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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of formal internal communications on organizational cohesion. The study was guided by the following three research questions:

To what extent does top-down communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? To what extent does peer-to-peer communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? To what extent does upward communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers?

A descriptive research design was adopted for this study. The target population for this study comprised of 312 permanent staff members from Taylor Movers offices. Stratified random sampling was used to select a sample of 79 employees. A self-administered structured e-questionnaire was used in conducting this study. The data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) tool. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation and presented in tables and figures.

With regard to the effect of top-down communication on organizational cohesion, majority of the participants indicated that their first level supervisor could interact with them more. Majority of the participants indicate that their manager approached them to discuss problems. Majority agreed that their manager encouraged career development opportunities. Under top-down communication, career development had a strong positive correlation with organization cohesion. However, only one item under top-down communication was found to be statistically significant.

Findings on peer-to-peer communications were assessed in terms of presence of constructive teamwork, encouragement in teamwork, recognition in teams, respect in teams and sharing of information. The study found that majority of the participants agreed that there was constructive teamwork at this organization. Majority of the respondents agreed that they felt that their colleagues understood the way they communicated. Majority agreed that they were recognized in the team by their teammates. Majority also agreed that they were respected in the team by their teammates. Majority agreed that they were happy to be working in a team than on their own. Under peer-to-peer communication, presence of constructive team work, recognition in teamwork and respect in teams all had strong positive correlations with organization
cohesion. In addition, encouragement in teamwork and sharing of information had moderate positive correlations with organization cohesion.

Findings on upward communication showed that majority of the respondents agreed that had freedom to make decisions regarding their work. Majority agreed that there is two-way communications between management and them. Majority of the respondents agreed that they always clarified work related issues with their supervisor. Majority agreed that they regularly sent suggestions to their supervisor. Freedom to approach supervisors had a moderate positive correlation with organizational cohesion. In addition, clarification of issues with supervisors had a strong positive correlation with organization cohesion.

The study concluded that in regards that top-down communication affected organizational cohesion to a small extent. Employees don’t feel that their supervisors interact with them enough or communicate reliable information about the organization to them. Whereas peer-to-peer communication had a strong effect on organization cohesion. Staff cooperated with each other to get the job done, everyone was encouraged to participate in teamwork and majority of employees felt respected in the team by their teammates. Finally upward communication was found to have a small effect on organization cohesion at the company. Majority of employees did not feel free to advise top management. Majority of the respondents did not also feel that top management respected the opinion given by staff. The study also recommended that first and second supervisors should interact more with their employees, the frequency of meetings should be increased to ensure more interaction between peers and top level management should acknowledge contribution from employees so that they feel their input is valued.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Everyday workplace interactions are achieved through communication. Today’s selling employers, working employees and buying customers are directly or indirectly involved in workplace communication. By identifying the appropriate tools required, to understand how others are influenced, effective communications can increase the effectiveness of the organization (Gerson & Gerson, 2007).

Numerous scholars have defined communications; Blundel (2004) defines communication as an instrument used by humans in their everyday interaction. Marketing scholars define communication as a management tool that facilitates interaction in the workplace (Fitz-enz, 1990). Additionally Argenti (2003), defines communication as a means in any workplace to coordinate information exchange within the workplace, to establish effective coordination of activities between the members of the workplace. Organizations that encourage effective communication for their members, achieve set aims, goals and have a clear vision. These definitions show how organizational communication works as an essential part of a business strategy that motivates members and increases overall satisfaction leading to increase of the productive work-load and revenue.

Internal organizational communication is the process of transmitting messages within the organisations units, where the overall purpose of the communication and tools used is to establish and moderate mutually beneficial understanding between the units in order for the organization to successfully achieve set goals for the business (Gerson & Gerson, 2007).

Managerial communication has changed over time because as companies grow larger and more complex, this often becomes more difficult – hence the need for the internal communication functions. The term ‘communication’ is derived from the Latin word communicare, which means ‘to make something common’, and the noun communicatio which may be translated to mean ‘community’. According to the Oxford dictionary, an organization is a group of people with a particular purpose, such as a business or government department (Oxford University Press, 2010). Additionally, internal
communications is defined in many different ways. To some internal communications is “the exchange of information and ideas within an organization” while to others they contend, “Internal communication is, in essence, about creating an atmosphere of respect for all employees within the organization (Argenti, 2003). Managerial communication has changed over time because as companies grow larger and more complex, this often becomes more difficult – hence the need for the internal communication function. A good understanding of history and the interactions between and within social groups, corporations and even national states reveals that internal communications have always been a contributing factor to the existence of relationships that harness organizational cohesion to achievement of desired goals (Argenti, 2003).

In the United States around the 1990s, the rise of internal communications as function of management began, crossing to Europe and finally to the rest of the world. ‘Factors such as globalization, deregulation, and economic crises brought with them permanent restructuring, downsizing, outsourcing, mergers and acquisitions and other kinds of more or less creative destruction’ (Vercic, 2012). Causing histrionic reduction of trust by employees in management, leading to a reduction in employee loyalty. Despite the increased need for the strategic management in workplace interactions and overtime, internal communication has risen as a critical function for organizations and thereby merits recognition.

Managing organizational cohesion is a complex task that is usually ignored by today’s organizations due to it intangible measure. However, difference in culture between members of an organization, can affect effective communications (Gerson & Gerson, 2007). The process of making decisions, getting agreements, and building consensus has transformed, requiring an understanding of cross-functional communication competence. Developing trends and events, are placing cultural awareness and cross-functional communication as critical management skill due to the increasing number of organizations involved in multinational missions, strategic partnerships, and joint projects (Kalla, 2005). Social cohesion stimulates improved communication in a group. When group members that are working closely together are encouraged to freely express their thoughts, there will be improvements in their communication flow. Cohesion among members who work in close proximity, are usually tight as they are able to resolve issues easily among themselves than among those scattered in far-flung distances. (Mulunga & Yazdanifard, 2014).
Communication occurs when a sender relays a message to a receiver and receives feedback. The feedback component is usually overlooked. The degree of mutual understanding varies in cross-cultural contexts due to different perceptions. Cultural diversity currently represents a barrier to communication, because no culture is specific and international managers have now ascertained that there is no sealed way of doing business (Radebaugh, Sullivan, & Daniel, 2004). Appelbaum and Belmuth (2007) argue, “Without excellent internal communication across borders and cultures, it is difficult to execute a consistent and effective global message to external stakeholders. Since every global employee is a potential ambassador for a company’s corporate message or brand, excellent internal communication is essential” (Aula & Heinonen 2002).

According to Carsten (2008), strategic communication management is defined as the systematic planning and realization of information flow, communication, media development and image care in a long-term horizon. It conveys deliberate message(s) through the most suitable media to the designated audience(s) at the appropriate time to contribute to and achieve the desired long-term effect. Communication management is process creation. It has to bring three factors into balance: the message(s), the media channel(s) and the audience(s).

According to Westenkirchner (2010), strategic communication provides a theoretical umbrella that enables organizations to integrate their different messaging efforts, allowing them to generate and deliver communications that, while different in style and purpose, have an inner consistency. This consistency can, in some instances, generate an echo that reinforces the organizational brand and message. At the least it prevents misunderstanding through contradictory, confusing messaging to different units across all multicultural platforms. Strategic organizational communication enhances its strategic positioning by aligning itself to the organization's strategic objectives.

Employees who identify strongly with their organizations are more likely to show a supportive attitude toward them (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and to make decisions that are consistent with organizational objectives (Simon, 1997). Therefore, organizations should provoke identification to facilitate their functioning (Cheney, 1983; Pratt, 1998). One strategy could be to improve their perceived external prestige, since prestige has been shown to positively affect organizational identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Members may feel proud of being part of a well-respected company, as it strengthens
their feelings of self-worth to “bask in reflected glory.” (Smidts, Pruyn, & Van Riel, 2001)

Relationships grow out of communication, and the functioning and survival of organizations is based on effective relationships among individuals and groups (Mutuku, 2014). In addition, organizational capabilities are developed and enacted through “intensely social and communicative processes” (Jones et al., 2004).

Organizational cohesion refers to a friendly and cooperative agreement on working relationships between employers and employees for their mutual benefit (Laden, 2012). According to Puttapalli and Vuram (2012), organizational cohesion is concerned with the relationship between management and employees with respect to the terms and conditions of employment and the workplace. In effect, it is a situation where employees and management cooperate in pursuit of the organization’s aims and objectives. Organizational cohesion covers four broad areas of cooperation: responsibilities, employment policy, collective bargaining, and communication and consultation. It enhances labour productivity and in turn improves performance in the education sector, achieving economic growth, and enhancing living standards and quality of life. It creates a peaceful working environment conducive to tolerance, dialogue, and other alternative (to strike) means of resolving labour disputes in Nigeria (such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, conciliation, and litigation or court adjudication) (Laden, 2012). This creates a high level of employee satisfaction.

Effective communication helps to promote cohesive relations between managers and staff and is critical to productivity in an organization. A manager best achieves these objectives by adopting the inverted triangular system of communication which brings management closer to the workers thus smoothing the relationship between the two and easing the decision-making process.

Unachukwu (1997) goes further and argues for upward, downward, and lateral communication channels between top management and subordinates. Management should make themselves accessible to middle level managers and staff, delegate some functions to them, and actively pursue feedback. Unachukwu (1997) maintains that effective communication facilitates meaningful interaction and exchange of information or ideas among group members. Communication should be open and administrative functions coordinated cohesively.
The free flow of information, according to Olagunju (1999), is an important factor in creating understanding in an organization. In his view, managers have a responsibility to ensure not only that they are understood but that they in turn understand other members of the organization. Managers can be well understood if they maintain a commitment to openness. Management should ensure that staff members are kept well informed about issues such as salary structure, conflict and dispute resolution procedures, safety, staff development and training, and so on. To prevent duplication of instructions, management should also ensure that all unit heads are fully aware of their areas of responsibility.

Managers must avoid denying access to information. Fashoyin (1999) maintains that many cases that lead to employee grievances are associated with poor communication in the labour management relationship. This creates acrimony and distrust. Workers should not be denied information and management should not show lukewarm attitude towards information dissemination. Managers and/or administrators must be well versed in communication theory and practice if they are to enable employee access and understanding thereby promoting cohesive relationships between management and staff and among the staff themselves.

This research will investigate if organizational communications has an effect on organizational cohesion by investigating the communication flow dimensions in an organization. For this research the organization in question will be Taylor Movers. This is an international organization with offices in Nairobi, Kenya and Atlanta Georgia. Taylor Movers specializes in global logistics, specifically in relocation services for both individual and corporate clients. Their portfolio spans some global corporates like coca cola as well as several embassies within Kenya. Taylor Movers was incorporated in the year 2000 in Nairobi, Kenya to fill a gap in the market as well as a growing demand for full service logistics services. Over the years, the business has grown and a decision was made to open a subsidiary in Atlanta, Georgia. This decision was based on the continued requests by the Kenyan diaspora for a logistics company to service their personal and business logistics needs and thus the office was incorporated in 2008. Taylor Movers has a diverse and a dynamic staff owing to its Kenya and USA operations.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Organizations today have grown in complexity, with this organizational communications has grown into an important factor that facilitates the organization’s overall achievement of their objectives. The organization’s communications style is observed in the employee’s organizational drive, teamwork and individual performance. Salem (2008) explains why management attempts to transform organizations seldom succeed. He outlines how insufficient communication, local identification, global distrust, lack of productive humor, poor interpersonal communication skills and conflict avoidance are the six main reasons why employees dissociate from the change, defending the culture that works until they have no choice to adopt the enforced changes.

Communication as a component of strategic organizational management is ignored in many organizations until the end, as a means of disseminating information. This leads to use of poor communication techniques and rushed communication that may be misunderstood and end up not achieving its objective (Heron, 1942; Mehrabian, 1971; Oneil, 2013). When this takes place there are possibilities of low performance and lack of organizational cohesion. Globally organizations have suffered losses due to lack of proper or insufficient communications (Reinsch, 1996). If communication between employees and management is poorly address edit may lead to confusion and lack of direction, frustration of employees, decrease in motivation, purpose and productivity and even exit of highly skilled and dependable employees (Mutuku, 2014). Therefore, organizations may find that their’ strategic’ plan was not strategic because the implementers did not take it up, due to lack of adequate information.

The three dimensions of organizational communications downward communication, horizontal communication and upward communication (Hartley & Bruckman, 2002) are considered as the communication flow dimensions. Downward communication is the flow of information from a higher level to a lower level, from a dominate to a subordinate (managerial to lower level). Horizontal communications is the between levels on a peer-to-peer basis. Where as upward communications in initiated from a lower level to a higher level, usual from supervisee to their supervisor. These communications flow dimensions are the channels of communication are used in managing and orchestrating all internal and external communications, aimed at creating favourable points of view among the company’s stakeholders (Van Riel & Fombrun, 2007).
The Workplace Communication Consultancy (2005) stated that 90% of employees kept fully informed are driven to deliver added value; while those who are not kept informed, almost 80%, are not. For employees to get comprehensive work-related information, the three formal dimensions of communication must be open.

Various researchers have conducted studies on organizational communication in Kenya. For instance, Mutuku (2014) carried out a research on the effect of organizational communications on employee motivation. The study found that information sharing had the greatest effect on the employee motivation, followed by the employee involvement in decision making, then communication channels while the 7 C’s of communication had the least effect to the employee motivation. The study recommends that the company managers should involve the employees of all cadres to enable them have experience on the intricate of running the business. However, there is no study that has been done in Kenya to specifically evaluate the effect of formal organizational communication flow dimensions (downward, peer-to-peer and upward) on organizational cohesion and more so in the research industry. It is not clear how formal organizational communication flow dimensions affects organizational cohesion. This study sought to fill the mentioned gap by focusing on the effect of formal organizational communications on organizational cohesion.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to evaluate the effect of formal organizational communication flow dimensions on organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers.

1.4 Research Questions
1.4.1 To what extent does top-down communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers?

1.4.2 To what extent does peer-to-peer communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers?

1.4.3 To what extent does upward communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers?
1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Taylor Movers
This study provided a case on Taylor Movers. An organizational audit is currently being undertaken and the results of this study can contribute to future communication strategy within the organization.

Being an international organization, Taylor Movers is in constant communication with partners and local and international authorities in order to ensure the streamlining of their door to door services. As a result of this, the company has established a solid network of contacts globally with whom they endeavor to ensure the highest standards of service and communication is maintained. In the Nairobi head office which is also the hub of operations, there are a total of 198 staff with the rest of the staff being in Atlanta, Georgia. Taylor Movers also has agents in Europe and Asia who act as remote sales staff. These agents, while not being staff at Taylor Movers, are an integral part of the organization. In future, Taylor Movers plans to expand further afield to South Africa and Australia.

1.5.2 International Organizations
This study will benefit international organizations by enhancing their knowledge of communication theory in an organizational context as well as the measure of communication within their organization structure. The evaluation methodology can be used to identify how they measure the diversity (multiculturalism and multidisciplinary dynamics) sensitivity of internal communications in their organizations.

1.5.3 Academicians and Researchers
The study will also benefit other researchers and scholars that have explored the internal communications subject by providing new information specifically from a global perspective and also new researchers that wish to explore how formal organizational communications affects organizational cohesion.

1.6 Scope of the Study
The target population for this study comprised of 312 permanent employees at directorate, senior, middle level and support. Both male and female employees were sampled from Taylor Movers Nairobi and Atlanta offices. This study was limited to a time period of 3 months (Feb-April 2015) as a prerequisite to the completion of the
Researchers partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree of executive Masters of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD). During the project, a few limitations where encountered around data collection and data analysis. Majority of the respondents filled the questionnaire in good time however some respondents had to be urged to complete the questionnaire via telephone calls. In regards to data analysis, incorrect data entry was initially identified that led redoing the process to ensure the data was accurate and adequate. Affecting the time lines of the project negatively.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Organizations
The term ‘communication’ is derived from the Latin word communicare, which means ‘to make something common’, and the noun communicatio which may be translated to mean ‘community’. We may define an organization as a community of individuals, created to achieve common goals (Wright, 2009).

1.7.2 Corporate Communication
A set of activities involved in managing and orchestrating all internal and external communications aimed at creating favourable point of view among stakeholders on which the company depends (Van Riel & Fombrun, 2007).

1.7.3 Top-down Communication
Top-down communications emphasizes on managerial hierarchy and the methodical transfer of information from the highest levels in the organization to its staff. It moves in traditionally moves in one direction from the supervisor to subordinate (Oliver, 1997).

1.7.4 Peer-to-peer Communication
Peer-to-peer communication is between employees and units on the same organizational level. It enables coordination and integration of activities of units, engaged in relatively autonomous tasks (Miljković & Rijavec, 2008).

1.7.5 Upward Communications
Upward communication refers to messages that flow from subordinates to superiors, usually to seek clarification, provide feedback, and make suggestions to improving morale and employee attitude (Goldhaber, 1990). Gurgen describes upward communication as a two-way process that occurs between employees and supervisors.
(vertical and diagonal), involve both the managers’ encouragement on employees (downward) and the employee’s response to managers (upward) (Gürgen, 1997).

1.7.6 Organizational Cohesion
According to Puttapalli and Vuram (2012), organizational cohesion is concerned with the relationship between management and employees with respect to the terms and conditions of employment and the work place.

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter provides the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study and the definition of terms. Thereafter, chapter two will provide a literature review academic research in the topics of discussion. Chapter three will give the research methodology, then chapter four will give the findings and finally chapter 5 will provide the results, findings and conclusion of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter covers the literature review, which provides an overview of previous existing literature to support this research. The literature review is aimed on the research questions namely top-down communication and organizational cohesion, peer-to-peer communication and organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers, and upward communication and organizational cohesion. The information gathered will facilitate the interpretation of the research on whether they contrast/support previous findings.

2.2 Top-Down Communication and Organizational Cohesion
Top-down communications emphasizes on managerial hierarchy and the methodical transfer of information from the highest levels in the organization to its staff. It moves in traditionally moves in one direction from the supervisor to subordinate. Reviewing the types, roles, effectiveness and future of top-down communication in relation to organizational cohesion can provide a holistic review of top-down communication and organizational cohesion.

2.2.1 Types of Top-Down Communication
Communications can be informal or formal, informal communications is usually personal and unplanned; an example is a face-to-face interaction such as bumping into one’s boss in the elevator at work; whereas formal communications is structured, planned and impersonal such as written communications or structured oral communications (Johlke & Duhan, 2000).

Top-down communications flows from top management to lower employees. This type of communication is characteristic for organizations with an authoritative style of management (Spaho, 2013). However, effective communication takes place when the receiver, producing resultant action, understands the message. Effective communication leads to action or decisions (Wild, 2010). Communication does not necessarily result in this. Additionally, effective communication and communication can be distinguished from reporting, as reporting happens only one-way and often top-down in an organizational setting, whereas communication, and especially effective communication, is always a two-way process (Kalla, 2005). One further principle for effective
communication is that work-related tasks are performed effectively and free of fewer troubles (Juholin, 2009).

Top-down power distance can be either large or small. Organizations with larger top-down power distances (hierarchy) tend to be more formal and less interactive than organizations with small power distances. Hierarchical disparity does not encourage free information exchange, as more authority is given to top-down directional communication as compared to bottom-up directional communication (Kalla, 2005). In agreement, Wild notes that when employees are treated relatively equally, at least in theory, this means that communication can flow rather freely among individuals in organizations and the direction of information flow is often two-way (Wild, 2010). The higher the top-down power distance can mean that the communication is more formal and thus less interactive.

2.2.2 The Roles of Top-Down Communications

The manner in which a manager communicates to their staff can affect group cohesion. Their responsibilities as managers hold them accountable to their roles. They are accountable for obtaining results in their organizations through their employees. They relay information down to their teams acting as messengers of information from their top-level managers (MacNeil, 2004). Additionally managers are knowledge sharing agents who participate in organizational practices and procedures, such as evaluating employees through performance appraisals. The way the managers communicate during these evaluations can influence employee perceptions and attitudes towards the organizational management, which affect organizational cohesion (Ruck, 2012).

Line management communications deals with addressing how employee roles and responsibilities affect the unit’s organizational objectives. This is highly dependent on the managers’ own interpersonal communication skills. Daily organizational activities involve day-to-day interactions that give line managers the opportunity to build rapport with their colleagues (Ruck, 2012). By getting involved in strategic planning and activities manager’s contribution organizational performance increase (MacNeil, 2004). The communications delivery is fundamental. Communication that is task oriented creates staff commitment, whereas non-task oriented communications creates trust (Ruck, 2012). This however does not apply for a heterogeneous group of employees who react differently to different types of communication because other contributing factors need to be considered.
Employee roles vary due to factors such as functional or professional requirements, organizational size and structure, and institutional culture (Currie & Proctor, 2004). Managers occupy a unique position; with 48% of all UK employees believing that the most trusted and reliable communications are from their managers indicating that the managers word is held with high regard (Tench & Yeomans, 2006). Notably this can be argued to be one sided considering that organizations defer significantly. However this does suggest that managers do occupy a critical role in communication with staff.

2.2.3 Effective Top-Down Communications Approaches

By engaging in traditional top-down way of primary communication it can result in poor communication. Resulting in absenteeism, staff turnover, and low efficiency in task performance due to lack of information. Employees’ personal interests do not always agree with the interests of the organization (Huczynski & Buchanan, 2007) thus, a challenge to influence employees to work towards common goals. Scholars argue that management cannot change the behavior of employees directly, but it must be done more craftily through, for example, pay or employee appraisals. People join companies; they leave managers (Robinson & Hayday, 2009). Indicating the importance of the supervisor-employee relationships, demonstrating how supervisors have the power to engage or disengage their staff (MacLeod & Brady, 2008). Engagement studies consistently demonstrate how manager behaviour and the work environments they create around them have a more direct effect than reward programmes on the level of staff engagement (MacLeod & Brady, 2007). Thus recommending that this should be the central principle of any engagement or communication strategy to avoid it from becoming an extremely influential obstruction.

Supervisors understand first hand how unique daily operations can be. Often known as “the personification of the organization” (MacLeod & Brady, 2008) because of their power to influence how employees feel towards the workplace. As Houlihan (2001) identifies, supervisors play a critical mediating role in how people see and experience the organization. Therefore demonstrating an opportunity for internal communication to support supervisors to achieve mediation and increase engagement. However, communication skills tend not to be highlighted by senior managers as a fundamental skill to be developed. Communication theory is hardly included as a primary subject in leadership learning (Ruck, 2011). Undeniably, literature indicates that significant characteristics of supervisors is the ability to influence through communication, rarely are
supervisors chosen or developed through advanced communication skills training to develop their individual ability (Oliver, 1997).

Feeling “informed” is fundamental in achieving engagement, therefore, supervisors need to be empowered to deliver information in a way that encourages conversation within their teams to achieve quality two-way communication. Internal communications can support this and encourage engagement by clearly highlighting the corporate values of the organization, ensuring everyone knows what is expected of them and appropriate behavior (Quirke, 2008).

2.2.4 The Future of Top-Down Communications Approaches
Top-down communications is evolving. Miller (2003) argue that communication is no longer just a one or two-way process when the feedback cycle is taken into account it becomes rather complex. They take Detert and Curtis’s communication cycle theory further and talks about communication systems and intricate networks where everyone is interlinked, where common meanings can be created and shared (Miller, 1996; Varttala et al., 2010). They argue that, especially in multicultural settings, creating a managerial communications network becomes crucial to successful internal communications.

The direction of communication is not only limited to top-down channels but encourages to all directions and between all members of the organization. This approach to managerial communications is often team-based and a range of channels is used to maximize the free flow of ideas for effectiveness of communication to optimize the free flow of ideas (McBreen, 2002). Both formal and informal styles of communication are important, especially informal communication; in fulfill human social needs and enhancing organizational effectiveness.

2.3 Peer-To-Peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion
Peer-to-peer communication is between employees and units on the same organizational level. It enables coordination and integration of activities of units, engaged in relatively autonomous tasks (Miljković & Rijavec, 2008). In order to effectively coexist in a peer-to-peer environment organizations strive to achieve horizontal cohesion. This is the trust shared between peers. It is the bonds of confidence between employees within a single unit or horizontally between members of separate units (McBreen, 2002). Effective communications conveys a deliberate message through the most suitable media to a designated audience at an appropriate time. It contributes to achieving the desired long-
term effect (Cheney, 1983). It has to bring three factors into balance: the message(s), the media channel(s) and the audience(s).

Others have taken a slightly different view of “how people assign meanings to messages, verbal and nonverbal communication, communication skills, the effectiveness of communication in organizations, and how meanings are distorted or changed while people exchange messages, in both formal and informal networks” (Tourish & Hargie, 2004).

2.3.1 Cultural Differences in Peer-To-Peer Communication

In today's world where communication occurs between publics of different nations from different geographical locations the option to ignore the difference in cultural attributes can be destructive. Therefore difference in culture, between members of an organization, can affect effective communications (Blum, 1992). The process of making decisions, getting agreements, and building consensus has transformed requiring an understanding of cross-cultural communication competency. Developing trends and events are placing corporate etiquette and cross-cultural communication as critical management problems because of the increasing number of organizations involved in multinational missions, strategic partnerships, and joint projects (Guirdham, 2005).

The degree of mutual understanding between peers varies in cross-cultural contexts due to different perceptions. Cultural diversity amongst peers currently represents a barrier to communication, because no culture is specific. International managers now ascertained that there is no sealed agreement without written confirmation (Radebaugh, Sullivan, & Daniel, 2004). Appelbaum and Belmuth (2007) argue, “Without excellent internal communication across borders and cultures, it is difficult to execute a consistent and effective global message to external stakeholders. Since every global employee is a potential ambassador for a company’s corporate message or brand, excellent internal communication is essential” (Aula & Heinonen 2002, p230).

Furthermore, perception influences how individuals view others. This is mostly appears in the context of international organizations in the way that peers view each other. This is according to a study conducted on perception of Germans and Americans on qualification of peers, the findings were that both the German and American respondents perceived their subordinates to be less qualified that their peers. However, the Germans perceived their managers to have more managerial ability than their peers and the Americans felt
that South American peers had qualifications equal to or better than the qualification of their own managers. Perceptions such as this affected how the Germans and American expatriates communicated with their South American and other peers and subordinates, as well as how the expatriates communicate with their bosses (Miller, 1996).

2.3.2 Interpersonal Sensitivity in Peer-To-Peer Communication
In developing interpersonal sensitivity, an employee must make a point to know the receiver, encode the message (in a form that will be easily understood), relay the message and provide an avenue for feedback (Kalla, 2005). However in peer-to-peer communication, the employee would be required to be aware of their own perceptions and how it affects the communication process. Interpersonal sensitivity is really just a matter of understanding the other person, the context and how the person will respond to the context (Moran, 1991). The sender is required to identifying or understanding the cultural background (societal, economic and organizational context) in which this communication is taking place and the possible outcomes from this communication.

2.3.3 Encoding Messages Between Peers
Encoding messages is needed to ensure that messages are as objective as possible, while refraining from reliance on personal interpretations (Mehrabian, 1971). Ways of addressing these problems are to speak slowly and clearly to avoid long sentences and informal expressions or try explain things in several ways through a mix of media whenever possible. Linguistic training is invaluable, but senders should also avoid idioms and regional sayings in translation or even in English when speaking to a non-American who consider English to be a second language (Ngari, 2013).

Global telecommunications and computer networks are changing the face of interpersonal communications. Faster dissemination of information through modern electronic media has broken down communication barriers by reducing the amount of time for to deliver information, clarifying issues and allowing instant consultation (Samovar & Potter, 2009). Colleagues get the opportunity to get instant verbal and visual feedback that helps them make rapid changes to the communication process through personal interactions. For relationship building, face-to-face interaction is best used for important transactions, particularly in intercultural communications, because of the lack of familiarity between the parties involved (Selmeski, 2007).
Decoding is the process of translating the received symbols into the interpreted message (Friesen, 1971). A good listener practices projective listening or empathetic listening – listening without interruption or evaluation of the full message of the speaker, attempting to recognize the feelings behind the words and non-verbal cues and understanding the speaker’s perspective (Goodenough, 1971). At the horizontal level, avenues of communication and feedback among peer and subsidiaries can be kept open through telephone calls, regular meetings and reports and plans, which collectively facilitate cooperation, performance control and the stress less running of the company. Communication among far-flung operations can best be managed by setting up feedback systems and liaison people (Ngari, 2013).

In international organizations researchers have established a relationship between personality traits and behaviors and the ability of the host country to adapt to the host country’s cultural environment (Ruben, 1983). Communication is the mediating factor between those behaviors and the relative level of adaptation the expatriate achieves. They learn the dominant communication patterns of the host society through the communication process hence the link to the personality factors such as open mindedness, tolerance for ambiguity, resourcefulness, having an external focus of control and persistence that ease adaptation with the necessary effective intercultural communication.

Feedback systems are particularly important between organizations members (Brandt & Hulbert, 1976). Lack of continuous assistance and feedback, are a hindrance to successful communications that are considered critical.

2.3.4 Peer-To-Peer Communication Training

Linguistic training and cross-culture training are important but often neglected by organizations because they concentrate their resources solely on addressing their critical needs. Linguistic training develops successful communication in the international field. Consequently, organizations are encouraged to learn the language of their office location to aid in possible face-to-face, telephone conversations and e-mail communication. However, English is often regarded as the official international language of business (Miller, 2003).

Cultural training must be conducted on a regional or country specific basis otherwise the result will be a continuous communication breakdown. In the 1970’s, many Americans
returned from the Peace Corps with increased awareness of cultural differences and hence have adopted the culture of investing in programs that help train their executives in international communication as well as other employees who frequently interact with individuals from other cultures in their workplace or in their communication (Robert et al., 2002). Global demand for managers with interpersonal skills will likely grow, and organizations will need to continue to invest in recruiting and training the future leaders (Ngari, 2013).

2.3.5 Peer-To-Peer Non-Verbal Communications

Peer-to-peer interactions can be formal and informal. These interactions include verbal and non-verbal communications. It's important to recognize, though, that it's our nonverbal communication that speaks the loudest. Non-verbal communication is defined as the transfer of meaning through means such as body language and the use of physical space (Condon & Yousef, 1975). Common forms of non-verbal communication include postures, facial expression, eye gaze, gestures, and tone of voice, just to mention a few. Some of the important categories to communication in international management are kinesics, proxemics, chronemics and chromatics.

Chromatics is communication through the use of color i.e. colours of clothing, packaging, products, or gifts send intentional or unintended messages when people communicate cross-culturally. Additionally, chronemics reflects the use of time in a culture. In a culture with a monochromic time schedule, things are done linearly, or an activity at a time. Whereas polychromic time schedules are used by people who tend to do several things at the same time (Argyle, 1975). Kinesics is the study of communication through body movement and facial expression. Posture, eye contact, and gestures are the major areas of concern. In the United States when one communicates verbally it is considered good manners to look the other person in the eye, Condon (1975). However in Japan looking one directly in the eye can be considered offensive, rude, threatening or disrespectful (Samovar & Potter, 2009). Proxemics is the study of how people use physical space to convey messages.

In the United States, confidential information is delivered on a face-to-face basis, generally conveyed at an intimate distance. Personal distance is used for speaking to family and close friends. Whereas, social distance refers to closeness between groups of
all kinds usual racial groups are referenced (Argyle, 1975). Finally public distance is personal space at the far end of the territory in which humans operate (Segen, 2012).

In Japan, manager’s work closely with their teams, occupying large offices would be a sign of distrust and anger toward the unit. A majority of managers have no trouble communicating directly with their superiors since they spend a great deal of time with them.

According to Yousef (1975) he defines chromatics as the use of color to communicate messages. Colors that mean one thing in one culture may mean something completely different in another culture. Knowledge of chromatics in a culture is very helpful because if a Kenyan manager in Rwanda attends a corporate function dressed in all purple, he may wonder why everyone would continuously console him, since according to the Rwandese culture, the colour purple indicate someone in has passed away or he is in mourning. Whereas, it’s not the case to the Kenyan it is just a purple outfit. Being aware of the effects on non-verbal communications to relationship building can affect a groups overall cohesion. Training staff on non-verbal communications can affect not only its internal organizational cohesion but that its external organizational cohesion with partners and stakeholders.

2.4 Upward Communication and Organizational Cohesion

Upward communication refers to messages that flow from subordinates to superiors, usually to seek clarification, provide feedback, and make suggestions to improving morale and employee attitude (Goldhaber, 1990). Gurgen describes upward communication as a two-way process that occurs between employees and supervisors (vertical and diagonal), involve both the managers’ encouragement on employees (downward) and the employee’s response to managers (upward) (Gürgen , 1997).

2.4.1 Types of Upward Communication

Though at times it may occur in a this official manner, sometimes, it may occur informally and freely as a result of personal relationships of members in a organization. Group relationships formed can be used to evaluate vertical cohesion. Vertical cohesion is the bond between subordinates and leaders. Cohesive units are strengthened when subordinates trust that their leaders are knowledgeable and considerate. Measures of vertical cohesion can be identified when the day-to-day targets of each individual in a primary group correspond to the goals of their group. If the first loyalty of a team
member is to the group, members resist leaving their group, and when individuals in the
group act as a coordinated, collective whole this group has favorable vertical cohesion.
Cohesive groups refer to each other as we rather than I, which demonstrates group pride,
solidarity, loyalty, and teamwork (McBreen, 2002).

Vertical cohesion only applies to small primary groups with close relationships. Cohesion
is inversely proportional to the number of people in the group. Some researchers with
broad definitions of cohesion describe it as a wider phenomenon of esprit de corps
(Johns, 1984). Esprit is a collective pride felt by large groups of individuals above the
peer-to-peer level (Ingraham and Manning, 1981).

2.4.2 Power Distance
As the complexity of organizations increase so do then importance of upward
communication. The organogram of an organization can show the power distance
present. Furthermore, top management must rely on effective upward communication and
support it as an integral part of the organizational culture. It is an approach that allows
employees of lesser authority to express their opinions, individual or collective, to higher-
level management. Resulting in their contribution to the organizational decision making
processes. Luthan (1984) suggests the use of whistle blowing procedures, open-door
policies, counseling, surveys, exit interviews and participatory decision-making
techniques and the use of a mediator to foster effective upward communications. In
upward communications, subordinates can provide personal information about issues as
well as technical information to provide feedback to supervisors. However the
encouragement from management is needed to protect against staff victimization
(Borkowski, 2009).

2.4.3 Negative Feedback in Upward Communications
On the contrary Baron’s (1996) study radically suggests different perceptions between
managers and their staff on upward communication. He cites that supervisors are more
likely to give negative feedback than their subordinates. Yet supervisors and subordinates
generally give the same level of positive feedback. Illustrating that people are especially
sensitive to negative input — what has been termed the automatic vigilance effect (Pratto
& John, 1991). Intentionally or otherwise, it is therefore likely that subordinates are less
than enthusiastic to respond at all out of self defense mechanism. Chow, Hwang, and
Liao, (2000) found even though getting upward communication is encouraged, truthful upward communication is widely recognized as a serious problem.

‘Effective organizational functioning demands that people have a healthy respect for their boss, feel free to express emotions and opinions openly, and are comfortable engaging in conversations where it is both give and take’ (De Vries, 2001). So, particularly when in disagreement, employees consider whether it will result in retribution or perceived as constructive (Kassing, 2001). To determine the availability and efficacy of upward feedback one must look at trust as a key issue. Without it communication will be limited. Additionally, the rate and openness of internal organizational communication is an essential precondition for the development of trust (Sydow, 1998). A concept increasingly recognized as an affirmative contributor to professional effectiveness. ‘Subordinates who do not trust their superior are willing to suppress unfavorable information even if they know that such information is useful for decision making’ (Putnam, 2013).

Buzzanell & Stohl (1999) refer to the fifth postulate of W. Charles Redding’s ten postulates of organizational communication, which emphasizes the importance of feedback. That talks about feedback receptiveness, with which refers to the magnitude to which management is open to subordinate feedback. They make a notable distinction between being a receptive feedback receiver and responding to feedback; they note that they are indeed different; this difference is a crucial point that should be recognized. If feedback is only received but not acted upon in the correct and required manner, the communication remains ineffective. The importance of not only providing the enabling environments for feedback but the ownership of responding to it, either positively or negatively, is highly encouraged.

2.4.4 Communication Barriers in Upward Communications

Numerous communication barriers can affect the flow of upward communication. It is essential for managers and staff to overcome these barriers. Language, perception, culture and non-verbal communication are the most common barriers to communication in organizations.

According to Fox (2000), barriers like language and culture show the importance of having sufficient knowledge of home country’s language especially for employees placed on foreign mission. Most organizations have English as the common language for internal communication enabling managers to communicate information to their
colleagues in other geographically distributed locations. Majority of potential employees wishing to work in global organizations go through language training to become multilingual, the ability to speak the language of the headquarters is not enough to ensure that information will flow easily within the organization. Regardless how many languages one can speak, less attention is placed on the person having the other necessary skills to build interpersonal relationships in the workforce i.e. like ability to interact with managers, cultural sensitivity and the technical knowledge required for the job.

In relation to perception barriers, Sullivan defined perception as a person’s view of reality and this to a great extent influences their judgment and decision-making (Sullivan, 1999). Misperception hence becomes a barrier to effective decision-making and communications. Some of the perception barriers include misunderstanding of the role of an employee. This occurs where one uses words or symbols that are simply misinterpreted by their manager. Misunderstanding can occur in communication via messaging. An example is how Chinese translation proved difficult for Coke, took multiple and many expensive mistakes to get the translation right. It is therefore important for employees to be careful when translating messages, as errors in translations can be costly to companies’ brand, identity and reputation. However, organizations can rise to the top with care and persistence if they always remembering that perception can create new reality (Solymossy, 2013).

Furthermore, perception influences how individuals view others. This is mostly appears in the context of international management in the way that staff perceive their managers. This is according to a study conducted on perception of Germans and Americans on qualification of managers, the findings were that both the German and US respondents perceived their managers to be less qualified that their peers in management. However, the Germans perceived their managers to have more managerial ability than their peers and the Americans felt that South American peers had qualifications equal to or better than the qualification of their own managers (Solymossy, 2013). Perceptions such as this, affected how the Germans and US expatriates communicated with their South American and other peers and managers, as well as how the expatriates communicate with their bosses (Miller, 2003).
2.5 Chapter Summary
This chapter provides the literature review of the three research questions of this study; top-down, peer-to-peer and upward communication and organizational cohesion. Chapter three will give the methodology of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the research methodology adopted for the study. The chapter
discusses the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods,
research procedures and data analysis methods used to guide the study. The chapter ends
a summary of the methodology.

3.2 Research Design
A descriptive research design was adopted for this study. A descriptive design enables the
researcher to get answers on questions about whom, how, how much, and how many
(McIntyre, 1999). The design makes it possible to measure application areas, challenges
and strategies of phenomena using structured data-collection techniques, and requires that
data collected be expressed in numbers; that is quantified (Simon, 1997). It also made it
possible for researchers to aggregate data into statistics, make comparisons on variables
and draw conclusions and generalizations (Crestwell, 1994).

A self-administered structured e-survey was used, as it is the most appropriate
considering the time constraints, resources and locational barriers involved. The sample
population was Taylor Movers, which had a head office in Nairobi, Kenya and a
subsidiary in Atlanta Georgia. The choice of using e-surveys was due to the availability
of the organizations global email directory. This method offered an advantage of
producing comparable information across the surveyed population. The quantitative data
 gathering methods were useful especially when a study needs to measure the cause and
effect relationships within the organization. In this research, the dependent variable was
organizational cohesion whereas the independent variables were: top-down
 communications, peer-to-peer communication and upward communications.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population
A population is the total number of individuals in a defined group; a sample is a subset of
the population (McIntyre, 1999). For instance in this case study, the population is the
staff at Taylor Movers.
The target population for this study comprised of 312 permanent staff members both male and female from Taylor Movers offices. The population included the Managing Directors Office, Senior Management, Human Resources Department, Operations Department, Sales and Marketing Department, Finance Department and Logistics Department. Table 3.1 outlines the population’s distribution.

Table 3.1: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Directors Office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Department</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing Department</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Department</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Department</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>312</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

The sample frame is a list of elements from which the sample is drawn from. It ideally consists of a complete and correct list of population’s members only (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The sample frame comprised of the current permanent staff of Taylor Movers. The sample was drawn from members of staff, both locally and internationally. The list was obtained from the 2015 database and records from the Human Resources Department.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling involves dividing the population into homogenous subgroups and then taking a simple random sample in each subgroup. The sample is selected in such a way that certain subgroups in the population are represented in the sample in proportion to their number in the population (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). It adds boundaries to the sample selection and applies the randomness principle within the boundaries; hence the strata. In this study, the stratification was done according to six categories, namely: Managing Directors Office, Senior Management, Human Resource
Department, Operations Department, Sales and Marketing Department, Finance Department and Logistics Department.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
Gay (2011) illustrated that in descriptive research 30% of the entire population is required for consideration when the population is small. Out of Taylor Movers 2015 employee list of 264 the sample size of 79 elements is adequate to form the sample of the study. This study proportionately covered the following selected units from the population: different departments, genders, assorted age groups, different job categories, both administrative and managerial staff. Table 3.2 shows the stratification of the sample by the six categories.

Table 3.1: Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Directors Office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Department</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Department</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods
A self-administered structured e-questionnaire was used in conducting this study. Creswell (1994) noted that utilization of structured questionnaires enhances objectivity and supports statistical analysis. The questionnaire had closed ended questions. The questions will be anonymous to maintain confidentiality of the staff members interviewed. Taylor Movers staff provided data for this process. Employees signed authorization and confidentiality letter to manage expectations. This was an agreement by the author to the respondents to ensure that data gathered was anonymous and used only for research purposes. The results and findings of the study were compared with the standards taken from the theoretical framework of this study. Findings regarding the
common practices being done and the methods that are commonly adopted by the employees are obtained with the use of the survey method (Vaus, 2002).

The survey, seen in the Appendix 1 of this, has been done using Survey Monkey® and Question Pro®, survey creation tools, to reach the sample population. The survey is based on the theoretical framework data, information and theory. The survey is distributed to randomly selected employees within the different functional groups at Taylor Movers with the support from the people and organizational development department. The author does not work at Taylor Movers and sought authorisation from the Managing Directors office to conduct the survey. This method was used in order to reach maximum efficiency in distribution of the survey. The author, in regards to the theory, will use this distribution approach because employees are more likely to answer the survey if it has been authorized from Taylor Movers management.

The questionnaire was structured in five parts. The first part of the questionnaire sought to identify the general information about the respondent. The second part sought to establish how top-down communication affects organizational cohesion. The third part sought to establish how peer-to-peer communications affect organizational cohesion. The fourth part sought to identify how upward communications affect organizational cohesion. Finally the fifth part sought to identify organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers. A likert scale was used to measure attitudes and behaviors using answer choices that range from one extreme to another, specifically from 1 strongly disagrees to 5 strongly agree.

Gathered data and results are stored in the survey monkey internal server, only the study author had rights to access the data. When the survey data collection is concluded the author exported the results of the survey from Survey Monkey® to later be used in chapter four that deals with results and findings.

3.5 Research Procedures
The questionnaire was administered via email and followed up using a combination of email, phone and actual visitations to staff from the 7 categories in Taylor Movers. In order to ensure maximum response, e-mail alerts and follow-up phone calls were used to clarify any questions posed in the questionnaire by the respondent selected from the Taylor Movers staff database. One enumerator was trained for data collection and in order to perfect the process, a pilot data collection was conducted where the feedback
was used to attest the effectiveness of the tool and also amend where necessary. To seek the organization’s permission, the researcher took the opportunity to explain to the Taylor Movers senior management the importance and purpose of this study.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods
The data analysis was performed by use of descriptive statistics and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and further by use of Microsoft excel tool to generate graphs for interpretation because SPSS is commonly used in the social sciences and in the business world today (Field, 2009). Prior to analyzing the responses, the questionnaire was edited for completeness, consistency and accuracy in preparation for coding. Pearson correlation method used inferential statistics to analyze the data. The data in this study was first analyzed using frequencies and descriptive statistics (mean) to give an illustration on the affect of formal internal organizational communications on organizational cohesion.

3.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter highlighted the elements used in the research methodology of this study: the research design, the data collection methods, the research procedures and the data analysis method that was used. Chapter four presents the findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results and findings of the study as set out in the research methodology. The results were presented on the effect of formal internal organizational communication on organizational cohesion in Kenya: a case of Taylor Movers. The study sought answers to the following specific research questions: To what extent does top-down communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? To what extent does peer-to-peer communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? To what extent does upward communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? The chapter covers the demographic information and the findings based on the study’s research questions. The findings were then presented in tables, graphs and charts as appropriate with explanations being given in prose thereafter. Descriptive (frequencies and percentages) as well as inferential (correlation) statistics were used.

4.2 General Information
The general information that was collected from the respondents included their ages, gender, level of education and the duration of service at Taylor Movers.

4.2.1 Response Rate
The response rate of this study is shown is Figure 4.1. The researcher administered 79 questionnaires in total and managed to obtain 62 completed questionnaires representing 86% response rate.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires distributed</th>
<th>Questionnaires returned</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Respondents’ Age

Findings in Figure 4.1 show that majority (67%) of the respondents in the study were aged between 21 and 30 years whereas 33% were aged between 31 and 40 years. The findings therefore indicate that permanent staff members of Taylor Movers offices were relatively young and below 40 years.

![Figure 4.1: Respondents’ Age](image)

4.2.3 Respondents’ Gender

Majority (65%) of the respondents in the study were female with the male participants accounting for 35%. The findings therefore show that there was a great gender disparity among the permanent staff members of Taylor Movers offices. The findings are presented in Figure 4.2.
4.2.4 Respondents’ Level of Education

Findings in table 4.2 show that 36% of the participants had attained a bachelor’s degree, 31% had attained a post graduate degree while 22% had a graduate degree as their highest level of education. The findings also show that 8% had attained college education while 3% had acquired high school education. The findings therefore show that the permanent staff members of Taylor Movers offices were highly educated since majority of them had attained qualifications of higher education.

Table 4.2: Respondents’ Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 Respondents’ Working Experience

Findings in Figure 4.3 show that 41% of the participants had a working experience of more than 2 years while 23% had an experience of between 1 and 2 years. Nineteen percent of the respondents had a working experience of less than 6 months whereas 17% had worked at the company for between 6 months and 1 year. The findings therefore show that majority of the respondents in the study had adequate working experience to
enable them respond resourcefully to the questions posed to them in the study. The findings are presented in Figure 4.3

![Figure 4.3: Respondents' Working Experience](image)

### 4.3 Organization Cohesion

To measure organization cohesion, the respondents in the study were asked a number of questions relating to organization cohesion at Taylor Movers. The findings are presented in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I always clarify work related issues with my supervisor.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not fear approaching my supervisor to seek advice</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regularly send my suggestions to my supervisor.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, STD = Standard Deviation

The respondents were asked whether they always clarified work related issues with their supervisor, 63% agreed and another 20% strongly agreed even though 12% remained neutral the latter 6% disagreed. The mean was 2.04 with a standard deviation of 0.75. The respondents were also prompted to give information on whether they feared approaching their supervisor to seek advice, 55% agreed and another 25% strongly agreed, however 12% remained neutral, 4% disagreed. The mean was 2.08 with a standard deviation of 0.95. The participants were also asked whether they regularly sent their suggestions to
their supervisor. Eighteen percent were neutral, 52% agreed whereas 16% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 14%. The mean was 2.36 whereas the standard deviation was 0.92.

4.4 Top-Down Communication and Organizational Cohesion

Factors dealing with top-down communications were assessed in terms of intrapersonal interactions, problem solving and decision-making together with career development opportunities. Table 4.4 shows the responses for each section, respectively.

Table 4.4: Top-Down Communication and Organizational Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-level management communicates effectively</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-level management communicates information through middle-level managers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My first level supervisor could interact with me more.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My second level supervisor could interact with me more.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor communicates reliable information about the organization to me.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager could benefit from a communications skill training.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager approaches me to discuss problems.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive useful feedback from my manager during job evaluations.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear understanding of my roles and responsibilities because of my job evaluations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel involved in decision-making.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager encourages career development opportunities.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager helps me understand the strategic goals of the organization.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my organization values my personal goals.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, STD = Standard Deviation
The respondents were asked whether top-level management communicated effectively. 30% were neutral while 28% agreed and 22% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 13% while 7% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.83 with a standard deviation of 1.15. Again, the respondents were required to give their opinion on whether top-level management communicated information through middle-level managers. A total of 59% agreed, 11% disagreed and 17% were neutral. Those who strongly agreed were 9% while 4% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.41 with a standard deviation of 0.94.

The respondents were required to indicate whether their first level supervisor could interact with them more. A total of 40% agreed, 21% were neutral while 17% disagreed. Fifteen percent strongly agreed while 8% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.62 with a standard deviation of 1.16. Next, the respondents were asked whether their second level supervisor could interact with them more. A total of 43% agreed, 35% were neutral and 11% disagreed. 6% strongly agreed and an equal number (6%) strongly disagreed.

The respondents were required to give their opinion on whether their supervisor communicated reliable information about the organization to them. 35% of the respondents agreed 33% were neutral while 21% disagreed. Eight percent strongly agreed and 4% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.79 with a standard deviation of 0.99. The respondents were also asked whether their manager could benefit from a communications skills training. 32% agreed, 25% were neutral and 10% disagreed. Twenty five percent strongly agreed while 10% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.47 with a standard deviation of 1.23. Next, the respondents were prompted whether their manager approached them to discuss problems. Forty three percent agreed, 11% were neutral and 19% disagreed. Seventeen percent strongly agreed while 10% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.60 with a standard deviation of 1.25.

The respondents were asked whether they received useful feedback from their manager during job evaluations. A total of 50% agreed, 33% were neutral and 6% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 10% while those who strongly disagreed were 2%. The mean was 2.4 with a standard deviation of 0.82. The respondents were also asked whether they had a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities because of their job evaluations, 47% percent agreed, 24% were neutral and 12% disagreed. Fourteen percent strongly agreed while 4% strongly disagreed, the mean was 2.45 with a standard deviation of 1.0. The respondents were required to provide their opinion on whether they
felt involved in decision making. Twenty nine percent agreed, 23% were neutral and 21% disagreed. Fourteen percent strongly agreed and an equal number (14%) strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.92 with a standard deviation of 1.27.

The respondents were required to give their opinion on whether their manager encouraged career development opportunities. A total of 50% agreed, 17% were neutral and 14% disagreed. Fourteen percent strongly agreed while 6% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.48 with a standard deviation of 1.08. The respondents were also prompted whether their manager helped them understand the strategic goals of the organization. A total of 50% agreed, 14% were neutral while 15% disagreed. Fifteen percent strongly agreed and 6% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.46 with a standard deviation of 1.11. Again, the respondents were asked whether they felt that their organization valued their personal goals. A total of 37% of the respondents agreed, 20% were neutral and 20% disagreed. Nine percent were strongly agreed and 13% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.91 with a standard deviation of 1.21.

4.5 Peer-to-Peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion

Factors dealing with peer-to-peer communications were assessed in terms of presence of constructive teamwork, encouragement in team work, recognition in teams, respect in teams and sharing of information Table 4.5 shows the responses for each section, respectively.
Table 4.5: Peer-to-Peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is constructive team work at this organization.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my colleagues understand the way I communicate.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my organization cooperate with each other to get the job done.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my teammates at work.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is encouraged to participate in team work.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meetings are conducted regularly.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team success is celebrated as a group achievement.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am recognized in my team by my teammates.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am respected in my team by my teammates.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to be working in a team than on my own.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the members of my team are supportive.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information is shared equally in my team.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences (age, gender, education, race) are respected in my team.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N=Neutral, D= Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, STD = Standard Deviation

The respondents were required to give their opinion on whether there was constructive team work at Taylor Movers. Twenty nine percent of the respondents agreed, 35% were neutral and 14% disagreed. Sixteen strongly agreed and 6% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.65 with a standard deviation of 1.11. Next, the respondents were required to give their opinion on whether they felt that their colleagues understood the way they communicated. Fifty one percent agreed, 24% were neutral and 8% disagreed. Fourteen percent strongly agreed and 4% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.37 with a standard deviation of 0.96. The respondents were also asked whether employees at Taylor Movers cooperated with each other to get the job done. Forty three percent agreed, 31% were neutral and 8% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 14% and 4% strongly disagreed.
Next, the respondents were asked whether they encouraged their teammates at work. Sixty nine percent of the respondents agreed, 20% strongly agreed while 11% were neutral. The mean was 1.92 with a standard deviation of 0.56. The respondents were then prompted to give their opinion on whether everyone at the company was encouraged to participate in team work. Forty five percent agreed, 26% were neutral and 6% disagreed. Twenty two percent strongly agreed and 2% strongly disagreed.

The study sought to find out whether team meetings were conducted regularly. Forty percent agreed, 24% were neutral and 14% disagreed. Sixteen percent strongly agreed and 6% strongly disagreed. The study also sought to find out whether team success was celebrated as a group achievement. Forty six percent agreed, 19% were neutral and 14% disagreed. Fifteen percent strongly agreed and 6% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.48 with a standard deviation of 1.09. Next, the respondents were required to give their opinion on whether they were recognized in their team by their team mates. Fifty seven percent agreed, 24% were neutral and 2% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 16% while 2% strongly disagreed.

The respondents were also prompted to give their opinion on whether they were respected in their team by their teammates. Fifty-five percent agreed, 26% were neutral and 4% disagreed. A total of 16% strongly agreed. The mean was 2.18 with a standard deviation of 0.74. The respondents were asked whether they were happy to be working in a team than on their own. Thirty nine percent agreed, 31% were neutral and 14% disagreed. Fifteen percent strongly agreed and 2% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.48 with a standard deviation of 0.98.

The study sought to find out from the respondents whether all the members of their team were supportive. Forty two percent agreed, 36% were neutral and 10% disagreed. A total of 10% strongly agreed while 2% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.52 with a standard deviation of 0.88. The respondents were also asked whether all information was shared equally in their team. Thirty seven percent agreed, 33% were neutral and 17% disagreed. Six percent of the participants strongly agreed and 8% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.84 with a standard deviation of 1.03. Next, the respondents were requested to give their opinion on whether individual differences (age, gender, education and race) were respected in their teams. Forty seven percent agreed, 24% were neutral and 6% disagreed. A total of 24% strongly agreed. The mean was 2.12 with a standard deviation of 0.84.
4.6 Upward Communication and Organizational Cohesion

Factors dealing with upward communication were assessed in terms of type of upward communication, power distance, and negative feedback in upward communications and communication barriers in upward communications. Table 4.6 shows the responses for each section, respectively.

Table 4.6: Upward Communications and Organizational Cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have input into organizational decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have freedom to make decisions regarding my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is two-way communications between management and I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to advise top management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to approach top management for support on my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee recognition programs would benefit this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel top management respect the opinions given by staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-level management respects the opinions given by staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SA = Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N=Neutral, D= Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, STD = Standard Deviation

The respondents were prompted to give their opinion on whether they felt free to advise top management. Thirty nine percent agreed, 15% were neutral and 27% disagreed. Ten percent strongly agreed and an equal number (10%) strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.88 with a standard deviation of 1.19. The respondents were also prompted to give information on whether they were able to approach top management for support on their work. Fifty three percent agreed, 16% were neutral and 12% disagreed. Eight percent strongly agreed and 10% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.63 and a standard deviation of 1.13.

Next, the respondents were asked whether employee recognition programs would benefit their organization. 35% agreed and 22% were neutral. 39% strongly agreed and 4% strongly disagreed. The means was 1.95 with a standard deviation of 0.99. The
respondents in the study were asked whether they felt that top management respected the opinions given by staff. 31% agreed, 31% were neutral and 18% disagreed. Those who strongly agreed were 10% and an equal number 10% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.85 with a standard deviation of 1.13. The respondents in the study were also asked whether top-level management respected the opinions given by staff. Twenty nine percent agreed, 31% were neutral and 20% disagreed. Twelve percent strongly agreed and 8% strongly disagreed. The mean was 2.82 with a standard deviation of 1.12.

4.7 Chapter Summary
The foregoing chapter has presented the findings of the study. Descriptive statistics were used to organize the findings which were present in tables and figures. Inferential statistics namely correlation analysis were used to establish the strength and direction of relationships. Chapter five presents the discussion, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary and a discussion of findings presented in the previous chapter. The study’s conclusion and recommendations are also presented. The summary, discussion, conclusion and recommendations are presented in the order of objectives that were evaluate the effect of formal organizational communication flow dimensions (downward, peer-to-peer and upward) on organizational cohesion in the case of Taylor Movers.

5.2 Summary of Findings
The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of formal organizational communication flow dimensions on organizational cohesion. The study was guided by the following research questions: To what extent does top-down communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? To what extent does peer-to-peer communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers? And To what extent does upward communication affect organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers?

A descriptive research design was adopted for this study. The target population for this study comprised of 312 permanent staff members both male and female from Taylor Movers offices. Stratified random sampling was used to draw a sample of 79 employees. A self-administered structured e-questionnaire was used in conducting this study. The data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social (SPSS). The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation and presented in tables and figures.

Findings indicated that Taylor Movers had high organization cohesion. Majority of the participants indicated that they clarified work-related issues with their supervisors. Majority indicated that they did not fear approaching their supervisor to seek advice while indicated that they regularly sent suggestions to their supervisor. The findings therefore show that Taylor Movers had high organization cohesion since staff freely interacted with supervisors in executing their duties.

Factors focusing on top-down communications were assessed in terms of intrapersonal interactions, problem solving and decision-making together with career development
opportunities. Majority of the participants indicated that their first level supervisor could interact with them more. Majority of the participants indicate that their manager approached them to discuss problems. Majority agreed that their manager encouraged career development opportunities. Undertop-down communication, career development had a strong positive correlation with organization cohesion. However, only one item under top-down communication was found to be statistically significant.

Factors focusing on peer-to-peer communications were assessed in terms of presence of constructive teamwork, encouragement in teamwork, recognition in teams, respect in teams and sharing of information. The study found that majority of the participants agreed that there was constructive team work at this organization. Majority of the respondents agreed that they felt that their colleagues understood the way they communicated. Majority agreed that they were recognized in the team by their teammates. Majority also agreed that they were respected in the team by their teammates. Majority agreed that they were happy to be working in a team than on their own. Under peer-to-peer communication, presence of constructive teamwork, recognition in teamwork and respect in teams all had strong positive correlations with organization cohesion. In addition, encouragement in teamwork and sharing of information had moderate positive correlations with organization cohesion.

Factors focusing on upward communication were assessed in terms of type of upward communication, power distance, and negative feedback in upward communications and communication barriers in upward communications. The study found that Majority of the respondents agreed that had freedom to make decisions regarding their work. Majority agreed that there is two-way communications between management and them. Majority of the respondents agreed that they always clarified work related issues with their supervisor. Majority agreed that they regularly sent suggestions to their supervisor. Freedom to approach supervisors had a moderate positive correlation with organizational cohesion. In addition, clarification of issues with supervisors had a strong positive correlation with organization cohesion.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Top-down Communication and Organizational Cohesion
The study sought to establish the extent to which top-down communication affected organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers. Majority of the respondents agreed that top-
level management communicated effectively and that top-level management communicated information through middle-level managers. Corresponding with Morley (2015) who managers not only need to be good communicators, they also need to communicate with their employees frequently to stay abreast of changes and assess new programs and policies. Business managers need to set up regular opportunities for communication through online forum discussions, comment boxes, individual meetings with employees or group discussions with specific committees. These findings are consistent with Kalla (2005) who found that hierarchical disparity does not encourage free information exchange, as more authority is given to top-down directional communication as compared to bottom-up directional communication. The finding is also in agreement with Wild (2010) who notes that when employees are treated relatively equally, at least in theory, this means that communication can flow rather freely among individuals in organizations and the direction of information flow is often two-way.

Majority of the respondents indicated that their first level supervisor could interact with them more. In addition, the latter of the participants indicated that their second level supervisor could interact with them more. However majority did not feel that their supervisor communicated reliable information about the organization to them. This is in contrast to Mikoluk (2013) who recommended that every manager should learn how to properly recognize employees in the workplace. The manager must make every effort to make recognition a very public event. Recognizing an employee for their hard work shows that you value their contributions to the organization. In addition, many indicated that their manager could benefit from communications skill training and did not feel involved in decision-making. This finding is consistent with Ruck (2012) who indicated that line management communications deals with addressing how employee roles and responsibilities affect the unit’s organizational objectives. This is highly dependent on the managers’ own interpersonal communication skills.

In addition, majority of the participants did not feel that the organization valued their personal goals. This is in agreement with Mikoluk (2013) who identified that one aspect of the manager-employee relationship has to do with including employees in on project management and development. This doesn’t necessarily mean that you have to accept every idea that comes across your desk, but the fact that you’re sincerely listening to concerns positions you as a respected and trusted leader within the company. In short, if
employees truly feel like they are a part of the process, they will connect to projects in a more meaningful way, and do high-quality work.

The findings of the study suggest that there was a gap in top-down communication at Taylor Movers. This may explain why the study found that top-down communication affected organizational cohesion to a small extent. The findings are in agreement with MacNeil (2004) who found that the manner in which a manager communicates to their staff can affect group cohesion. The findings are in agreement with Ruck (2012) who found that the way the managers communicate during evaluations can influence employee perceptions and attitudes towards the organizational management, which affect organizational cohesion. The findings are in agreement with Mikoluk (2013) who indicated that effective communication is so important for organizational success that not only managers, but also their employees must be effective communicators. One role of a manager is to help employees improve their communication skills.

5.3.2 Peer-to-peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion

The study also sought to determine the extent to which peer-to-peer communication affects organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers. Majority of the respondents agreed that there was constructive teamwork at Taylor Movers. They also agreed that team meetings were conducted regularly. The findings therefore show that teamwork was valued at Taylor Movers. The findings are in agreement with Fröbel and Marchington (2005) who found that teamwork is valued just as highly as the traditional attributes of technical competence and creativity, and they must be rewarded by making them an integral part of the performance evaluation. The findings are also in agreement with Cooney and Sahal (2004), there are some well-established links between the use of work teams and the success of Quality Management programs.

Majority of the respondents agreed that everyone at the company was encouraged to participate in teamwork and that team success was celebrated as a group achievement. This reemphasized that teamwork is valued at Taylor Movers. This is in agreement with McBreen (2002) who found that in order to effectively coexist in a peer-to-peer environment organizations strive to achieve horizontal cohesion. This is the trust shared between peers. It is the bonds of confidence between employees within a single unit or horizontally between members of separate units.
Additional the respondents were required to give their opinion on whether they were recognized in their team by their team mates, majority of respondent agreed that this occurred at Taylor Movers. Consecutively the respondents were also prompted to give their opinion on whether they were respected in their team by their teammates and whether they felt that their colleagues understood the way they communicated, majority agreed that both occurred at Taylor Movers. This is in agreement with Moran (1991) who indicated that in peer-to-peer communication, the employee would be required to be aware of their own perceptions and how it affects the communication process. Interpersonal sensitivity is really just a matter of understanding the other person, the context and how the person will respond to the context.

The respondents were requested to give their opinion on whether individual differences (age, gender, education and race) were respected in their teams, majority of the respondents agreed that this took place at the company. This is in disagreement with Radebaugh et al (2004) who found that the degree of mutual understanding between peers varies in cross-cultural contexts due to different perceptions. Cultural diversity amongst peers currently represents a barrier to communication, because no culture is specific.

The findings therefore show that not only was there existence of teamwork at Taylor Movers, there existed motivation, trust and respect in the teams. The employees therefore felt valued in their teams. Peer-to-peer communication was found to have a strong influence on organization cohesion. The findings are in agreement with Miljković and Rijavec (2008) it enables coordination and integration of activities of units, engaged in relatively autonomous tasks. The findings are also in agreement with McBreen (2002) who found that in order to effectively coexist in a peer-to-peer environment organizations strive to achieve horizontal cohesion.

5.3.3 Upward Communication and Organizational Cohesion
The study sought to assess the extent to which upward communication affected organizational cohesion at Taylor Movers. Majority of respondents felt that there was two-way communications between them and management. Majority of respondents felt that they were not free to advise top management. However majority of the respondents felt they could approach top management for support on their work. The findings are in disagreement with Borkowski (2009) who indicated that in upward communications,
subordinates can provide personal information about issues as well as technical information to provide feedback to supervisors. However, the encouragement from management is needed to protect against staff victimization.

Majority of respondents felt that they had input into organizational decision-making, had freedom to make decisions regarding their work and that there was two-way communications between them and management. The findings therefore show that there was high employee engagement. The findings are in agreement with Luthan (1984) who recommended the use of whistle blowing procedures, open-door policies, counseling, surveys, exit interviews and participatory decision-making techniques and the use of a mediator to foster effective upward communications. Additional De Vries (2001) states that effective organizational functioning demands that people have a healthy respect for their managers, feel free to express emotions and opinions openly, and are comfortable engaging in conversations where it is both give and take, this is in agreement with the findings at Taylor Movers where majority of respondents felt engaged with management. Additionally, the rate and openness of internal organizational communication is an essential precondition for the development of trust (Sydow, 1998). A concept increasingly recognized as an affirmative contributor to professional effectiveness.

Majority of respondents in the study opted to remain neutral on there on whether top management respected the opinions given by staff. The findings are in agreement with Baron’s (1996) study, which suggested different perceptions between managers and their staff on upward communication. Supervisors are more likely to give negative feedback than their subordinates yet supervisors and subordinates generally give the same level of positive feedback. Additionally agrees with Buzzanell & Stohl (1999) who refer to the fifth postulate of W. Charles Redding’s ten postulates of organizational communication, which emphasizes the importance of feedback. That talks about feedback receptiveness, with which refers to the magnitude to which management is open to subordinate feedback. They makes a notable distinction between being a receptive feedback receiver and responding to feedback, they note that they are indeed different; this difference is a crucial point that should be recognized. If feedback is only received but not acted upon in the correct and required manner, the communication remains ineffective. The importance of not only providing the enabling environments for feedback but the ownership of responding to it, either positively or negatively, is highly encouraged.
The respondents were asked whether employee recognition programs would benefit their organization, majority agreed. This shows that there was room for improvement at Taylor Movers when it comes to upward communication. This may explain why upward communication was found to have a small effect on organization cohesion at the company. The findings are therefore in agreement with Sydow (1998) who found that the rate and openness of internal organizational communication is an essential precondition for the development of trust. The study is also in agreement with Baron’s (1996) study, which suggested different perceptions between managers and their staff on upward communication.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Top-down Communication and Organizational Cohesion

The study concludes that top-down communication affected organizational cohesion to a small extent. In the case of Taylor Movers Ltd, employees felt that their supervisor’s interactions were enough and that they communicated reliable information about the organization to them. Showing that Taylor Movers Ltd managers are aware of the contribution communication gives to group cohesion. By communicating with their subordinate staff where able to achieve; clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities through job evaluations; involvement in decision-making; career development opportunities; clarity in the strategic goals of the organization; connection between the organization values their personal goals. As a manager one of the roles is to improve communications skills in their team. In this study we identify that capacity development of managers in communications training can result in favorable results for the organizations cohesion. Finally the study concludes that organizational cohesion faced various challenges however in regards to top-down communication, as much as it has a small extent on organizational cohesion, the continuous communication interventions supports individual, group and organizational engagement.

5.4.2 Peer-to-peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion

The study concluded that peer-to-peer communication had a strong effect on organization cohesion. Staff cooperated with each other to get the job done between employees and units on the same organizational level that enables coordination and integration of activities of units, engaged in relatively autonomous tasks. Everyone was encouraged to participate in teamwork in order to effectively coexist in a peer-to-peer environment to
achieve horizontal cohesion. Majority of employees felt respected by their teammates, which encouraged trust and developed confidence within a single unit, or horizontally between members of separate units. The findings therefore show that not only was there existence of teamwork at Taylor Movers, their existed motivation, trust and respect in the teams. The employees therefore felt valued in their teams. Peer-to-peer communication was found to have a strong influence on organization cohesion.

5.4.3 Upward Communication and Organizational Cohesion
The study concludes that upward communication was found to have a small effect on organization cohesion at the company. This was because majority of employees did not feel free to advise top management meaning that they felt restrained to seek clarification, provide feedback, and make suggestions to improving morale and employee attitude. The rate and openness of internal organizational communication is an essential precondition for the development of trust. The study also highlighted that majority of the respondents did not also feel that top management respected the opinion given by staff. Issues in feedback receptiveness, with which can be described as the magnitude to which management is open to subordinate feedback, makes a notable distinction between being a receptive feedback receiver and responding to feedback which are indeed different. This difference is a crucial point that should be recognized. If feedback is only received but not acted upon in the correct and required manner, the communication remains ineffective. The importance of not only providing the enabling environments for feedback but the ownership of responding to it, either positively or negatively, can affect the organizational cohesion in a company.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Top-down Communication and Organizational Cohesion
Given the importance of top communication for organizational cohesion in companies, the study recommends that Taylor Mover’s first and second supervisors interact more with their employees. Additionally Taylor Movers should provide on the job training to its first line and second line managers to enable them to improve the way they communicate with the employees. Finally more information should be made available to the employees about the strategic and business objectives so that employees can feel involved and appreciated as that they a valuable part of the organization.
5.5.1.2 Peer-to-Peer Communication and Organizational Cohesion
Given the importance of peer-to-peer communication for organizational cohesion in companies, the study recommends that the frequency of meetings at Taylor Movers should be increased to ensure more interaction between peers. Reward interventions for teams should be introduced to motivate and appreciate teamwork performance throughout the organization should be introduced. Additionally regular team building activities should also be incorporated throughout the company to promote cohesion and promote appreciation for each team member’s role and activities across the company.

5.5.1.3 Upward Communication and Organizational Cohesion
Given the importance of upward communication for organizational cohesion in companies, the study recommends that top-level management at Taylor Movers should continuously acknowledge employee contributions to build institutional moral and appreciation for performance. This will contribute to how employees feel at an intrapersonal level and at an intrapersonal level, as they will identify that their input is valued. To mitigate power distances and power plays at the company Taylor Mover’s top level management should mitigate the organizational bureaucracy by avail themselves to employees, which will support efforts to make them approachable to employees.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
Since this study explored the effect of formal internal organizational communication on organizational cohesion in Kenya: a case of Taylor Movers, the study recommends that similar studies should be performed to evaluate future studies should be carried out on more small to medium size organizations in Africa. Future studies can also include new media communications factors that could affect organizational cohesion in regards to communication. Additionally results from different environmental factors could be compared to get a better understanding of the effect of formal organizational communication flow dimensions (downward, peer-to-peer and upward) on organizational cohesion.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

Dear Respondent,

I am writing to request you to participate in an academic research that I will carry out in 2015. I am a postgraduate student at the United States International University-Africa, undertaking a Master of Arts course in Organizational Development. The findings of this research will be presented as a final project for my masters to the institution's Chandaria School of Business.

The study topic evaluates the effect of formal internal organizational communication on organizational cohesion in Kenya: a case of Taylor Movers. In my current profession I am impressed with the communication practices therein, and would like to document the same, to increase the academic pool of knowledge on what works for development organization’s holding campaigns.

Kindly fill the attached questionnaire as honestly as possible to enable this research to be successful. The information purely for academic research and will be treated as confidential and anonymous.

Your assistance and cooperation is highly appreciated. All the details you require to know about the study can be directed to me, I'm available on phone or email, to answer queries you may have, regarding this research. I value your input and hope that you will make the time to take part.

Many thanks for your help,

Umuliza M. Njiru,
Graduate Student,
United States International University-Africa
APPENDIX2: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is your age?
   - 20 or younger
   - 21-30 yrs
   - 31-40 yrs.
   - 41-50 yrs.
   - 51-60 yrs.
   - Over 60 yrs.

2. Gender:
   - Female
   - Male

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - High school diploma or equivalent
   - Some college but no degree
   - Bachelor degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Post graduate Degree

4. How long have you worked at Taylor Movers?
   - Less than 6 year
   - 6 months-1 year
   - 1-2 years
   - More than 2 years
**PART 2: FACTORS THAT AFFECT TOP-DOWN COMMUNICATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COHESION**

Kindly tick only one based on the indicates scale

Strongly agree-1, Agree-2, Neutral-3, Disagree-4, Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that top-level management communicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Top-level management communicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information through middle level managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel my first level supervisor could interact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with me more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel my second level supervisor could interact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with me more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In my opinion my supervisor communicates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable information about the organization to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel my manager could benefit from communications skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My manager approaches me to discuss problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I receive useful feedback from my manager during job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have a clear understanding of my roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of my job evaluations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My manager encourages career development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My manager helps me understand the strategic goals of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel that my organization values my personal goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PART 3: FACTORS THAT AFFECT PEER-TO-PEER COMMUNICATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COHESION

Kindly tick only one based on the indicates scale

Strongly agree-1, Agree-2, Neutral-3, Disagree-4, Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. There is constructive teamwork at this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel that my colleagues understand the way I communicate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Employees at my organization cooperate with each other to get the job done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I encourage my team mates at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Everyone is encouraged to participate in teamwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Team meetings are conducted regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Team success is celebrated as a group achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I am recognized in my team by my teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am respected in my team by my teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am happy to be working in a team than on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. All the members of my team are supportive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. All information is shared equally in my team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Individual differences (age, gender, education, race) are respected in my team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART 4: FACTORS THAT AFFECT UPWARD COMMUNICATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COHESION

Kindly tick only one based on the indicates scale

Strongly agree-1, Agree-2, Neutral-3, Disagree-4, Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. I feel I have input in to organizational decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have freedom to make decisions regarding my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. There is two-way communications between management and I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I feel free to advise top management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am able to approach top management for support on my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Employee recognition programs would benefit this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I feel top management respect the opinions given by staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I always clarify work related issues with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I do not fear approaching my supervisor to seek advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Regularly send my suggestions to my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Top-level management respects the opinions given by staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>