

Communication - Vector for Growth of Management Performance

Manoela Popescu¹, Mirela Dogaru², Carmen Mihaela Boteanu³, Ana Maria Ifrim⁴, Savu Florin⁵

^{1,2,4}Titu Maiorescu University, Romania, ¹E-mail: manoela_popescu@gmail.com, ²E-mail: mirela_dogaru@gmail.com, ⁴E-mail: amifrim@gmail.com

^{3,5}Valahia University, Romania, ³E-mail: carmenboteanu@yahoo.com, ⁵E-mail: savuflorin@yahoo.com

Abstract

Everything is communication. Regardless of how it manifests itself, in time and in space, factors of influence or effects, the individual communicates. The multitude of studies, researches and analyses did not exhaust the subject. Addressed as a function, as a phenomenon, as a process, as a result, as an art, as a science, communication is inexhaustible in terms of the forms of manifestation, the result and the impact. The responsible communication for any organizational problem has become a custom and a tradition. True, communication is crucial to the existence and success of the business. The results of the study carried out reveal the importance of communication on the increase of managerial performance, identifying the type of communication, organizational structure and relationship that can create the mix of ensuring the managerial performance.

Keywords

Managerial communication, organizational communication, managerial performance

JEL Codes: D83

© 2020 Published by Dimitrie Cantemir Christian University/Universitara Publishing House.

(This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Received: 20 February 2020

Revised: 05 March 2020

Accepted: 15 March 2020

1. Introduction and literature review

Business development, as well as individuals, is determined by communication. In this sense, the connection between communication and development analysed by different communication theories highlights the reconstitution of the set of rules, rituals, socio-cultural norms that make up the communication seen as a dynamic process, but also from a systemic perspective (Baporikar, 2015; Provasnek *et al.*, 2016; Qionglei *et al.*, 2019). Addressed at the organizational level, communication plays an important role both in generating the context of emergence and development of organizational intelligence (organizational, technological and linguistic context), as well as in the determinants, as well as of the determinants. co-factors of organizational intelligence (organizational learning, leadership, organizational culture, management). Moreover, the generation of knowledge within the organizational framework is achieved through communication.

Communication is a transaction in which man invents and assigns meanings to achieve his goals. Along with human nature, communication is the essential factor that creates and develops personalities and meaning (Popescu, 2013; Miller, 2012). The individual is the one who communicates, voluntarily or involuntarily, and in this way, on the one hand, he develops his communication skills and abilities, and on the other hand, he changes his behaviour in a positive or negative. The entity communicating including its attitude towards life, towards the world, towards the persons with whom it relates, towards events, situations, etc., through its body. Known as the fact that, in achieving success, it does not matter, ultimately, the degree of intelligence or the level of education, but the attitudes. People are the result of continuous and irreversible communication. Human behaviour is the natural consequence of interpersonal and intrapersonal communication. This is because any communication has effects on both the receiver and the transmitter. The personality of an individual is the result of communication, because education in the family and in school is, first and foremost, communication.

In the current context of globalization and competitiveness, information and communication mean personal and organizational power. As the functioning of the organization is inextricably linked to the quality of interpersonal communication, organizational performance is only possible through effective communication within the organization. According to Miller (2012), who said that "Communication not only serves the organization, it is the organization", it can be concluded that without communication, the organization loses its most important part, because communication unifies and organizes different parts of the organization in order to achieve the objectives.

In order to reveal the importance of communication in the effective activity of a manager, a quantitative study was performed, based on 49 questions addressed to the managers of the Romanian SMEs, in the three interest categories:

demographics, study-specific questions and participants' opinions. The purpose of this study was to explore possible antecedents of internal relations within organizations. The hypothesis being that there is an influence of organizational structure and internal communication on the relations between employees and organization in the context of organizational justice.

2. Managerial performance through organizational communication

Although communication is a resource and a component of the organization and functioning of the organization, however, little research addresses it in the organizational context. This is because there are definitions of organizational communication that present it as a process, usually intentional, of exchanging messages between people, groups and organizational levels within the organization, in order to achieve both individual objectives, as well as the collective (Paulus, 2000; Qionglei *et al.*, 2019).

Although, the organizational communication is often analysed through the following components: formal and informal communication; horizontal communication (at the same hierarchical level), ascending (from subordinates to superiors) or descending; internal communication (in the organization), external (partners, customers, collaborators, suppliers, etc.). Which means that the communication approach in the organizational context is aimed at both the communication within the organization (internal communication) and the communication outside the organization with the target audience, target communities, intermediary communities and groups (external communication).

Official communication is official and involves when there are certain rules and orders in behaviour within an organization (Miller, 2012). According to recent research done by various specialized people in 2016, today's organizations are more concerned about efficient upward communication (Martineau & Pastoriza, 2016). Participation in the decision-making process is more common in organizations. However, researchers have also stated that official communication channels often filter information. So, this aspect generates the misinformation of the management regarding the current situation and, consequently, the decrease of the efficiency. Therefore, a manager must communicate properly when employees contact him, because communication upstream is a necessary flow that offers more opportunities for understanding, satisfaction and efficiency among employees. So, this type of communication should be evaluated as part of the development of the communication strategy for managers.

Internal communication can be structured, in turn, from the point of view of the involvement of one or more departments/hierarchical levels, in intra-hierarchical communication, which can be inter-departmental and interdepartmental and inter-hierarchical communication. In the spirit of the same idea, organizational communication is defined as the discipline that deals with the study of communication processes within the organizational context (Bourgeon & Tarondeau, 2000). In the organizational context, the communication approach aims: the interpersonal communication that can be direct or mediated by the members of the organization: employees, managers, specialists, collaborators; communication between the organizational structures: between departments, branches, departments, departments; communication to employees and abroad or how the organization communicates through the transmission of meanings to its employees, customers and other organizations (Cook & Hunsaker, 2001; Popescu, 2013).

The manager, who wants to choose the communication strategy, must know the possible barriers in the communication between colleagues, in order to avoid misunderstandings and to increase the efficient exchange of information; this will make the communication strategy successful. Same studies, informal communication plays a significant role in workplace performance (Martineau & Pastoriza, 2016; Alcouffe & Louzzani, 2003). A vineyard metaphor is used to describe informal communication. Communication with the coil describes the concept of information dissemination within an organization, when person A sends a message to person B and C, and these two people send a message to people D, E and F. Usually, personal information or social news is disseminated. Also, this information circulates at the specific levels of the organization. For example, managers and employees can receive different types of information. However, the participants in the communication with the vine are both men and women. The flow of information can start with any member of the organization, as researchers have found that the message being sent is usually correct.

Thus, a manager must be separated from this communication and accurately send his message to others. The communication strategy involves the differentiation of accurate gossip information, contacting other levels of the organization to obtain information on social news. Personal information is something that gives an understanding of a situation and helps identify the needs and desires of employees. However, formal and informal communication cannot be viewed separately but as an interconnected network. This is because these types of formal and informal communication styles within an organization are always tight and used together. Probably, the most well-known theories of organizational communication are those from the classical period that arose from the industrial revolution (Toffler & Toffler, 2006). The main idea of the classical perspectives of organizational communication is that organizations are like machines.

Taken together, the six principles of leadership propose an organization that is highly structured and hierarchical. The organization is divided into functional divisions (division of labour, unity of direction and principles of order). Within these divisions, managers command a certain number of employees (the control principle) and each employee has a single supervisor (the control unit principle). Throughout the entire organization, communication flows through highly structured vertical channels (the principle of the scalar chain).

For all that, the most important way of communication is the vertical flow of information along the scalar chain of the organizational hierarchy (Miller, 2012). In addition, in these classical theories, most of the communication within the organization flows in the form of orders, rules and directives. The probability of horizontal and free communication increases at higher levels of the organization, because the tasks assumed tend to involve more planning and coordination. However, horizontal and free communication is an exception in classical theories. The rule of communication is the flow of information down from managers to employees. Moreover, an analysis of communication within groups (working group, department or department) highlights the importance of the concept of managerial communication, the relationships of influence and power within groups, as well as the modalities of construction of the communication networks. The functions of managerial communication are informing, socializing, motivating, dialogue, education, promoting organizational culture, fun and integration (Miller, 2012; Baporikar, 2015). This means that managers will provide information necessary for the activities and implementation of decisions using different forms and channels of communication.

Thus, the manager will have a clear attitude, the voice will be normal, the rhythm normal, without any special intonation in the announcement of the promotion but accentuated when presenting the achievements of the promoted person. In order to ensure an efficient management communication, it is considered that the organizational members can be classified in certain typologies depending on the role and function of the company, the information held, as well as other criteria. Thus, it must be considered that there are manipulators, verifiers, martyrs, gossipers, all-knowing persons, etc., in an organizational framework, which determines the use of specific communication strategies.

Also, an approach of analysing the role of the organizational context (social - the organization represents a social and institutional system - the organization is an institution with rules, norms, values, beliefs, attitudes, expectations, hypotheses) on communication, it emphasizes the importance of informal communication and the symbolic dimension of communication (status, power, rituals, relationships) within the organization. It should not be neglected that it is necessary to educate and train managers on the importance of structures, forms of communication and organizational systems in order to ensure managerial performance. In order to identify the importance of organizational communication in ensuring managerial performance, a study was conducted among 500 managers from Romanian SMEs. The primary data for this quantitative study were obtained through a survey, consisting of 49 questions in the three interest categories: demographic, study-specific questions and participants' opinions. With a rate of response rate of 48% (i.e. 237 participants), the profile of the respondents becomes important by the fact that any communication is influenced by the initiator. Thus, the participants in the survey are mostly men (79.3%) and have a large variation in age; the share of managers between 45-54 and 55 and above is the same as 37, 6%. It should be noted that there are only 5.1% managers aged 25-34.

3. Results and discussions

Regarding the education of the respondents, there is a significant variation, thus even having managers with "less than 12 classes", 22.8% are graduates of at least two years of post-secondary education, 37.6% have a bachelor's degree, and 29.1% have graduated from a master's or doctoral level. The study shows that 33.3% of the participants do not have certifications in the field of management, while 158 (66.7%) have such certification. However, all 237 participants indicated that they had completed at least one basic course in management. The majority, 183 (77.2%), have completed professional development courses and 137 participants (57.8%) have completed an advanced course. 84.8% graduated a course of study within the Institute of Management, while 63.3% graduated a course outside Europe. A larger number, 209 (88.2%), indicated that they participated in another formal or sponsored course by the Greek group Kraft. Almost half of the respondents (48.1%) consider that education plays an important role in their current position, and 4.6% even consider that education represents the most important advantage held in the occupied position. Most managers, the participants in the survey are of the opinion that education could help them in the promotion process (43.2%) and even significantly in the selection process (34.7%).

Moreover, all participants indicate that the level of management training has contributed to the occupation of current functions and that a continuous training in the managerial field is necessary. Thus, 73.4% of the respondents consider that the preparation for the management represents an important asset in their current position, and 17.7% consider it the most important asset at this time of the career.

Regarding managerial experience, 21.1% have an experience between 15 and 19 years, and 18.1% have an experience of over 25 years. Between 5 and 14 years of managerial experience or slightly more than 17% of the respondents. The managerial experience for 41.9% of the respondents is an important asset in their current position, and another 51.7% consider it to be the most important asset at this time of their career. Cronbach's factor analysis results and reliability test for internal communication variables reveal that Cronbach's Alpha was .80 for asymmetric communication and .83 for symmetric communication (Table 1).

Table 1. Cronbach's factor analysis results and reliability test for internal communication variables

Variables.	Item	Factor	Alpha
Symmetrical communication.	Most communications between managers and other employees within our company can be communicated in two directions.	.74	
	Our company encourages differences of opinion.	.80	
	The purpose of communication in our company is to help managers respond to the problems of other employees.	.71	
	Supervisors encourage employees to express their differences.	.79	
	Employees are usually aware of major policy changes that affect the workplace before it occurs.	.70	
	Employees are not afraid to talk during meetings with supervisors and managers.	.66	.83
Eigenvalue		3.27	
% of Variance Explained		54.49	
Symmetrical communication.	The purpose of communication in our company is to attract employees to behave in the way that top management wants us to behave.	.75	
	Most communications within our company are one: from management to other employees.	.80	
	Employees rarely receive feedback when communicating to managers.	.73	
	In our company, management uses communication to control employees.	.78	
	Managers here are not interested in hearing employees' suggestions on how to improve the company's performance.	.68	.80
Eigenvalue		2.81	
% of Variance Explained		56.26	

About the construction of internal communication, it was possible to develop a continuum of asymmetrical-symmetrical communication. However, when we performed the exploration factor analysis after combining all the elements of internal communication, we found that two factors were extracted. These two factors clearly represented asymmetric and symmetrical communication. Also, the Pearson correlation between asymmetric and symmetric communication was -.45 at the individual level and -.68 at the organizational level. All the elements for both an exchange relationship and a communal relationship loaded strongly, respectively, on a single factor (Table 2).

Table 2. Cronbach's factor analysis results and reliability test for relationship variables

Elements, factor loads and reliability for the exchange relationship			
Item		Factor	Alpha
Whenever this company gives me or offers me something, they generally expect something in return.		.83	
Even though I have had a relationship with this company for a long time, I still expect something in return, whenever I offer a favour.		.88	
This company will compromise with me when it knows it will win something.		.90	
This company takes care of me because I'm very likely to reward the company.		.85	
Eigenvalue		2.99	
% of Variance Explained		74.83	
Elements, factor loadings and reliability for the common relationship			
This company does not particularly enjoy my help. (R)		.83	
This company is very concerned about my well-being.		.87	
I think this company is taking advantage of vulnerable people. (R)		.86	
I think this company manages to defend me. (R)		.87	
This company helps me without expecting anything in return.		.84	.90
Eigenvalue		3.64	
% of Variance Explained		72.85	

The exchange relationship explained that 74.83% of the variation and the common relationship explain 72.85% of the variance. Alpha Cronbach was high for both indices and was close to the ideal level of 0.90 (0.89 for the exchange relationship and 0.90 for the common relationship).

In general, the participants in this study seemed to have centralized ($M = 4.41$), formalized ($M = 4.18$) and stratified ($M = 4.31$) and did not allow employees to participate in decision making ($M = 3.72$). In the case of complexity, the participants estimated that their companies have an average degree of complexity ($M = 3.99$). The means of asymmetric and symmetrical communication were the same ($M = 3.92$). Asymmetric communication and symmetrical communication seem to coexist in participants' organizations. Organizational correlations showed that organic structures were significantly related to symmetrical internal communication systems ($r = .58, p < .01$), and mechanical structures were significantly related to asymmetric internal communication systems ($r = -.66, p < .01$).

The survey shows that an organizational and managerial system in which management treats employees with dignity and gives them the opportunity to express their voice or contribution to the management process is a necessary condition for quality relationships, employees. Entities need to develop positive employee organization and communication relationships. Also, it is necessary to train and educate managers on the importance of organic structures, symmetrical communication systems and fair organizational systems. If the dominant coalitions and the managers do not recognize the important roles that the three organizational contexts play in the relations with the employees, the research of such relations would never be beneficial for the managerial practice.

4. Conclusions

At the organizational level, communication develops on the functional framework of the organization. The study reiterates the fact that, regarding the construction of the internal communication, it was possible to develop a continuum of asymmetrical-symmetrical communication, the two types of communication being significantly linked, but not at a sufficiently high level to suggest that they are the same. Organizational correlations showed that the organic structures were significantly related to the symmetric systems of internal communication, and the mechanical structures were significantly related to the asymmetric systems of internal communication. The correlation between asymmetric communication and symmetrical communication was significantly negative.

Also, this study has shown that symmetrical communication and organic structure can contribute to building quality relationships when combined with fair management behaviour and fair organizational policies and systems. This means that good relationships result from good organizational behaviour (fair treatment), which is initiated by symmetrical communication and organic structure.

Which leads us to the idea that the results of the study showed how organizations can build quality relationships with employees. For example, employers need to develop equitable organizational systems in which they can treat employees with dignity and offer employees the opportunity to express their voice or contribution to the management process. Also, management should treat employees with respect, offering appropriate and honest explanations regarding decision making. These efforts by management should constitute the building block of positive employee relationships within organizations. Symmetrical communication without correct behaviour is "pseudo symmetrical communication". The organizational structure and the internal communication were indeed antecedents of some dimensions of the employee-organization relations.

Especially the organic structure and the symmetrical internal communication facilitated the development of positive relations of organization of the employees. It has also been found that a fair organizational system in which management treats employees with dignity and gives employees the opportunity to express their voice or contribution to the management process is a necessary condition for relationships. quality of the employees. It is true that an organic structure, a symmetrical communication system and a fair organizational system should be established first in order to create positive employee organization relationships. Thus, managers should begin to build quality relationships with employees by changing the structures of their organization, as well as internal communication systems with a strategic perspective. Organizations should also try to establish a fair organizational system.

Acknowledgement: This paper was co-financed from the Human Capital Operational Program 2014-2020, project number POCU/380/6/13/125245 no. 36482/23.05.2019 "Excellence in interdisciplinary PhD and post-PhD research, career alternatives through entrepreneurial initiative (EXCIA)", coordinator The Bucharest University of Economic Studies.

References

- Alcouffe C., & Louzzani Y. (2003). Mesures de l'investissement immatériel. Indicateurs d'évaluation et de performance, Note du LIRHE, Toulouse, pp. 381.
- Baporikar, N. (2015). Drivers of Innovation. Knowledge Management for Competitive Advantage During Economic Crisis. Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference. 250-270.
- Bourgeon L., & Tarondeau J. (2000). Le management stratégique des compétences, Dirigé par Quelin B. et Arrègle J.L., Apprentissage et organisation par projet, Paris: Ellipses.
- Cook, C., & Hunsaker, P. (2001). Management and organizational behavior (3rd ed.). Chicago: Irwin.
- Martineau C., & Pastoriza D. (2016). International involvement of established SMEs: A systematic review of antecedents, outcomes and moderators, *International Business Review*, 2016, 25(2), 458
- Miller, K. (2012) *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Processes*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Paulus, P.B. (2000). Groups, teams and creativity: The creative potential of idea-generating groups. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49.
- Popescu, M. (2013). Comunicarea și negocierea în afaceri – esența succesului antreprenorial, PRO Universitaria, București.
- Provasnek, A.K., Schmid, E., Geissler, B., & Steiner, G. (2016). Sustainable Corporate Entrepreneurship: Performance and Strategies Toward Innovation. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 25(5), 337-354
- Toffler A., & Toffler H. (2006). *Revolutionary Wealth*. Traducere în limba română: *Avuția în mișcare*, Editura ANTET, București.
- Qionglei Y., Dorothy A. Y., Barnes B. R., & Huang Y.-A. (2019) Enhancing firm performance through internal market orientation and employee organizational commitment, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(6), 964-987.