or business.

1   2   3   4   5

19. Even after working hours contact strategic publics and stakeholders for their

complaints and new information and share the information with colleagues.

1   2   3   4   5

20. Start conversation or give information to relevant colleagues about new trends or

unusual signals related to work.

1   2   3   4   5

21. When talking about or sharing external information with people inside your

organization, do you communicate with your _____?

(Please mark/check all that apply to you!)

1. Supervisor

2. Subordinate

3. Peer/co-worker

4. Others_____

22. When talking about or sharing external information with people inside your

organization, do you primarily communicate via _____?

(Please mark/check all that apply to you!)

    1. Face-to-face talk

    2. Email

    3. Telephone/cellphone

    4. Online/Internet/instant message

    5. Texting

    6. Memo/documents

    7. Others_____

Appendix C

Organizational structure measure

This section asks you about your organizational structure. Please mark/check the number that best reflects the extent to which, in general, the management philosophy in your firm favors.

23

Highly structured channels of communication and a highly restricted access to important financial and operating information.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Open channels of communication with important financial information flowing quite freely throughout the organization.
A strong insistence on uniform managerial style throughout the firm.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Managers' operating styles allowed to range freely from the very formal to the informal.
A strong emphasis on giving the most say in decision making formal line managers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A strong tendency to let the expert in a given situation have the most say in decision making, even if this means temporary bypassing of formal line of authority.

A strong emphasis on holding   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   A strong emphasis on holding fast to
fast to tried and true   changing circumstances without too
management principles despite   much concern for past practice.
any changes in business
conditions.

A strong emphasis on always   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   A strong emphasis on getting things
getting personnel to follow the   done even if this means disregarding
formally laid-down   formal procedures.
procedures.

Tight formal control of most   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   Loose, informal control; heavy
operations by means of   dependence on informal relationships
sophisticated control and   and norm of cooperation systems.
information for getting work
done.

A strong emphasis on getting   1 2 3 4 5 6 7   A strong tendency to let the
line and staff personnel to   requirements of the situation and the
adhere closely to formal job   individual personality define proper
descriptions.   on-the-job behavior.

Appendix D

Societal culture measure

This section is about general characteristics. Please mark/check the number that most accurately indicates the extent to which you agree (or disagree) with the following statements.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Slightly Disagree**	Undecided	**Slightly Agree**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

Individualism/collectivism

24. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

25. Group success is more important than individual success.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

26. Being accepted by the members of your work group is very important.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

27. Employees should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

28. Managers should encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

29. Individuals may be expected to give up their goals in order to benefit group success.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Individualism/collectivism

30. Managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.

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

31. It is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with

subordinates.

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

32. Managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.

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

33. Managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.

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

34. Employees should not disagree with management decisions.

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

35. Managers should not delegate important tasks to employees.

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

This section is about how you feel about your relationship with your immediate

supervisor. Please mark/check the number that most accurately describes the extent to

which you agree (or disagree) with each of the statements.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Undecided**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

36. I know how satisfied or dissatisfied my   1 2 3 4 5

immediate supervisor is with what I do.

37. My immediate supervisor understands   1 2 3 4 5

    my work problems and needs.

38. I feel my immediate supervisor   1 2 3 4 5

    recognizes my potential.

39. Regardless of how much formal   1 2 3 4 5

    authority my immediate supervisor has

    built into his/her position, he/she will be

    inclined to use his/her available power

    to help me solve problems in my work.

40. Regardless of how much formal   1 2 3 4 5

    authority my immediate supervisor has,

    I can count on him/her to "bail me out"

    at his/her expense when I really need it.

41. I have confidence in my supervisor's   1 2 3 4 5

    decisions such that I would defend and

    justify them even if he or she were not

    present to do so.

42. I would characterize my working   1   2   3   4   5

   relationship with my supervisor as

   effective.

Demographic Information

Please answer each of the questions below by checking the appropriate answer category

or by writing in the relevant information.

43. Are you? _____ Male _____ Female

44. How old are you? _____ Years

45. What is your highest diploma?

   _____1. Elementary school or less

   _____2. Middle school

   _____3. High school

   _____4. Associate level (including junior college and technical school)

   _____5. Community college,

   _____6. Bachelor's degree

   _____7. Master's degree (including double bachelor's degree)

   _____8. Ph. D degree

   _____8. Higher than Ph. D degree

64

46. Is your organization (Please check all that apply)?

    1. State-owned/government-owned

    2. Private-owned

    3. Joint venture

    4. NGO

    5. Others_____

47. Is your supervisor? _____ Male _____ Female

48. How many people work in your organization? _____

49. How many people work in your department? _____

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

附录 A

组织结构，文化属性及员工传播行为问卷

您被邀请参加一项由来自休斯顿大学传播学院硕士研究生姜峰发起的研究项目。该研究项目是他硕士论文的一部分，指导老师为 Dr. Jaesub Lee。

您的参与是自愿的，并且可以在本项目的任何时间选择退出。同时，您也可以选择不回答问卷中的任何单个问题但不退出整个问卷。本人承诺以上这些权利的实施不会伴随任何惩罚或利益的损失。

本项目旨在探索中国文化和组织结构对员工传播行为（Employee communication behaviors, ECBs）的影响。具体来说，研究的目的在于检验员工的个体文化属性以及两种典型的组织结构对员工传播行为的影响。这项研究的重要性在于问卷面向具有代表性的中国组织，为中国公共关系实践提供了一个建立在文化和组织结构层面上的广阔视角。这项研究的成果可以帮助公共关系实践人员，组织管理者和文化学者提供多维度的数据参考。

您将会是 300 位本项目的参与者之一。您首先将会阅读关于研究目的的前言，随后将会回答一系列与您所在单位的组织结构，文化属性，和员工传播行为的问卷。问卷将包括一些人口统计学问题，一些 1-5 或 1-7 分的李克特量表问题。比如：您选择 1 代表"强烈的不认同"，选择 7 代表"强烈的认同"，以此类推。问卷预计会花费您 20 分钟左右的时间，并且不会有任何后续活动。

您的参与是匿名的，请不要在任何位置留下关于有助于辨认您姓名的信息。

您的参与是安全的，参与本项研究不会对您造成任何可能伤害。

虽然您不会从本项目中获得任何物质奖励，但您的参与可以帮助我们更好的了解和分析您所在单位的组织结构和公共关系状况，同时也能验证文化属性是否同之前的研究一致。
本项目的研究成果可能会被发表在学术期刊中，或者被用于以教学为目的的学术讲演中，但不会有任何个体作为实例被研究。

如果您有任何问题，欢迎联系本人（Email: fjiang2@uh.edu; 电话：001-832-340-1762），或者 Dr. Lee（Email: jlee@uh.edu; 电话：001-713-743-2885）。任何关于您作为研究主体的权利也可以咨询休斯顿大学人权保护委员会（电话：001-713-743-9204）。

附录 B

在这个部分，您的回答将帮助我们辨别您所的传播行为。请在以下的每一项描述中选择最符合您观点的数值。

1. 我会在网上发布对单位的正面评价。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

2. 我会对朋友和邻居称赞单位好的方面。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

3. 我会经常推荐单位的产品和服务给别人。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

4. 我会试图说服那些对我的单位持有负面观点的人。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

5. 我会反驳别人对我单位的偏见和刻板印象。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

6. 我曾经对批评我单位的人展开反击。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

7. 听到那些对单位的无知或偏颇的观点，我会觉得失望并且出言反驳。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

8. 我会在网上发布对单位的负面评价。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

9. 我会对我的家人和朋友说起单位在管理上的错误和问题。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

10. 我会对我的朋友和家人说我的单位不如竞争对手运营得好。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

11. 我会对别人说我们产品的问题。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

12. 我赞同那些批评我们单位的人。 [单选题]
    很不符合　　　不符合　　　一般　　　符合　　　很符合

13. 我试图会见单位的供应商和相关的政府官员并且获取新信息。 [单选题]

很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

14. 我会主动与对我单位有不满的人碰面并了解不满的原因。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

15. 我会主动了解人们对我单位发起的活动的反馈。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

16. 我会查找新信息并订阅与单位有关的群发邮件，新闻和出版物等。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

17. 即使在下班时间，我也会受理重要客户的投诉，并且与我的同事们分享信息。
[单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

18. 为了培养和维护重要客户的关系，我做出过额外的努力。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

19. 我会和同行碰面并且核实那些与我单位有关的传言。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

20. 我会向我的同事提供和工作有关的最新趋势和指出不寻常的现象。 [单选题]
很不符合　　　　不符合　　　　一般　　　符合　　　　很符合

21. 当您和单位内部人员讨论或共享外部信息时，您会选择和谁交流？（请选择所有符合的选项） [多选题]
上司/领导　　　　下属　　　　同事　　　　其他

22. 当您和单位内部人员讨论或共享外部信息时，您会选择何种方式？（请选择所有符合的选项） [多选题]
当面交流
电子邮件
电话/手机
在线/即时通信软件（如：MSN）
短信
正式文件
其他

附录 C

这个部分关于您单位的组织结构。请在以下描述中最能体现您所在单位的管理理念的倾向。 [矩阵量表题]

| 传播渠道高度结构化，财务和运营信息被严格控制 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 财务和运营信息开放透明 |

| 坚持使用正规的管理风格 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 管理风格可以在正式和非正式之间自由转换 |

| 在决策中强调上司的绝对话语权 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 在决策中强调专业人员的决策权，即使这么做会暂时"越权" |

| 强调既有的管理模式，即使周围环境发生变化 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 强调管理方式要适应多变的外部环境 |

| 强调员工要严格执行工作流程 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 强调任务的完成，而不必拘泥于正规流程 |

| 通过一套完善的控制体系完成工作 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 松散的控制，高度依靠实际工作中形成的非正式关系 |

| 强调严格执行特定岗位应该行使的职责 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 根据工作需要和员工特点定义职责 |

附录 D

这一部分将评测您的个人文化属性。请选择您认同或不认同以下观点的程度。

24. 集体利益大于个人利益 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

25. 集体的成功比个人的成功更重要 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

26. 被同事接纳是非常重要的 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

27. 员工应该在考虑了集体的利益后再追求个人目标 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

28. 经理应该鼓励员工的集体忠诚，即使这与个人目标相冲突 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

29. 个人可能被期待为了集体的成功而放弃自身利益 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

30. 在多数决策中，经理不需要咨询下属 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

31. 在处理与下属的关系时，经理经常需要动用手中的权力 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

32. 经理很少询问下属的观点 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

33. 经理应该避免在非工作时间和员工接触 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

34. 员工不应该反对管理层的决策 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

35. 经理不应该把重要工作委派给员工完成 [单选题]
    非常不认同　　　1　　2　　3　　4　　5　　6　　7　　　非常认同

以下的这些问题关于您和您的直接领导。

36. 我知道我做什么能让我的直接领导满意（或不满意）[单选题]

非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

37. 我的直接领导知道我工作上的问题和需求 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

38. 我感觉我的直接领导能认识到我的潜力 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

39. 我的领导会使用可利用的权力帮助我解决工作上的问题 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

40. 领导愿意为解决我工作上的困境而承担责任 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

41. 我对领导的决策有信心，并愿意自觉为之辩护 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

42. 我认为我和领导之间的关系是有成效的 [单选题]
非常不认同　　　　1　　　2　　　3　　　4　　　5　　　非常认同

　第四部分：在这个部分中您将回答一些个人信息，但这并不涉及您的隐私。

43. 您的性别：[单选题]
　　男　　　　女

44. 您的年龄：[填空题]

45. 您正在攻读或已获得的最高学位：[单选题]
　　小学以下
　　初中
　　高中
　　中专
　　大专
　　大学本科
　　硕士研究生
　　博士研究生
　　博士以上

46. 您所在单位的体制：[单选题]
　　国有企业/机关事业单位
　　私营/民营企业
　　合资企业/股份制企业

非盈利组织
其他

47. 您直接领导的性别： [单选题]
　　男　　　女

48. 您所在单位的人数大约为： [填空题]

49. 您所在部门的人数大约为： [填空题]

References

Ahmad, Z., Ali, L., Ahmad, N., Ahmad, Z., Ahmed, I., & Nawaz, M. (2010). Satisfaction as an outcome of communication and organizational structures: An outcome based approach. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2*(5), 249-257.

Alston, F., & Tippett, D. (2009). Does a technology-driven organization's culture influence the trust employees have in their managers? *Engineering Management Journal, 21*(2), 3-10.

Ambrose, M. L. & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 295-305.

Argyres, N. (1996). Capabilities, technological diversification and divisionalization. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*, 395–410.

Arif, M., Jan, K., Marwat, Z., & Ullah, I. (2009). Performance enhancement through effective communication: A study of the role of external and internal communication. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 1*(7), 119-148.

Bakanauskien, I., Bendaraviien, R., & Kriktolaitis, R. (2010). Empirical evidence on employees' communication satisfaction and job satisfaction: Lithuania's university case. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research, 54,* 21-36.

Birkinshaw, J., Nobel, R., & Ridderstrale. J. (2002). Knowledge as a contingency variable: Do the characteristics of knowledge predict organization structure? *Organization Science, 13*(3), 274-289.

Bobbitt, H. R., and Ford, J. D. (1980). Decision-maker choice as a determinant of organizational structure. *The Academy of Management Review, 5,* 13-23.

Brandts, J., & Cooper, D. J. (2007). It's what you say, not what you pay: an experimental study of manager-employee relationships in overcoming coordination failure. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 5*(6), 1223-1268.

Broom, G. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1990). *Using research in public relations: Applications to program management.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. (1961). *The management of innovation.* London: Tavistock.

Carlson, E. R. (1960). Clique structure and member satisfaction in groups. *Sociometry, 23*(4), 327-337.

Chandler Jr., A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: chapters in the history of the American industrial enterprise.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chang, Y. C. (2000). *A normative exploration into environmental scanning in PR. Unpublished master's thesis,* University of Maryland, College Park.

Chen, N. (1996). Public relations in china: the introduction and development of an occupational field. In H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen (Eds.), *International Public Relations: A Comparative Analysis*, pp. 121-153. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chia, J. (2009). Intercultural interpretations: Making public relations education culturally relevant. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 6*(1), 39-48.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: the role of strategic choice. *Sociology, 6,* 1-22.

Cohen, A. (1993a). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research, 26*(1), 75-90.

Conduit, J., & Mavondo, F. T. (2001). How critical is internal customer orientation to market orientation? *Journal of Business Research, 51*, 11–24.

Cooper-Chen, A., & Tanaka, M. (2008). Public relations in japan: the cultural roots of kouhou. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 20*(1), 94-114.

Cummings, L. L., & Berger, C. J. (1976). Organization structure: How does it influence attitudes and performance? *Organizational Dynamics, 5*(2), 34-49.

Czaplewski, J. (2001). Southwest Airlines: How internal marketing pilots success. *Marketing Management, 10*, 14–17.

Dalton, D. R., Todor, W. D., Spendolini, M. J., Fielding, G. J., & Porter, L. W. (1980). Organization structure and performance: A critical review. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(1), 49-64.

Darrat, M., Amyx, D., & Bennett, R. (2010). An investigation into the effects of work-family conflict and job satisfaction on salesperson deviance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 30*(3), 239-251.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*, Chicago: Swallow.

Dickson, M. W., Resick, C. J., & Hanges, P. J. (2006). When organizational climate is unambiguous, it is also strong. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 351-364.

Dimarco, N., & Norton, S. (1974). *Life style, organization structure, congruity and job satisfaction.* Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Dover, C. J. (1964). Three eras of management communication. *Business and Industrial Communication.* New York: Harper & Row.

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

Dozier, D. M. (1986, August). The environmental scanning function of public relations practitioners and participation in management decision making. *Paper presented at the meeting of the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication*, Norman, OK.

Dozier, D. M. (1990). The innovation of research in public relations practice: Review of a program of studies. In J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public relations research annual, 2*, 3-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dozier, D. M., Grunig, L.A., & Grunig, J. E. (1995). *Manager's guide to excellence in public relations and communication management*, Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.

Duncan, R. (1971). *Multiple decision-making structures in adapting to environmental uncertainty: the impact on organizational effectiveness.* Working Paper, Northwestern University, Graduate School of Management, 54-71.

Ergeneli, A., Ilsev, A., & Karapınar, P. (2010). Work-family conflict and job satisfaction relationship: the roles of gender and interpretive habits gender, work and organization work-family conflict and job satisfaction. *Gender, Work & Organization, 17*(6), 679-695.

Ethiraj, S., & Levinthal, D. (2009). Hoping for A to Z while rewarding only a: Complex organizations and multiple goals. *Organization Science, 20*(1), 4-21.

Fallman, D., & Waterworth, J. (2010). Capturing user experiences of mobile information technology with the repertory grid technique. *Human Technology, 6*(2), 250-268.

Ford, J. D., & Slocum Jr., J. W. (1977). Size, technology, environment and the structure of organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 2*(4), 561-575.

Garc ÍA-Morales, V. J., Mat ÍAs-Reche, F., & VerdÚ-Jover, A. J. (2011). Influence of internal communication on technological proactivity, organizational learning, and organizational innovation in the pharmaceutical sector. *Journal of Communication, 6* (1), 150-177.

Garzo Jr., R., & Yanouzas, J. N. (1969). Effects of flat and tall organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 14*(2), 178-191.

Geeraerts, G. (1984). The effect of ownership on the organization structure in small firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29*(2), 232-237.

Gonzalez, J. V., & Garazo, T.G. (2006). Structural relationships between organizational service orientation, contact employee job satisfaction and citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 17*(1), 23-50.

Goswami, C., & Goswami, S. (2010). Role of organisation structure in facilitating marketing. *Global Business & Management Research, 2*(2/3), 162-183.

Grinyer, P. H., & Yasai-Ardekani, M. (1980). Dimensions of organizational structure: A critical replication. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*(3), 405-421.

Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: Conceptual history, recent challenges and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacManus & D. Veri (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective*, 3-4. London, UK: ITB Press.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Han, G., & Zhang, A. (2009). Starbucks is forbidden in the Forbidden City: Blog, circuit of culture and informal public relations campaign in China. *Public Relations Review, 35*(4), 395-401.

Hannan, R. R., Rankin, F., & Towry, K. (2010). Flattening the organization: the effect of organizational reporting structure on budgeting effectiveness. *Review of Accounting Studies, 15*(3), 503-536.

Hardy, G. E., Woods, D., & Wall, T. D. (2003). The impact of psychological distress on absence from work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 306-314.

Harlow, R. F. (1976). Building a public relations definition. *Public Relations Review, 2*(4), 34-42.

Heugens, P. R., & Lander, M. W. (2009). Structure! Agency! (and other quarrels): A meta-analysis of institutional theories of organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(1), 61-85.

Hofstede, G. (1983). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies (Pre-1986), 14*(2), 75.

Huang, Y-H. (2000). The personal influence model and gao guanxi in Taiwan Chinese public relations. *Public Relations Reviews, 26*, 219-236.

Huegli, J. M., & Tschirgi, H. D. (1974). An investigation of communication skills application and effectiveness at the entry job level. *Journal of Business Communication, 12*(1), 24-29.

Ilies, R., Wilson, K., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: the facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy Of Management Journal, 52*(1), 87-102.

Iverson, R. D., & Deery, S. J. (2001). Understanding the 'personological' basis of employee withdrawal: the influence of affective disposition on employee tardiness, early departure, and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 856-866.

Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (2001). *New Handbook of Organizational Communication.* London: Sage.

Jackson, J. H., & Morgan, C. P. (1982). *Organization Theory,* Second Ed., Prentice-Hall.

Jacobides, M. G. (2007). The inherent limits of organizational structure and the unfulfilled role of hierarchy: Lessons from a near-war. *Organization Science, 18*(3), 455-477.

Jiang, J. Y., Li-Yun, S., & Law, K. S. (2011). Job satisfaction and organization structure as moderators of the effects of empowerment on organizational citizenship behavior: A self-consistency and social exchange perspective. *International Journal of Management, 28*(3), 675-693.

Jung, H., & Yoon, H. (2011). The effects of nonverbal communication of employees in the family restaurant upon customers' emotional responses and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 30*(3), 542-550.

Kim, J., & Rhee, Y. (2011). Strategic thinking about employee communication behavior (ECB) in public relations: Testing the models of megaphoning and scouting effects in Korea. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 23*(3), 243-268.

Kim, J.-N. (2006). *Communicant activeness, cognitive entrepreneurship, and a situational theory of problem solving.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland, College Park.

Kim, J.-N., & Grunig, J. E. (2011). Problem solving and communicative action: A situational theory of problem solving. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 120–149.

Kim, J.-N., & Grunig, J. E. (in press). *Situational theory of problem solving: Communicative, cognitive, and perceptive bases.* New York: Routledge.

Kim, T., Rosen, B., & Lee, D. (2009). South Korean managerial reactions to voicing discontent: The effects of employee attitude and employee communication styles. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30*(7), 1001-1018.

Kim, Y., & Kim, S. (2010). The influence of cultural values on perceptions of corporate social responsibility: Application of Hofstede's dimensions to Korean public relations practitioners. *Journal of Business Ethics, 91*(4), 485-500.

Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities and the replication of technology. *Organ. Sci. 3*, 383-397.

Landsberger, H. A. (1958). *Hawthorne Revisited*, Ithaca.

Lauzen, M. M. (1995). Toward a model of environmental scanning. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 7*, 187–203.

Lauzen, M. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1994). Issues management mediation of linkages between environmental complexity and management of the public relations function. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 6*, 163–184.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 12*(1), 1-47.

Lee, S. Y. (2000). Historical perspectives on Korean corporate culture: The transition and its future. *KukjeJiyeokYeongu [Journal of International Area Studies Research], 4*, 3–29.

Leifer, R., & Huber, G. P. (1977). Relations among perceived environmental uncertainty, organization structure, and boundary-spanning behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*(2), 235-247.

Lenz, R. T. (1980). Environment, strategy, organization structure and performance: Patterns in one industry. *Strategic Management Journal, 1*(3), 209-226.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization: Its management and value. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Lin, Y. (2008). *Public relations roles and models: A case study of the super basketball league (SBL) in Taiwan (China).* Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 68.

Mayo, E. (1949). *Hawthorne and the Western Electric Company, The social problems of an industrial civilisation,* Routledge.

Mccown, N. (2007). The role of public relations with internal activists. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 19*(1), 47-68.

Mcmillan, C. J., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., & Schneck, R. E. (1973). The structure of work organizations across societies. *Academy of Management Journal, 16*(4), 555-569.

Miller, D. (1986). Configurations of strategy and structure: Towards a synthesis. *Strategic Management Journal, 7*(3), 233.

Ming-Yi, W. (2005). Can american public relations theories apply to asian cultures? *Public Relations Quarterly, 50*(3), 23-27.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall.

Mishra, K. (2007). *Internal communication: Building trust, commitment, and a positive reputation through relationship management with employees.* Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 68.

Mohr, L. B. (1982). *Explaining organizational behavior*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ni, C. (2008). Internal/employee communication and organizational effectiveness: A study of Chinese corporations in transition. *Journal of Contemporary China, 17*(54), 167-189.

Ni, C. (N.D). From propaganda to public relations. *Asian Journal of Communication, 13*(2), 96-121.

Perrow, C. (1967): A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. *American Sociological Review, 32*(2), 194–208.

Petelle, J. L. (1991). The new kid on the block: A qualitative analysis of new employee communication and uncertainty reduction behaviors, 38.

Pheysey, D. C., Payne, R. L., & Pugh, D. S. (1971). Influence of structure at organizational and group levels. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16*(1), 60-73.

Porter, L. W., & Siegel, J. (1965). Relationships of tall and flat organization structures to the satisfactions of foreign managers. *Personnel Psychology, 18*(4), 379-392.

Pugh, D. S. (1973). The measurement of organization structures. *Organizational Dynamics, 1*(4), 19-34.

Pugh, D. S., Ed. (1990). *Organization theory: Selected readings.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., & Turner, C. C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 13*(1), 65-105.

Rehman, M., & Waheed, A. (2011). An empirical study of impact of job satisfaction on job performance in the public sector organizations. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2*(9), 167-181.

Reimann, B.C. (1974). Dimensions of structure in effective organizations: Some empirical evidence. *Academy of Management Journal, 17*, 693-708.

Rhee, Y., & Kim, J. (2009). *Employees as boundary spanners: Predicting employees' external communication behavior through employee-organization relationships.* Conference Papers, International Communication Association, 1-28.

Robbins, S. P., Millett, B., Cacioppe, R., & Waters-Marsh, T. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Leading and managing in Australia and New Zealand.* Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Schminke, M., Cropanzano, R., & Rupp, D. E. (2002). Organization structure and fairness perceptions: The moderating effects of organizational level. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 89*, 881–905.

Schneider, B., White, S., & Paul, M. (1998). Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Test of a causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 150–163.

Scott, K. D., & Taylor, G. S. (1985). An examination of conflicting findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism: a meta-analysis, *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 3, 599-612.

Sendil, K. E., & Daniel, L. (2004). Modularity and innovation in complex systems. *Management Science, 50*(2), 159-173.

Shamir, B. (1978). Between bureaucracy and hospitality. *Journal of Management Studies, 15*, 285–307.

Sharma, J., Bajpai, N., & Holani, U. (2011). Organizational citizenship behavior in public and private sector and its impact on job satisfaction: A comparative study in Indian perspective. *International Journal of Business & Management, 6*(1), 67-75.

Shin, J., Heath, R. L., & Lee, J. (2011). A contingency explanation of public relations practitioner leadership styles: Situation and culture. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 23*(2), 167-190.

Singh, A., & Ashish, K. (2011). Role of stress and locus of control in job satisfaction among middle managers. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*(1), 42-56.

Sollund, R. (2006). Mechanistic versus organic organizations' impact on immigrant women's work satisfaction and occupational mobility. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality & Tourism, 6*(4), 287-307.

Spector, P. E. (2003). *Industrial and organizational psychology: research and practice.* New York: Wiley.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences, Sage Publications,* Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sriramesh, K. K., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (1996). Observation and measurement of two dimensions of organizational culture and their relationship to public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 8*(4), 229-261.

Stoffels, J. D. (1994). *Strategic issues management: A comprehensive guide to environmental scanning.* Oxford, OH: Pergamon.

Stroh, L. K., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (2002). *Organizational behavior: A management challenge.* Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Yang, S., & Grunig, J. E. (2005). Decomposing organisational reputation: The effects of organisation-public relationship outcomes on cognitive representations of organisations and evaluations of organisational performance. *Journal of Communication Management, 9*(4), 305-325.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*, New York, NY, USA and London, UK: Harper & Brothers.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Toh, P. (2008). *Structure-scope matching: A study of the interrelationship between organization structure and innovation in the United States communications industry*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A, 68, Retrieved From Ebscohost.

Tushman, M., & Scanlan, T. (1981). Boundary spanning individuals: Their role in information transfer and their antecedents. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*, 83–98.

Vranešević, T., Frajlić, D., & Ozretić-Došen, Đ. (2001). Marketing within the organisation structure-the reflection of its importance as a competitive determinant. *Enterprise in Transition: International Conference Proceedings,* 2001, 512-523.

Wagenheim, M., & Rood, A. (2010). The relationship between employee satisfaction with organizational communication and customer orientation. *Managing Leisure, 15*(1/2), 83-95.

Walton, E. J. (1981). The comparison of measures of organization structure. *Academy of Management Review, 6*(1), 155-160.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* Translated By A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Weber, M. (1948). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology,* Translated, Edited and with
An Introduction By H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. London: Routledge and Kegan
Paul.

White, C., Vanc, A., & Stafford, G. (2010). Internal communication, information
satisfaction, and sense of community: The effect of personal influence. *Journal of
Public Relations Research, 22*(1), 65-84.

Winter, S. G. (1987). *Knowledge and competence as strategic assets.* D. Teece, Ed. The
Competitive Challenge—Strategies for Industrial Innovation and Renewal.
Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, 159-184.

Woodward, J. (1958). *Management and technology.* London: Her Majesty's Stationary
office.

Woodward, J. (1965). *Industrial organization: Theory and practice.* New York, NY:
Oxford University Press.

Yadollah, H., & Zahra, E. (2010). The relationships among employees' job stress, job
satisfaction, and the organizational performance of Hamadan urban health centers.
Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 38(7), 936-968.

Zander, U., & Kogut, B. (1995). Knowledge and the speed of the transfer and imitation of
organizational capabilities: An empirical test. *Organ. SCI. 6*(1)76-92.

Zanzi, A. (1987). How organic is your organization? Determinants of
organic/mechanistic tendencies in a public accounting firm. *Journal of
Management Studies, 24*(2), 125-142.

Zeffane, R. M. (1989). Centralization or formalization? Indifference curves for strategies
of control. *Organization Studies (Walter De Gruyter Gmbh & Co. KG.), 10*(3),
327-352.

Zhao, X., Qu, H., & Ghiselli, R. (2011). Examining the relationship of work–family
conflict to job and life satisfaction: A case of hotel sales managers. *International
Journal of Hospitality Management, 30*(1), 46-54.