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The impact of effective communication by managers has become a topic of interest in the literature because of the way it impacts both the employee experience and organizations. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes in Saudi hospitality and tourism organizations. Mix-methods, non-experimental, and exploratory survey was used in this study. Hotel employees working in Saudi hospitality and tourism organizations were surveyed. The results show that effective communication can predict employees’ job satisfaction, job engagement, and turnover intention. The finding of this study suggest that more effort is needed from human resources to encourage and reinforce a change in attitude among managers to promote effective communication.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The impact of effective communication by managers has become a topic of interest in the literature because of the way it impacts both the employee experience and organizations. Communication is a “basic function of all managers’ jobs” (Greenberg, 2010, p. 22) because managers spend 80% of their daily duties communicating with others in order to drive the organization’s success (Dasgupta et al., 2012; Lolli, 2013). Voinea, Busu, Opran, and Vladutescu (2015) point out managerial communication is a tool to understand information and management decisions in order to achieve organizational objectives. Failures in effective communication have direct and indirect impacts on individuals and organizations (Pretorius & Roux, 2011; Moncarz, 2007; Rudd & Mills, 2015). For this reason, an appropriate communication model is critical for effective organizational behavior due to the use of open communication in leader and member interaction to increase the level of engagement (Hsiung, 2012), particularly when managers have an influence over subordinates’ expected outcomes (Lolli, 2013).

Communication has been found to influence employee satisfaction and engagement. As such, a number of studies have indicated that there is a need to examine effective communication in the work environment and its impact on the workforce as lack of job satisfaction and engagement can influence employee intention to leave (Aburge, 2011; Fragouli & Ibidapo, 2015; Hsiung, 2012; Sanchez, 2006). Along with the need to study effective communication in general, further studies that focus specifically on effective communication in multicultural work environments are required because it
has been found that it is more challenging for managers to communicate effectively with multicultural teams of employees than teams that are less diverse (Cooren, Cornelissen, & Clark, 2011; Tran, 2016). Little research has been done to determine the impact effective communication has on such employees’ job outcomes (Jain, 2015). Looking specifically at the hospitality and tourism industry, it has an increasingly diverse workforce. The transmission of information can be impeded in multicultural workforces such as the ones found in this industry due to differences in individuals’ cultural norms, values, beliefs and religion, education, and attitudes and behaviors (Samovar et al., 2015). Managers are recommended to pay close attention to cultural aspects of an organization to promote efficient management when working with a diverse workforce (Vasquez, 2014). According to and McJannet (2005), ineffective communication can lead to the failure of even the best ideas. In order to break through the barriers of managing a diverse workforce, effective communication should be thoroughly investigated in order to improve employees’ outcomes that lead to positive impact on organizational outcomes.

In addition to the general problems caused by lack of effective communication, there are factors related to communication that are perceived as limiting an employee’s ability to perform their duties. When managers fail to clearly communicate, their employees often feel they cannot appropriately perform their duties (Puni, Agyemang, & Asamoah, 2016). Schijins and Schroder (1996) and Gudykunst (2005) have suggested that behavioral and psychological factors have to be measured to assess effective communication and determine its impact on employees’ attitude and behavior. For example, managerial feedback practices may impact an employees’ self-esteem.
Self-esteem has been found to moderate job performance and satisfactory relationships (Judge & Bono, 2001). Within the feedback practices of managers, information seeking has been described as a mediating variable between effective communication and turnover (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013). Thus, the study will examine the mediating effects of self-esteem and information seeking between effective communication and three types of job outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement and turnover rate). Understanding employees’ attitude and behavior will help promote a healthier workplace and positive organizational culture.

The negative consequences of a lack of effective communication can also impact employees’ well-being, which has been found to be the most reliable indicator of employees’ attitude and behavior in the workplace (Heponiemi et al., 2011). Well-being is perceived as “indicators of mental and physical well-being, such as anxiety, depression, tension, and somatic health” (Edwards & Shipp, 2007, p. 225). Also, workplace well-being refers to subjective health and depressive symptoms that include employee job satisfaction and engagement (Stengård, Bernhard-Oettel, Berntson, Leineweber & Aronsson, 2016), all factors that may impact employee performance.

When employees are satisfied, they tend to be more engaged and thus perform their job better. Job engagement is associated with the success of an organization business as it contributes to productivity, profitability, and boost employees performance (Takeuchi et al., 2007; Karatepe, 2013). Kahn (1990) defined engagement as “the simultaneous employment and expression of a person’s preferred self in task behaviors that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive,
an emotional), and active, full performances” (p. 700). Hence, employees who are engaged in their workplace have a desire to stay with their current employers (Christensen et al., 2008). On the other hand, disengaged employees found to experience negative emotion and overall well-being concerns (Hart, 2016). According to Gerst (2013), communication between managers and employees is a major driver of employee engagement in the workplace. Managers perceive employee engagement as a major challenge for organizational leadership (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011; Ling, Liu, & Wu, 2016). Meanwhile, disengaged employees often do not perceive their direct managers as effective communicators (Neves & Eisenberger, 2012). This disengagement affects organizations and may lead to negative outcomes.

Keeping employees satisfied has become a priority for many organizations because firms benefit when they have a satisfied workforce. Lee and Moreo (2007) have indicated employee satisfaction is a key factor to a company’s success. Organizations experience significant business costs related to the loss of employees (Huang et al., 2016). The estimated cost of employee turnover is between 90% and 200% of the employee’s annual salary (Mitchell et al., 2001). Organizations have reported the cost due to the lost investment in training and developing their employees who eventually leave regardless of the efforts (Almalki, 2012; Mello, 2011; Wolvin, 1994). Holtom and Burch (2016) noted that employee turnover is disrupting the workflow structure and trust among organizational members making work environment complex.

With so much to be gained by retaining employees, issues of job satisfaction and engagement are becoming increasingly important in the field of hospitality and tourism
and managers play an important role in improving the situation. According to the World Trade Organization (2015), the hospitality and tourism industry is one of the world’s largest employers with 9.1% of the population working in this area and one in eleven of all available jobs being a result of this sector. Despite its size, the industry is considered to be one in which employees have a high intention to leave (AlBattat & Som, 2013; Hendi & Nasardin, 2006; Mwilu, 2016; Jagun, 2015). Many researchers consider intention to leave to be the most significant indicator of employee turnover (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Dasgupta, Suar, & Shilpee, 2012). There are some reasons for employee turnover such as unhealthy working conditions, low wages, work stress, burnout, perceived injustice, and lack of career advancement (AlBattat, & Som, 2013; Banet, 2005; Hemdi, Omar & Azmi, 2012; Lam, Baum & Pine, 2003; Pathak, 2012; Sharma, Verma, Verma & Malhotra, 2010). Improper supervisory practices have also been reported to be one of the most common reasons influencing employee turnover in the industry (Haven-Tang & Jones, 2012; Kusluvan et al., 2010) with ineffective managerial strategies such as poor communication practices found to be a key predictor of employee job dissatisfaction (Buzeti, Klun, & Stare, 2016; Tiwari, 2015), job engagement (Neves & Eisenberger, 2012), and leaving job (Buzeti et al., 2016; Puni, Agyemang, & Asamoah, 2016).

Environmental complexity requires great deal of interaction, two-way communication, stronger social networks, and more interdependence among members (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). Appropriate managerial communication practices cultivate powerful emotional relationships between managers and subordinates within
organizational context (Dasgupta, Suar, & Shilpee, 2012), boost organizational success (Greenberg, 2010), and foster effective worker decision making (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2015). By contrast, negative emotions among hospitality and tourism employees are often a result of ineffective management practices (Shani & Amir, 2014). According to Herzberg’s two factor theory, motivational sets such as reward systems, salary, interpersonal relations, organizational climate, and communication determine employees’ job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 2005; Lundberg, Gudmundson & Andersson, 2009).

Though turnover has been investigated in many contexts, little research has been done that is specific to the Middle East. Iqbal (2010) stated that employee turnover within Middle-East organizations is a serious issue to human resource managers. Numerous studies have stressed the key predictor of employee turnover intention is the degree of satisfaction in their workplace (Bhuian & Al-Jabri, 1996; Al-Kahtani, 2002; Iqbal, 2010; Al-Malki, 2012). However, in Saudi Arabia, the key factors leading to job dissatisfaction have been minimally studied (AlBattat & Som, 2013; Jehanzeb et al., 2013). Furthermore, because effective communication has been found to be vital to job satisfaction in other contexts, measuring effective communication in the Saudi hospitality and tourism industry will provide leaders with a better understanding of the impact their communication behaviors have on employees’ job satisfaction and engagement, which may in turn lead to improvements and a reduction in the high level of turnover rate in the industry. As a result of a lower turnover rate, organizational productivity will improve as well, along with the costs associated with it. There is a need to examine the
characteristics of the Saudi hospitality and tourism workforce in terms of the direct relationship between managerial communication and employee job outcomes as Saudi nationals are considered to be one of the minorities within the industry workforce, representing only 27% of the total labor force (SCTNH, 2016). Furthermore, the results of this study aim to identify factors of ineffective communication and provide solutions or suggestions for organizations to improve the issues impacting job outcomes. Improving employees’ job outcomes will reduce turnover rates and achieve the Saudi government’s national unemployment policy regulations. Sequentially, organizational effectiveness can possibly improve which will significantly boost economic activities thus diversifying income sources in the Kingdom.

**Significance of the Study**

Although there has been extensive research conducted in the hospitality and tourism industry concerning a number of functional areas, such as service quality (Tsang, Lee & Qu, 2015), employee incentive strategies (Kshirsagar & Mhashilkar, 2015), organizational innovativeness (Binder, Mair, Stummer & Kessler, 2016), job performance (Sturman & Park, 2016), customer loyalty (Suhartanto & Triyuni, 2016), brand image (Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou & Kaplanidou, 2016), social entrepreneurship (Chen, et al., 2016), and productivity (De Jorge & Suárez, 2014), the investigation of communication effectiveness is relatively incomplete. All of these human resources management practices aim to improve workplace sustainability. However, organizations neglect the importance of managers’ communication practices that determine the employees’ behaviors and attitudes. There is a serious communication
problem affecting the homogeneity of culturally diverse workforce, which negatively reduce achievement of organizational goals (DA, 2014). White (1999) stated that “Communication is the weak link in diverse organizations and research needs to focus on facilitating both external and intra organizational communication” (p. 485).

Having a multicultural workforce raises concerns regarding their job satisfaction, engagement, and overall well-being (Avey et al., 2011; D’Annunzio-Green et al., 2008; Dawkins et al., 2013; Dawson, Madera, Neal, & Chen, 2014; Jain, 2015; Loosemore & Lee, 2002). However, there is little known about the impact of effective communication on a multicultural workforce (Dawson, Madera, Neal, & Chen, 2014; Fragouli & Ibidapo, 2015). It is important for hospitality and tourism managers and organizations to acknowledge the impact of effective communication in the multicultural workforce. As is has been established that communication is an important issue affecting the relationship of leadership, organizational culture, and employees’ job outcomes (Alshanbri et al., 2015; AlGassim, Barry, & McPhail, 2012; Qubaisi, Elanain, Badri & Ajmal, 2015), all of which determine the success of each organization, leader, manager, supervisor, and employee (Bambacas & Patrickson, 2009; Erickson, 2016). For this reason, this study aims to advance the understanding of the impact of effective communication on employees’ job outcomes, especially when the industry is a multi-diverse workforce. There is a genuine need to examine the impact of communication practices on the hospitality and tourism industry. This need is increased in Saudi Arabia due to an insufficient number of Saudi employees working in the industry accompanied by a high level of turnover.
This paper examines the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes. The research purposes of this study are to (a) explore factors that could improve effective communication, (b) examine mediating effects of two job factors (self-esteem and information seeking) on then communication and job outcomes, and (c) investigate if effective communication has a relationship with employee overall wellbeing (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement) and intention to leave.

This research study aims to provide insight into the workplace with respect to people’s interactions within organizations and to offer timely information about the recent communication issues that have emerged. This research will assist hotel organizations within the hospitality and tourism industry, government agencies, human resource practitioners, and senior or top managers to implement and manage communication approaches that promote the sustainability of employees’ performance and improve the quality of employee behaviors, both of which have direct impact on employees’ well-being. Maintaining employees’ well-being is important to improve their job satisfaction, reduce turnover, and enhance productivity which in turn will create a healthy work industry (Albrecht, 2012; Bonet, 2007; Karatepe, 2013; Lu et al., 2016; Luthans et al., 2007; Pak, 2007; Takeuchi et al., 2007). Having a healthy workplace is vital to the development of the industry in order to become one of the essential drivers for the kingdom’s future economy.

Enhancing what is known about well-being and reducing turnover among Saudi hospitality and tourism workers will add to the body of knowledge in the hospitality and tourism industry. Furthermore, this study has potential to serve as a facilitator for further
studies examining the work behavior from a Saudi hospitality and tourism industry perspective. The contribution of this study may help achieve the Saudi government’s newly launched vision objectives of lowering the unemployment rates from 11.7% in 2016 to 7% in 2020, and increasing the average life expectancy from 74 years to 80 years (Saudi Vision 2030, 2016). Implementation of effective communication strategies with the needed skills will give a better outlook for the hospitality and tourism industry along with any organization itself. Understanding communication behaviors in daily work practices not only provides trainers with better vision to coach employees to be more focused on their work, but also improves organizational effectiveness (Brown et al., 2010).
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The chapter is organized to first provide a discussion of the theoretical foundations that have guided the objectives of this study. Second, to provide overview of current factors impacting workforce in Saudi Arabia, followed by background information of the Saudi hospitality industry. In addition, studies addressing the key variable, communication in the hospitality industry and its relationship with (a) self-esteem, and (b) information seeking as well as wellbeing variables (c) job satisfaction, (d) engagement, and (e) intention to leave will be included and discussed. Within the communication in the hospitality industry section, an overview of the importance of effective communication, cross-cultural communication, and managerial leadership practices within organizations are discussed. The purposed research questions and hypotheses of this study are addressed in the end of this chapter.

Theoretical Foundations

Since there was no single theory to completely illustrate the theoretical foundation for this study, a combined theoretical model consisting of Social Identity Theory, Job Characteristic Theory, and Leader-Member Exchange Theory were used as the guiding theoretical framework.

The role of effective communication in organization management has recently exceeded its normal actions or basic functions of managing employees, planning, recruiting, or policy making (Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, & Clark, 2011). Currently strategic planning involves multiple disciplines such as leadership, political science,
psychology, and sociology to formulate the way organizations manage their business and deal with internal issues affecting human resources. As a result, communication which is made up of interactions where both the supervisor and the subordinates have an influence on each other as they interact within the realms of organizational culture context, appears on top of skill list employers seek. Employers expect employees to be effective communicators and rate employees for their communicative performances or related competencies, and vice versa. Thus, this study used social identity theory, job characteristic theory, and leader-member exchange theory to highlight employees’ work related attitudes such as work satisfaction, and to examine its impact on employees’ well-being and turnover.

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory (SIT) is a well-established theory developed by Tajfel and Turner (1979) used to facilitate an understanding of individual identity and identification in organizational contexts. The SIT has been reviewed by a number of authors (e.g., Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brown, 2001; Hogg & Terry, 2000, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and refers to the degree to which an individual belongs and perceives him/herself based on membership in certain group in terms of in-groups or non-membership in out-groups (Scott, 2007). SIT is not only applicable to the proposed study but also has capacity to explicitly explain differences in employee behaviors due to their diverse background (e.g., Richard et al., 2004; Tajfel, 2010; Thomas, 1999; Van et al., 2004). According to Hogg and Terry (2001), there are two sociocognitive processes within the SIT that characterize group boundaries and self-enhancement where individuals favor
their own in-group. The Social Cognitive Theory considers self-efficacy control behavioral intensity (Bandura, 2012), and hypothesizes that individuals experiencing increases in anxiety and fear will not be able to develop self-efficacy because of the negative emotions (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy refers to “beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 408). Thus, individuals’ belief about their ability influences their actions (Ng & Lucianetti, 2015).

Although the SIT has been applied to and guided the understanding of how cognitive and social factors contribute to individual behavior in organizations. Researchers have linked SIT with communication in an organizational context studying the use of language, interaction styles, and cross-cultural circumstances in order to examine other variables and to predict and explain behavior attitude (e.g., Fortman, 2003; Fox, Giles, Orbe, & Bourhis, 2000; Grainger, 1995; Harwood, Giles, & Ryan, 1995). Several studies have been formulated to integrate communication constructs into SIT (Kuhn & Nelson, 2002; Scott, 1999; Scott, Corman, & Cheney, 1998). In-group behavior also has examined issues such as crowd behavior, ethnic attitudes, racial prejudice, fascism, social conflict, and social influence (Turner & Giles, 1981).

Scott et al. (1998) noted that social identities are created by language expressed in our interactions with others. Within this realm, Scott (2007) emphasized how communication is shaped through varied identities in different groups. On the other hand, disidentifications occur with various groups during team meetings. For example, Scott’s (2007) study further addressed the importance of examining how active
information processing and active listening influence in-group or out-group status, which might shape identification. Although identity and identification issues are based on communication, expressing one’s belongingness to various collectives is a key to measure reputation and image of those collectives (Scott, 2007).

Communication in in-group contexts within international organizations involves out-group communication as well. There is a relationship between member identity and social distance, “members seek close relationships with those of the same nationality to increase their sense of security” (Suzuki, 1998, p. 176). Hence, Suzuki (1998) stated, “one important factor that may differentiate intergroup communication from intragroup communication is individuals’ awareness of their group memberships” (p.156). Suzuki (1998) uses the social identity theory to test boundary conditions within the cultural membership of groups from Japan and the US. Suzuki (1998) noted groups in international organizations were aware of their group categories based on national cultural labels; the cognitive process of the awareness will have an impact on the motivational process. The study found that Japanese individuals ranked low on identity and they feel insecure regarding their own group’s statues because they hold a minority status.

Social identity theory will support this study by understanding individual’s identity within group’s context. Individuals during information processing and interaction with ingroup or outgroup might shape their identities; thus, they may only seek information or communicate with their in-group instead of managers. Hence, multicultural workforce may favor their own in-group, which will build boundaries
affecting their attitudes and behavior. Also, the theory will support how minorities such as the Saudi nationals workforce in the tourism industry may not be motivated to seek information due to the low identity and negative emotions.

**Job Characteristic Theory**

Job Characteristic Theory (JCT), a well-developed framework by Hackman and Oldham (1975), is used to study certain job characteristic factors that affect employees’ job outcomes, such as job satisfaction, mitigating absenteeism, and the turnover rate (Bartlett, 2007; Kusluvan, Kusluvan, Ilhan, & Buyruk, 2010). The job characteristic design involves five job characteristics. These are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback provided to the employee to process work in organizations. These factors influence employees’ psychological states including experiencing meaningfulness and responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The psychological states play an important role in influencing employees’ personal and job outcomes in terms of motivation, satisfaction, performance, low absenteeism, and turnover rates (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

Based on the framework, skill variety is the degree to which employees are required to use different task activities in everyday work life. The second dimension is task identity, which refers to the amount of involvement of completion of a task in the entire process. Thirdly, task significance is known as the degree to which the job impacts other people’s lives. Autonomy is the fourth dimension in the job characteristic model and is the degree to which employees obtain freedom, independence, and discretion to
work plan and determine the procedures in workplace. Finally, the feedback refers to the degree to which employee receive information regarding to individual’s effective job performance; if workers receive clear and actionable information from their supervisors, they will be able to analyze knowledge to improve their productivity (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

Furthermore, communication impacts job satisfaction and organizational commitment (e.g., Anderson & Martin, 1995; De Nobile, 2016; Jacobs et al., 2016; Park et al., 2015; Pettit, Goris, & Vaught, 1997; Pincus, Knipp, & Rayfield, 1990). Thus, maintaining positive employee and manager relationships is a major key to increasing employees’ job satisfaction and reducing turnover intention (Tutuncu & Kozak, 2007). Ozturk, Hancer, and Im (2014) used the JCT to investigate the relationship between job characteristics and effective commitment and job satisfaction in the hospitality and tourism industry. They indicated that both affective commitment and overall job satisfaction were affected by feedback. As the feedback from supervisors and managers is much valued by employees (Elanain, 2009; Kochanski & Ledford, 2001), feedback is a process of delivering information that is carried by particular communicative interaction (Brownell, 1992).

As the JCT works as guidance for employees to maintain their psychological states that influence employees’ personal and job outcomes, the theory can answer the question regarding factors that affect job outcomes. The theory can justify the reason behind employees’ job satisfaction and turnover intention in the hospitality and tourism industry, as to why and how employees are influenced by the feedback from supervisors.
Employees who are satisfied with the clear feedback and necessary information from managers are expected to be satisfied with their workplace, which also can lead to lower their intention to leave the organization.

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

The leader-member exchange theory (LMX) is a relationship approach theory focused on the development of relationships between managers and members in the same team. LMX theory proposed that there are relationships developed by a leader with followers, and the quality of the relationship determined by employee competence, dependability, and interpersonal compatibility (Duchon, Green, & Taber, 1986; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). Duarte, Goodson, and Klich (1994) illustrated these elements of the relationship between leaders and followers with the following: “an employee can be categorized as a member of a leader’s in-group and the relationship as a high-quality one, characterized by trust, or as an out-group member in a low-quality exchange relationship characterized by distance” (p. 500).

While the LMX implicates interaction between supervisor and subordinate, feedback is an essential part of the social context (Steelman, Levy, & Snell, 2004). As the feedback is based on information provided, employees might not take action or communicate with their supervisors as a result of the credibility and characteristics of the information source (Robson & Robinson, 2013). Subordinates have been found to be more eager in seeking information from supervisors who are perceived to be transformational leaders (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013). Thus, a high quality
relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate enhances the exchange of information.

The development of supervisor–subordinate exchange has been found to increases a subordinate’s performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and commitment (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012); thus, having a sense of empowerment influences work engagement. At the same time, information seeking is associated with higher job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervisors, empowerment, role ambiguity, and role conflict, while behavioral intentions that avoid seeking information are significantly linked to intention to leave and increased turnover (e.g., Dulebohn et al., 2012; Duarte et al., 1994).

Based on the previous discussion on SIT, JCT, and LMX, these theories provide insightful guidance building the framework of this study. The discussion assist linking the relationship between the proposed variables that is mainly based on the relationship between managers’ practices and employees’ job outcomes. The impact of managers and subordinate relationship on employees’ job satisfaction, engagement, and turnover intention is complex (e.g. Morrell et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2011). The relationship influenced by a number of moderating variables such as self-esteem and information seeking. Thus, the psychological mechanisms of the employees and work-related outcomes attitudes and behaviors influenced employees’ job outcomes have been justified by the proposed theories. Based on the theories, the individual’s relationship with his or her in-group/out-group and the source of information predict individual’s behavior and attitude determining employees’ job outcomes (Ilies et al., 2007). Overall,
as the industry experience multicultural workforce differing in ethnic attitudes, racial prejudice, and social influence, the study referred to SIT, JCT, and LMX theory to explicate the how managers and employees behave in such a way influencing employees’ job outcomes.

**Background: Workforce in Saudi Arabia**

Over the past decade, the Saudi government has led initiatives to employ Saudi nationals in the private sector through a comprehensive legal framework (Mellahi, 2007). These initiatives are called Saudization, which aim to reduce foreign workers and replace them with Saudi nationals as the country experiences high unemployment levels among the rapidly expanding of young population (Looney, 2004). The Saudization Act’s goal is to categorize private sector organizations based on the number of Saudi employees in each firm with respect to its size. Failure to employ the stipulated number of Saudi nationals in an organization will result in a reduction of the number of foreign worker visas granted by the ministry of labor (Sadi & Henderson, 2005). Nonetheless, organizations in the private sector favor expatriates over Saudi employees because of the level of performance and the variety of qualifications required; which brought the idea of promoting Saudization and reduce the bias as if the Saudi employees do not meet the necessities of local labor market (Al-Ahmadi, 2002).

The Saudization policy was instituted to address the unemployment crisis that occurred in the Kingdom after the discovery of the oil industry (Alotaibi, 2014). The discovery of oil during the 1970s shifted the focus of the economy leaving behind the main employers, which were agriculture, fishing, and safe trades. A large number of
foreign workers were brought overseas to work in the industry because Saudi nationals were not qualified with essential skills (Al-Ahmadi, 2002). As the country has flourished, its population has grown dramatically due to improvements in the healthcare sector with birth growth rate by 141.8% in 1992 compared to 1970 (Ministry of Economy and Planning, 2012). The population growth and dependence on foreign employees generated the unemployment crisis. Along with the high turnover rate, the unemployment rate in 2012 has increased to 12.1% compared to 10.5% in 2009 according to the Saudi Central Department of Statistics and Information (CDSI, 2013).

Alotaibi (2014) reported that the educational system does not consistently equip students with knowledge nor competencies and qualifications to work in the Saudi market, which ushered in private human resources management training for Saudi nationals in the necessary skills fearing of staff leaking to another jobs. Sadi and Henderson (2005) stated that the hospitality and tourism industry in Saudi Arabia are affected by the Saudization policy as the industry heavily relies on expatriate workers at both the management and the front line level. Therefore, human resources face challenges in hiring and retaining Saudi nationals to work in certain departments that only foreigners are either willing to do at a lower wage or are often trained for top-level management jobs.

Organizations attempt to employ expatriates to overcome staffing and management expertise shortages as this will successfully drive their business. The idea of hiring expatriates provokes interesting consequences as it can affect locals’ chances in the job market. In some countries such as Australia and the United Kingdom, job priority
is given to locals over migrants to ensure there is a balance of demographic diversity among all workers (Sadi & Henderson, 2005). Problems can occur when there is an imbalance. For example, in the United States, there was the lack of Americans prepared to work in the hospitality and tourism industry to preform some duties (e.g., food and beverage service); thus, workers from Mexico, the Caribbean, Eastern Europe, and China are hired to do so (Longley, 2004). This reliance on expatriate workers led to a staffing crisis in 2004 in American resorts when certain temporary visa applications by law enforcement after 9/11 events were eliminated (Longley, 2004).

Job localization issues have drawn attention in the literature (e.g., Al-Waqfi & Forstenlechner, 2010; Ewers & Dicce, 2016; Harry, 2007; Rutledge & Shamsi, 2016), especially in the counties in Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) that heavily depend on expatiate labors. Examples of those countries include Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates being subject to the most investigation (Ewers & Dicce, 2016; Sadi & Henderson, 2005). Billions of dollars are transferred by expatriate employees to their home counties harming the economy of GCC countries (Sadi & Henderson, 2005). Beside the remittance issue, unemployment increases among young generations is considered to be another factor encouraging a focus on the development of nationals (Al-Qassimi, 1988). The development of locals promotes economic growth and reduces economic leakage (Sadi & Henderson, 2005).

Within this realm, Mellahi (2007) conducted a study examining the effect of government regulations on managerial functions of human resource management in private sector organizations in Saudi Arabia. Face to face interviews with Saudi
managers in the private sector were conducted to help understand if the new government regulations that have reformed HRM policies in the private sector support reduced unemployment levels. In response, the HRM policies force private sector organizations to employ Saudi nationals and regulate the management of both local and foreign workers by improving the work environment to make it more attractive. Mellahi (2007) suggested that there are four factors that shape the structure of the Saudi market: “high population growth; heavy reliance on foreign workers; negative stereotype of local workers; and social perceptions towards work in the private sector” (p. 88). There has been tremendous growth in the population in the Kingdom with an estimated birth rate of 4% each year making it one of the highest birth rates in the world, and most of the population is young (Mellahi, 2006). Previous studies indicated that the influx of large numbers of foreign workers is one of the obstacles to employing Saudi nationals because managers believe that national employees are more expensive than foreigners (Alsahlawi & Gardener, 2004; Mellahi & Al-Hinai, 2000). In addition, there are stereotypes that Saudi employees do not show discipline compared with foreign employees (Mellahi & Wood, 2002). Studies further disclose that turnover among expatriates does not exist (Bhuiyan & Al-Jabri, 1996; Mellahi & Wood, 2002).

The conducted interviewees by Mellahi (2007) revealed that organizations reshaped their human resource management practices in order to fulfill the ministry of labor requirements of reaching a 75% Saudi workforce. Consequently, there is a need to adjust and innovate different management styles to manage employees in the private sector as the diversity of the workplace has been transformed. Organizations attempted
to follow the rules regarding the employment of Saudi nationals; however, some organizations recruit Saudis but fail to effectively involve them in workplace (Mellahi, 2007).

The hospitality and tourism industry in Saudi Arabia is steadily growing and diversifying the economy of the country (Ageli, 2013; Nusair, 2016). The Saudi Commission for Tourism & National Heritage (SCTNH) was established in 2000 as a governmental agency responsible for promoting sustainable strategic planning and policy regulation for the hospitality and tourism industry in the country. During the fifteen years after the establishment of the SCTNH, dramatic shifts have been noticed in the development of the hospitality and tourism industry especially with financial incentives and subsidiaries from the government and banking sectors to encourage the implementation of new projects for those who are willing to invest in the market due to its economic growth in the last decades. Saudi Arabia is the world’s largest oil expert and its economy is oil-based (Ministry of Finance, 2010); hence, the government encourages the growth of the private sector industries in order to diversify its economy and provide job opportunities to Saudi nationals.

Even though oil prices have dropped below $30 per barrel causing a 367 billion riyal ($97.9 billion) deficit in the 2015 budget, the Saudi government cuts in spending to shrink the deficient did not involve the hospitality and tourism subsidizations as it believes in the future of this sector (Saudi Vision 2030, 2016). According to SCTNH (2016), the number of hospitality accommodation facilities in the Kingdom has increased
from 4,400 properties in 2000 to 8,000 properties in 2016. Meanwhile, the total amount of investment in the hotel industry by 2020 is SR143.9 billion (US$38.3 billion).

Along with the development of the hospitality and tourism industry, there are also academic and professional programs that have been developed to supply the industry with highly trained and educated employees to assist the fast growing development in this sector. The number of educational and training institutions that offer hospitality and tourism certificates have increased from only two academic institutions in 2000 to 44 public and private institutions in 2016 (SCTNH, 2016), ranging from a diploma that can be earned in two-years to bachelor degrees obtained mostly within four-year programs taught in the Saudi institution. Surprisingly, none of institutions provide a higher education degree. In addition, the ministry of education provides scholarship opportunities for those who are interested in pursuing a bachelor and master degree in the hospitality and tourism discipline.

The hospitality and tourism industry is a vital source of employment in Saudi Arabia. The industry is considered as the second largest employer of Saudi citizens after the banking industry (SCTNH, 2016). However, recent studies have shown that the number of direct jobs generated from the industry reached 897,000 in 2016 with only 27% of the total jobs occupied by Saudi employees compared to foreign workers (SCTNH, 2016). According to Aldosari (2013), “Saudis acquire social status from their position title” (p. 43); therefore, most of Saudi workers in the industry occupy clerical and supervisor positions. This is a trend in many industries as the number of foreign workers in the country is about seven million, with the overall population of Saudi Arabia
being 31.5 million. This means they play an important role in driving the economy of Saudi Arabia.

As the Saudization policy aims to increase the number of national workers and retain their employment status in the private sector, the Saudi government has provided human resource development funds (HRDF) to attract foreign investments to establish new businesses in the Saudi workplace. The HRDF contribute 50% of a national private-sector worker’s salary in order to encourage the private sector to employ Saudi nationals (Al-Dosary & Rahman, 2009). Even though the government has provided these incentives to the private sector, studies show that domestic workers cause a high turnover rate (Bosbait & Wilson, 2005). In addition, because private organizations need to have governmental approval to issue visas to hire foreign workers according to the Saudization policy, foreign investors may lack the motivation to invest in Saudi Arabia due to the obligatory governmental requirements. However, Sadi and Henderson (2005) indicated that within the existing literature, the Saudization policy is not the best initiative to resolve the unemployment crisis.

Even though the private sector experienced employment growth accelerated from 13.5% in 2013 to 14.18% in 2014, the increase in employment associated with policies applied by the Ministry of Labor to improve employment in the Saudi labor market (SECOR, 2015). Labor improvement included wage benefits, incentives to Saudi worker who continue to work in the private sector, and adjusting work hours in the private sector. As a result, the number of Saudi nationals increased in the private sector. In recent report conducted by the General Authority for Statistics (2016) shows that the number of Saudi
nationals working in the private sector increased from 1.09 million in 2013 to 1.25 million in 2014. Despite the success of increasing the number of nationals in the private sector, unemployment continued to be at 11.7% in 2013 and 2014. The CDSI (2016) reported that unemployment in 2015 decreased slightly into 11.5%.

While there have been policies applied to attract Saudi nationals to work in the private sector such as wage, work hours, incentives, there are other factors that have impeded the labor nationalization policies from reaching its goals. There is a small increase in female nationals participation rates in the labor market even though they are seen mostly as human resources potential (Rutledge & Shamsi, 2016). Alongside with small females ration in the labor market, nationals perceived private sector as unattractive working environment with respect to compensation and public image compared to the public sector (Harry, 2007; Jemielniak, 2014; Rutledge & Shamsi, 2016). On the other hand, private sector employers attribute the issue of avoiding employing nationals because they are not qualified, lack of work ethics, and their wage demands are more than expatriates (Salih, 2010). Moreover, visa restrictions slow the growth of expatiate workers result from reforming the Saudi’s labor market (SECOR, 2015). Public opinions concerned with the unemployment rates, which is perceived as a complicated issue. For one reason, there is a major concern regarding the substantial amount of growing number of graduates with university certificates as it expected to increase the unemployment rate. The number of labor force in 2015 reached 12 million (n = 12,164,832) persons, 6.54 million of whom are non-Saudis and 5.62 are Saudis taking into consideration about 66% of the Saudis are working in the government sector (General Authority of Statistics,
Meanwhile, the number of Saudis who are in working age is 13.5 million. The difference in the number of new entrants to the labor market and those left the labor force in 2014 is remarkable. The number of Saudis who are working in the hospitality sector increased by 79,988 workers. On the contrary, the number of non-Saudis increased by 108,715 workers (SECOR, 2015). About 237 thousand Saudi entered to the labor market in 2014. On the other hand, 99 thousands left the labor force during the year of 2014. The number of Saudi females labor force is 1.2 million while the Saudi males are 4.4 million (General Authority of Statistics, 2016).

The hospitality and tourism industry face challenges to employee Saudi nationals, females in particularly. Alkhaldi, Burgess, and Connell (2015) attributed the low ration of Saudi females in the labor market especially in the hospitality industry is due to the negative stereotype working in hotels (e.g., negative public image). Moreover, Alkhaldi, Burgess, and Connell (2015) conducted a study examining the transfer of human resource management policies and practices of United States in Saudi Arabia. The finding of the study revealed, “Female workforce participation in Saudi Arabia is limited due to Saudi social traditions and expectations” (Alkhaldi et al., 2015, p. 160). When recruiting females in the private sector, organization must comply with the labor law to facilitate specific workplace environment such as sex segregation (Ministry of Labour, 2013).

Although certain incentives to attract Saudis have been set in place, research has found that a large number of Saudi hospitality graduates decide not to pursue a career in this industry because of unmet expectations (Sadi & Henderson, 2010). In addition, organizations face other challenges resulting from employee turnover, such as disruptions
in operations, work team dynamics, and unit performance (Iqbal, 2010). As a result, a range of concerns over the impact of turnover rates has caused an imbalance between the Saudi nationals and foreign workers in organizations (Iqbal, 2010). The imbalance regarding job employment causes conflicts between organizations’ strategies and the government’s regulations; thus, the future of the industry is perceived to be unpromising to Saudi nationals in the long term. Within this realm, large numbers of employers in the Kingdom do not recognize the reasons behind employees’ turnover or retention rates nor do they place an effort to overcome this issue due to unawareness of turnover consequences that may be devastating to the productivity of their organizations (Iqbal, 2010).

Achoui and Mansour (2007) indicated that companies in Saudi experiencing a substantial amount of employee turnover, especially in the private sector. Therefore, companies compete for a limited number of qualified Saudi employees working in the industry; thus, employee recruitment is at the expense of the other companies in the same sector. The high demand for workforce and high turnover rates does not solely occur in Saudi Arabia, but is also perceived and reported worldwide in other countries such as the US (Dickerson, 2009), Australia (Richardson, 2009), and the UK (Jenkins, 2001).

Jehanzeb et al. (2013) and Al-Ahmadi (2002) reported that previous studies indicated the importance of training as a major key to overcome employees’ retention and turnover challenges in Arab organizations and third world countries. On the contrary, researchers do not perceive the idea that training employees is an absolute solution to develop their citizens because organizations lack of recognition of the strategic
organizational function (Murrell, 1984). For example, Tessema and Soeters (2006) indicated that human resource practices in Middle Eastern countries such as Saudi Arabia do not have standards to promote effective performance; despite the fact that the human resource management (HRM) is becoming a critical component in the development process of many developing countries (Budhwar & Debrah, 2013). Furthermore, training and development in Arab organizations has been seen as driven by a social structure not based on professional manner “in which family and friends plays a significant role” (Jehanzeb et al., 2013, p. 81). Employee training and development recognized to be a leisure activity and break offered for certain groups of workers (Jehanzeb et al., 2013). There are concerns regarding how the training and development strategies within the organizational culture context should be implemented (Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 1995; Alattas & Kang, 2016). Even though there are training and development programs developed in Arab organizations based on theoretical approaches, a lack of assessment and evaluation exists due to ineffective execution of plans, which may means these programs may not have an impact on employees (Abdalla et al., 1995). Meanwhile, Linton et al. (2016) suggested that effective communication between supervisor and subordinate solves issues regarding to employee’s desired outcomes and significantly improves self-report that cannot be accomplished by training program alone.

Jehanzeb et al. (2013) stated that most researchers acknowledge and admit the complexity of training and developing employees to fulfill the future aspirations of the organization. The process of training and development of employees relies on high level of communication and share information between managers and employees (Nataraja &
Alamri, 2016). Whereas, Saudi organizations involve employees bring about different
cultures such as values, beliefs and customs that affect the quality of effective
communication and information sharing among employees in working environment
(Alattas & Kang, 2016). Hence, effective multicultural communication by staff from
different cultures stand out significantly to organizations “who want to inroads into
international markets, take advantage of multiculturalism, and avoid possible side effect”
(Tran, 2016, p. 63). Possible side effects include psychological and cognitive factors that
drive employees’ attitude and behavior (Tran, 2016).

**Hospitality and Tourism Industry**

The hospitality and tourism industry aims to provide outstanding service and an
excellent customer satisfaction experience (Crick & Spencer, 2011), and the quality of
the service is influenced by employees (Tiwari, 2015). The industry requires a sufficient
number of qualified employees, and organizations rely on expatriates from overseas to
function adequately (Sadi & Henderson, 2005). The work environment in the hospitality
and tourism industry is competitive and challenging for employees who are interested in
advancing their careers (Tiwari, 2015). Within the hospitality and tourism industry, there
are various issues encountered by practitioners, some of which are retaining employees’
wellbeing and control turnover (Connolly & McGing, 2006; Lee & Moreo 2007; Sadi &
Henderson, 2005).

According to Sadi and Henderson (2005) and Khizindar (2012), western-style
tourism in Saudi Arabia is perceived to be in conflict with Islamic values and its ways of
life. Islamic values, social norms, and cultural context of the community of Saudi
Arabia, such as segregation of the sexes, dress codes in public, restrictions on the consumption of alcohol, intimate social contacts, and physical relationships (Khizindar, 2012). However, the hospitality and tourism industry is rapidly growing and is expected to reach 66 million inbound tourism arrivals and domestic tourism trips in 2015 (SCTH, 2016). In addition, the forecasting of tourism indicators report from the Saudi Commission for Tourism and National Heritage (2016) reveals that the spending from tourists was expected to be SR118.4 billion ($31.5 bn) with 446.6 thousand hotel rooms and furnished apartments. The tremendous growth of the hospitality and tourism industry has generated 897 thousand jobs (SCTH, 2016), and the number of jobs is expected to rise to 1.5 million jobs by 2020 (Sadi & Henderson, 2005). In addition, the growth of the industry is set to attract 10.9 million arrivals by 2020 based on the twenty-year tourism plan designed by the Supreme Commission for Tourism. Therefore, the number of accommodation properties is increasing as well.

Saudi employees working in the hotel industry represent only 17% of hotel staff members. Employers attributed the low number of nationals to many positions being low-paid and lacking prestige, such as working in the housekeeping, kitchen, restaurants, uniformed services, or as a concierge are not being preferred (AlGassim et al., 2012; Sadi & Henderson, 2005). On the other hand, a lack of training and development regarding the Saudi nationals has been reported (Bhuian & Al-Jabri, 1996; Jehanzeb, Hamid, & Rasheed, 2015; Sadi & Henderson, 2005). All of which make working in the private sector, especially in the hospitality industry, undesirable to nationals alongside the improper management practices and work related attitude have negatively affected
employee overall job satisfaction (Jehanzeb, Hamid, & Rasheed, 2015). Yet the hospitality tourism industry appears to be far from hiring enough Saudi nationals, it is difficult to follow the government’s Saudization goals (Sadi & Henderson, 2005).

Sadi and Henderson (2005) conducted a survey among hospitality managers to elicit an in-depth understanding of the shortage of Saudi workers in the Saudi Arabian hospitality and tourism industry. Participants reported the importance of involving more nationals in the industry, and most of them agreed with the principles of Saudization. Managers addressed concerns regarding a decline they believed may take a place in service standards in the industry as a result of Saudization. Nevertheless, participants indicated that organizational structures should be considered for revision so that organizations can boost productivity and be able to compete globally. The dominant work culture in hospitality and tourism organizations sought to be an obstacle of success of an organization, Saudi men do not like to be under women’s supervision as an example. In addition, academic education has inadequately prepared graduates working in the industry; and one of the issues challenges human resources is to increase employees’ English proficiency (Sadi & Henderson, 2005).

**Hospitality and Tourism Management Practices**

There are a limited number of studies examining the management practices in the hospitality and tourism management industry in Saudi Arabia. Reflecting the multicultural workforce and multinational corporation hotels experienced by the hospitality and tourism industry in Saudi Arabia, AlGassim, Barry, and McPhail (2012) studied the human resource management practices in Saudi within hotels sector. The
study took place in four Saudi cities, which are Makkah, Jeddah, Al Madinah and Riyadh and twelve general managers as well as human resource directors were interviewed. Managers reported common practices in Saudi hotels used to promote employees’ performance, and the employees’ preferred practices centered on the following: training and development, recruitment and selection, orientation program, performance evaluation, job description, motivation, salary and wages, and empowerment and communication. Among all, most managers indicated that communication is the most important practice. AlGassim et al. (2012) affirmed that communication cited by employees as one of the most favored practices. Managers also addressed concerns regarding the Saudi government’s regulations as they affect their human resources development programs. Furthermore, because the government wants to transform its economy from relying on oil exports to relying on human resources, training and development are perceived as major factors for the success of the hospitality industry (AlGassim et al., 2012).

In recent times due to the high development of the hospitality industry, customers have increased their demand for excellent service provided by employees (Connolly & McGing, 2006). Because of this, there is a demand for improved performance; on the other hand, human resource management has raised concerns regarding the difficulties in reducing the turnover rate rather than maintaining or increasing employees’ performance. Not only does employees’ satisfaction play an important role in reducing turnover rates, but it also reflects on the employees’ performance, which in turn determines customer satisfaction (Lee & Moreo, 2007). As the hospitality industry is a service industry,
employee satisfaction found to be a profitability indicator in hospitality organizations (Lee, 1988).

**Communication in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry**

Communication in the hospitality and tourism industry is a vital issue of an organization as it determines its continuity and efficiency (Seyitoglu & Yüzbaşıoğlu, 2015). The sensitivity of communication in the hospitality and tourism industry linked to the deal with a large amount of workers running the business; therefore, communication affects workforce’s daily activities (Seyitoglu & Yuzbasioglu, 2015). The role of communication in the hospitality and tourism industry has been discussed in the literature as a significant construct. Examples of these studies such as hospitality and tourism managers’ communication practices (Brownell, 1992; Dawson et al., 2014; Lolli, 2013), the development of communication during education (Connolly & McGing, 2006; Flaherty & Choi, 2014; Steed & Schwer, 2003), communication for leadership and managerial positions (Breiter & Dlements, 1996; Zach, 2016), and managers’ skills and competences (Kay & Rusette, 2000; Liu & Mattila, 2016; Moncarz, 2007; Rudd & Mills, 2015). The American Hotel and Lodging Association (1999) identified communication as a two-way process in which individuals transfer ideas or feelings to each other. Verbal and non-verbal interacted messages among workers are compulsory to complete the process (Dawson et al., 2011).

In the 21st century, organizations acknowledge the significance of effective communication both internally and externally to improve quality and productivity to compete in a global marketplace (Wolvin, 1994). Communication is critical in
management in hospitality and tourism sector, where reaching effective communication is an ongoing change. Grunig (2013) stated, “Internal communication is the catalyst if not the key to organisational excellence and effectiveness” (p. 569) as it can impede organizational change and development. In addition, poor internal communication perceived to be the reason behind negative feelings (Proctor & Doukakis, 2003). Hotel managers addressed the most common communication types occurring when communicate with their subordinates, which are downward communication and upward communication (Stevens & Hisle, 1996). Stevens and Hisle (1996) addressed the most common problems faced by hotel managers when communicating downward as they face layers of management structure are a lack of feedback, and with cross-cultural obstacles. Also, the concerns managers expressed when communicating upward are having hard time to reach their executive managers as well as the communication issues with executives and owners who do not understand the hotel business (Stevens & Hisle, 1996). Antwi, Opoku, Seth & Margaret (2016) conducted a study examined the human resources management practices and their impacts on employees’ job outcomes. Five HRM practices were selected and assessed their impact which are training & development, motivation, performance appraisal, internal communication, and reward/remuneration. Internal communication reported to be the strongest relation with employees’ outcomes. Meanwhile, performance appraisal came in as the second significant HRM practice that contributes to individuals’ organizational outcomes (Antwi et al., 2016).

Effective internal communication channels have shifted from the traditional form of downward communication to the involvement of employees in sharing their concerns
to enable upward communication (Wolvin, 1994). Wolvin (1994) illustrated upward communication as an important characteristic of quality organizations where employees are given the time to address work-related issues. By providing opportunities for employees to discuss their ideas and information, the result will be a “commitment that translates into greater satisfaction and greater productivity in the work they do” (Wolvin, 1994, p. 196). Therefore, the involvement of each employee in the organization planning by communicating effectively with peers and top management should be taken seriously.

Implementing a communication plan and skill training will be beneficial to employees, managers, and executives in order to communicate effectively. Brownell (1991) conducted a study on hospitality middle managers where they addressed concerns regarding their daily tasks, especially communication tasks that include encouraging information and providing clear messages to subordinates. Nowadays, the industry experiences more communication challenges as it becomes internationalized through the involvement of multinational employees; thus, the need for effective communication to interact with each other, the ability to empathize, and an understanding of others’ viewpoint are essential to improve cross-cultural communication (Brownell, 1992).

Rudd and Mills (2015) noted if the complexity of communicative interactions between the sender and receiver is not understandable, the information might not be adequately processed. There are different forms of communication defined to deliver a message, some of which include verbal or non-verbal, formal or informal, letters, memos,
billboards, body language, and meetings. In addition, the most common communication type used is face-to-face communication.

In terms of effective communication, communication skills are perceived as benchmarks of hospitality and tourism leadership (Kay & Russette, 2000). Cichy, Sciarini, and Patton (1992) illustrated key competences for effective leaders as having the ability to “(1) develop and provide a compelling vision, (2) earn and return trust, (3) listen and communicate effectively, and (4) persevere when others give up” (p. 50). Brownell (1992) asserted that effective service is synonymous with effective communication, where managers not only make their messages clear but also develop and maintain good relationships with their guests and employees, thus improving individual and organizational performance. Bass (1991) describes transformational leaders as able to gather organizational information, develop commitment and trust, and facilitate organizational learning and development, all of which can be achieved through communication.

**Effective Communication**

Communication can be defined as an exchange of messages performed between individuals in order to obtain expected outcomes (Craig, 1999; Lolli, 2013). Furthermore, communication satisfaction is the degree of satisfaction with communication experienced by employees within their work setting (Redding, 1978). In a fast growing industry, organizational communication is critical for maintaining productivity and profitability (Mishra, Boynton, & Mishra, 2014) and is essential for business success (Hargie, Tourish, & Wilson, 2002). Communication is a major
challenge for organizations because of the difficulties they face when providing information or promoting strategies, and as such it has received increased attention examining its impact on work behavior (Keyton et al., 2013), managerial skills (Suh et al., 2012), generational differences (Fu & Mount, 2002), and cross-cultural interaction (Bell & Roebuck, 2015; Lauring, 2011). Difficulties include a lack of information sharing and relational maintenance, and expressing negative emotion that impact members’ engagement in the organization (Keyton et al., 2013).

Managing behavior in organizations has evolved over time. The study of communication is a critical aspect of organizational settings, ranging from the study of humans’ attitudes in the workplace (e.g., Sager, Wallace, Jarrett, & Richey, 2015) to relational maintenance behaviors among employees in the same working environment (e.g., Qubaisi, Elanain, Badri, & Ajmal, 2015). The recent organizational communication studies are shown in Table 1.
Table 1

**Organizational Communication Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aritz, J., &amp; Walker, R. C.</td>
<td>Cognitive organization and identity maintenance in multicultural teams</td>
<td>Observes communication practices in intercultural decision-making meetings</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askehave, I.</td>
<td>Communicating leadership: A discourse analytical perspective on the job advertisement</td>
<td>Explores the relationship between recruitment needs (whom to recruit) and recruitment communications</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisel, R. S., Messersmith, A. S., &amp; Kelley, K. M.</td>
<td>Supervisor-subordinate communication: Hierarchical mum effect meets organizational learning</td>
<td>Proposes nine function and effects of supervisor-subordinate communication to encourage business communication</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Literature Review Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christensen, M.</td>
<td>Communication as a strategic tool in change processes</td>
<td>Develops a set of organizational communication factors for use in an organizational-change setting</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Literature Review Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton, J.</td>
<td>Discourse perspectives on organizational communication</td>
<td>Analyzing transcripts of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, M. A., &amp; Dougherty, D. S.</td>
<td>Managing the multiple meanings of organizational culture in interdisciplinary collaboration and consulting</td>
<td>Reports the meaning of word may be differ</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downing, J. R.</td>
<td>Linking communication competence with call center agents’ sales effectiveness</td>
<td>Addresses knowledge skills of salespeople gap in the literature</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
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Organizational Communication Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gómez, L. F., &amp; Ballard, D. I. (2013)</td>
<td>Communication for the long term information allocation and collective reflexivity as dynamic capabilities</td>
<td>Proposes two communication practices help develop a firm’s long-term viability</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Literature Review Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kankaanranta, A., &amp; Planken, B. (2010)</td>
<td>Belf competence as business knowledge of internationally operating business professionals</td>
<td>Explores internationally operating business professionals’ perceptions of BELF communication</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassing, J. W., Piemonte, N. M., Goman, C. C., &amp; Mitchell, C. A. (2012)</td>
<td>Dissent expression as an indicator of work engagement and intention to leave</td>
<td>Evaluates the level of engagement and intention of employees to quit their work</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued)

Organizational Communication Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kupritz, V. W., &amp; Cowell, E. (2011)</td>
<td>Productive management communication</td>
<td>Examines employees’ perceptions about the types of information management</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupritz, V. W., &amp; Hillsman, T. (2011)</td>
<td>The impact of the physical environment on supervisory communication skills transfer</td>
<td>Examines the impact of workplace design features</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauring, J. (2011)</td>
<td>Intercultural organizational communication: The social organizing of interaction in international encounters</td>
<td>Argues that the local organizational context has to be taken into account</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madlock, P. E., &amp; Kennedy-Lightsey, C. (2010)</td>
<td>The effects of supervisors’ verbal aggressiveness and mentoring on their subordinates</td>
<td>Examines the association between supervisors’ mentoring and verbal aggression</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWorthy, L., &amp; Henningsen, D. D. (2014)</td>
<td>Looking at favorable and unfavorable superior-subordinate relationships through dominance and affiliation lenses</td>
<td>Explores forces that influence subordinates’ impressions of their superiors</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishra, K., Boynton, L., &amp; Mishra, A. (2014)</td>
<td>Driving employee engagement: The expanded role of internal communications</td>
<td>Explores culture transparency between management and employees</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pazos, P., Chung, J. M., &amp; Micari, M. (2013)</td>
<td>Instant messaging as a task-support tool in information technology organizations</td>
<td>Investigates the use of IM as a communication tool to support task completion</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Mixed Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, P. S., Gunesekeera, M., &amp; Yang, M. L. (2011)</td>
<td>Language options for managing: Dana Corporation’s philosophy and policy document</td>
<td>Identifies language components managers may use</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogerson-Revell, P. (2010)</td>
<td>“Can you spell that for us nonnative speakers?”</td>
<td>Investigates the role of speech accommodation</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Communication behaviors are defined as consisting of interactions and actions or multiple combinations of these collective activities implemented in an appropriate way to enable an informal and formal conversation with certain objectives (Fisher & Ellis, 1980). These behaviors help to establish bonds between individuals’ actions in an organization and to engage them in communication designs (Keyton et al., 2013). In particular, there is an emphasis on the importance of information seeking and the communication of information (Järvelin & Ingwersen, 2005). Furthermore, Keyton et al. (2013) stated that communication behaviors are “used to engage in relationships with other members of the organization, and link micro actions of individuals to macro communication patterns and collective structures” (p. 2). Bisel (2010) asserted that
communication is critical in organizations, pointing out that not every associated interaction is considered as good communication. In addition, Keyton et al. (2013) have suggested that better communication in the workplace should be based on sets of behaviors that are used to accomplish efficient communication. They argue that viewing communication behavior as a model can provide better predictions for desired training programs and for performance evaluations.

Business schools invest heavily in business communication courses that serve a vital function in undergraduate education (Maes, Weldy, & Icenogle, 1997). Russ (2009) highlights the importance of communication courses among undergraduate students in business disciplines in order to boost skills that are necessary for contemporary managerial position. Moreover, communication is one of the essential competencies for future hospitality and tourism managers (Suh, West, & Shin, 2012). Lack of communication practice among managers plays an important role in the career development deficit of hospitality and tourism employees by not providing them with necessary constructive feedback and communication guidance (Lolli, 2013).

In the service industry, Brownell (1992) claims the effective managerial communication must be a priority to control turnover and enhance the quality of employees. Brownell and Chung (2001) and Kay and Russette (2000) argued that university educators demonstrate a high emphasis on the instructional outcomes that are competency-based to improve managers’ qualifications in graduate business education. During the learning process, most of the graduate students prove managerial effectiveness practices based on the implementation of communication competences and behavioral
flexibility within the context of management curriculum. To illustrate that, Brownell and Chung (2001) conducted a study that examine the development, implementation, and assessment of a competency-based management development component that has been integrated into the Master of Management in Hospitality program at the School of Hotel Administration at Cornell University. Brownell and Chung (2001) demonstrated the development of the master program by surveying industry executives, faculty members, alumni, and current graduate students to seek their perceptions to develop a competency-based approach in their graduate studies. All the stakeholders agreed communication and leadership skills are the most important component to graduate hospitality and tourism industry leaders.

Although findings of these studies agree communication and leadership skills are important component, researchers did not address critical issue on how to improve effective communication based on managing diverse workforce or enhance individual’s communication behavior and attitude. Hospitality managers’ communication activity and its impact need to be explored due to the substantial amount of information that managers carry to report to other organizational members (Brownell, 1992). Lang (1991) indicated in a career burnout report that hospitality managers perform nearly 97 tasks in their managerial position, whereas managers working in other industries perform half that number or even less. Brownell (1992) noted, one of the important factors impacting effective communication and effective management practice “is the accuracy of individuals’ perceptions regarding their own and others’ communication behaviors” (p.125). In fact, it is essential for perceptions to be accurate because managers must
deliver accurate and detailed feedback information to their members in spite of the hospitality managers’ workload (Brownell, 1992).

Dawson, Madera, and Neal (2011) indicated the high involvement of foreign workers in the hospitality and tourism industry requires initiatives to implement effective techniques to communicate in a diverse population. Although the employee demographics change managers’ practices, organizations should establish strategies to adapt to global and domestic competition. Rudd and Mills (2015) examined communication, climate, and culture in the hospitality and tourism industry, and they stated that:

In a world filled with detailed relationships, effective communication is critical to “Success.” Essentially, managers must be able to articulate expectations and listen effectively to discover the expectations of employees. They must also be able to persuade others to behave in desired ways. Employees must be convinced to work toward clear and concise goals that fulfill the company’s long-term strategic goals. (p. 11)

Communication is a desired and appreciated skill. “Skills are what people perform as behaviors (or not); tasks are what people are paid to do” (Keyton, et al., 2013, p. 2). Furthermore, when a communication skill is utilized at work, it then becomes a work task that plays a role during new employee socialization (Hart, 2012). In specific, Hart (2012) claimed that communication is key to organizational socialization in order to “inform new employees of organizational and unit practices, familiarize them with relationships within the organization, and instill the values of the organization” (p. 191)
and that it will drive the firm in a competitive market by shaping its employees into individuals who thrive in a creative and healthy workplace environment. In addition to that, Keyton et al. (2013) conducted a study of 127 participants who responded to a questionnaire consisting of 163 communication tasks in order to identify and determine the most common communication behaviors that occur in the workplace. The results of the study revealed the ten most common verbal communication behaviors in the workplace: listening, asking questions, discussing, sharing information, agreeing, suggesting, getting feedback, seeking feedback, answering questions, and explaining.

Although relational maintenance is vital to organizational socialization, the importance of relational maintenance behaviors among coworkers and their impact on employees’ job outcomes cannot be overlooked (Hart, 2012; Madlock & Booth-Butterfield, 2012). According to Sias, Krone, and Jablin (2002), relational maintenance behaviors represent relationships among coworkers and are “any relationship one has with a coworker, such as a supervisor-subordinate, peer, or mentoring relationship” (pp. 489-490). Madlock and Booth-Butterfield (2012) conducted their study by using Shutz’s (1966) interpersonal needs theory, which indicates the nonfulfillment of interpersonal needs resulted in emotional and motivational disorders. The results showed the most common interpersonal relationships among coworkers are conflict management, shared tasks, and positivity; all of which tend to have positive impacts on employees’ job outcomes and work-related attitudes including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, communication satisfaction, and work alienation (Madlock & Booth-Butterfield, 2012).
Along with relational maintenance behaviors, Kassing, Piemonte, Goman, and Mitchell (2012) examined how disagreement expressions have an impact on employees’ self reports of work engagement and intention to leave. Their study used the Organizational Dissent Scale (Kassing, 1998) to measure how employees express their opinions about workplace policies and practices they find annoying. Employees who see their workplace as having a dissatisfying environment due to barriers that they feel they cannot express were found to have a high level of work disengagement and have an intention to leave the organization (Kassing et al., 2012).

According to Russ (2012), employees with high communication apprehension were linked with reflective observation modes and assimilating learning styles. Communication apprehension (CA) was defined by McCroskey as (1977) “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p. 78). Russ (2012) reported, “employees with high CA may prefer to learn by working independently, carefully listening to and observing others to ascertain a holistic perspective of a problem or issue” (p.327), and that may have developed from communication training in business curriculums. On the other hand, Dixon and Dougherty (2010) involved themselves in a case study to interact with cultural assessment to see if the reaction to using the same word will differ in different audiences. The authors mentioned the meaning of messages could not be underestimated by communication scholars (Dixon & Dougherty, 2010).

Another matter associated with effective communication implemented in organizations is internal communication strategies to achieve management effectiveness.
Internal communication is based on communicational interaction between managers and employees (Mishra, Boynton, & Mishra, 2014), and a manager’s internal communication with employees influences subordinates’ engagement with customers (Lowenstein, 2006). Mishra et al. (2014) stated that “internal communication is important for building a culture of transparency between management and employees, and it can engage employees in the organization’s priorities” (p. 183). Managers seek many ways to communicate with employees, and the most common is face-to-face communication.

Kupritz and Cowell (2011) supported the use of effective face-to-face communication among managers and subordinates as being more desired, leading the productivity of the employees to increase. Moreover, organizational-change setting has been studied by Christensen (2014) to identify which factors were used within the settings. The study revealed five categories that could have an impact within any change process: social contact, central leadership, information, influence, and barriers to improvement. Christensen (2014) reported, “Communication is a part of an organization’s everyday life, but in many cases it can be problematic to uphold because the management can easily forget the special importance it has during a change situation, as a result of the financial, technical, and operational demands of the change process” (p. 382).

It is not surprising that employers rank oral communication skills among the most valued applied skills. Communicating effectively with others in daily life at work is a key factor to ensure that the meaning of the message is received without ambiguity. However, workplace facility aspects such as architecture design, light, temperature,
airflow, layout of walls, and size of cubicles, have been found to be a factor “impeding communication skills transfer in face-to-face interaction with employees” (Kupritz & Hillsman, 2011, p. 148). Additionally, organizations facilitate the use of instant messaging such as e-mail and teleconferencing as a channel (communication tool) to quickly disperse information among workers, and it appears that instant message is more likely to be used for collaboration tasks than cognitive conflict tasks (Pazos, Chung & Micari, 2013).

Meanwhile, technological advancements implemented to facilitate communication such as using emails to exchange information between managers and subordinates will lead to a collaborative work environment (Hastings & Payne, 2013). Hastings and Payne (2013) addressed some of the issues that employees should take into account when sending emails. Sending proper emails for the right people to prevent ambiguity that receivers may experience, and provide suggestions to act in a professional manner, which results in efficient and effective productivity in organizations (Hastings & Payne, 2013).

**Cross-Cultural and Cross-Generational Communication Interaction**

Cross-cultural communication refers to the socioeconomic, gender, religious, ethnic, and cultural background of an individual and how this influences the efficiency of communication among workers (Dawson, Madera, Neal, & Chen, 2014). Lauring (2011) examined intercultural communication in organizations where messages have implications that can be interpreted differently by various groups. Notwithstanding its impact on individuals, cross-cultural communication has been found to be an essential
strategy for boosting an organization’s business internationally and for promoting solutions to contemporary issues that can affect an organization’s relationships with its stakeholders and other corporate organizations (Lauring, 2011).

Lee and Moreo (2007) discussed one of the human resources obstacles within a multicultural hospitality workforce. Their results revealed that the industry faces challenges in employee satisfaction for those working in teams because employees’ perceptions of work environment vary depending on regions and countries. Most recently, Madera and Kapoor (2011) indicated that there are complex management issues facing human resources and researchers regarding communication matters because of the diverse workforce found especially in the hospitality and tourism industry. Examples of diversity, such as gender, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnic origins, and cultural backgrounds shift the understanding of communication (Madera & Kapoor, 2011). It is because people’s identities enhance or cause conflict regarding work responsibilities. Skills for managing diverse backgrounds workforce are needed to positively enhance supervisors and coworkers relationships, understanding work assignment and company policy, respect for social and moral values, and respect for cultural diversity (Lee & Moreo, 2007).

Based on a fieldwork study conducted by Lauring (2011) in a Saudi Subsidiary with more than 400 employees from 14 different nationalities (e.g., India, Egypt, and Philippines), the impact of different cultural communication practices between workers was analyzed. The findings of the study noted different communication perceptions in organizations can lead to poor decision-making and poor working processes that in turn
affect social relations. Training regarding international and intercultural aspects of organizational communication is an essential strategy to boost an organization’s business internationally and promote solutions for contemporary issues that might affect an organization’s relationship with its stakeholders or other corporate organizations. To illustrate this further, intergroup identity issues in communication practices that occur in meetings have been studied (Aritz & Walker, 2010). Using dialogue analysis of observed meetings between groups of US-born native English speakers and East Asian citizens, it was observed that the differences contributed to decreased performance were lack of team identity, and increased relational conflict. Differences in dialogue resulted in distinctions between the group members, and thus the importance of group status was lost amid the dominant culture. Training members of groups how to come together and adapt certain conversational patterns is important in order to elevate levels of satisfaction.

Likewise, Rogerson-Revell (2010) demonstrates the function of communication among native and nonnative speakers of English in international business meetings in order to reveal some of the obstacles faced by international businesses. She suggests that realistic examples should be used to create business communication training resources in order to facilitate the efficiency of communication interactions among native and nonnative speakers in international contexts. This issue is crucial, as about 40% of organizations in the US send their managers overseas to conduct a business or activity without training them in aspects of the new culture (Windham International & National Foreign Trade Council, 1996). Madlock (2012) has also provided strong support for the
role that cultural congruency plays in both macro and micro cultures (i.e., social culture and organizational culture).

To further emphasize the impact of communication practices in international settings, Ehrenreich (2010) examined the use of English in multinational firms applying the practice Business English as a Lingua Franca (BELF) in a study that appears to contain linguistics research and business communication concepts. BELF refers to “English used as a ‘neutral’ and shared communication code. BELF is neutral in the sense that none of the speakers can claim it as her/his mother tongue; it is shared in the sense that it is used for conducting business within the global business discourse community, whose members are BELF users and communicators in their own right – not ‘non-native speakers’ or ‘learners’” (Louhiala-Salminen et al., 2005, p. 403). The researcher interviewed 24 participants to observe them in different meeting settings. The use of BELF indicated that speaking English in international communication purposes within international business do not imply the same intended meaning when the native speakers speak it. In fact, Kankaanranta and Planken (2010) supported the previous study and stated, “BELF can be characterized as a simplified, hybridized, and highly dynamic communication code. BELF competence calls for clarity and accuracy of content (rather than linguistic correctness) and knowledge of business-specific vocabulary and genre conventions (rather than only “general” English)” (p. 380). Nowadays, BELF practices are widely appreciated by business professionals due to their high level of success in multinational organizations.
In addition, Downing (2011) highlights the importance of providing new employees with proper training techniques and offering knowledge tools to facilitate their duties in an effective manner. Cross-cultural communication understanding that is offered in accordance with the sensitivity of a particular subject relates to employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Power distance, avoidance messages, communication apprehension, and communication satisfaction are the variables most associated with instances where a sense of communication understanding is not cultivated (Madlock, 2012).

By the same token, a study by Rogers, Gunesekera, and Yang (2011) included a comparative analysis of management’s skillful manipulation in terms of the use of language on organizational communication understanding in a firm from 1987 to 2004. Rogers et al. (2011) suggested “language options—thematic devices, modifiers, verbs, and sentence subjects—that managers should consider when formulating messages about the strategic changes they envision” (p. 256). Furthermore, Dawson et al. (2011) investigated communication across cultures, and found that it has a major impact on management effectiveness and work productive. Also, the effectiveness of the feedback from leaders associated with non-verbal communication techniques intended to have positive reinforcement, to increase productivity, and overall quality. Dawson et al. (2011) added, integrating interactive multicultural workforce into a team improves satisfaction and reduces turnover intentions within the environment of the workplace. Rudd and Mills (2015) pointed out the climate of a workplace such as philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, and attitudes implemented within
organization structure shape the organization’s culture, and that organizational culture significantly impacts the organization and its employees.

Not only cross-cultural communication, but also cross-generational communication is important. Demographic changes appear to predict labor shortages in the future due to changes in the various generations employed in the hospitality and tourism industry, with older workers representing more than half of the industry’s workforce (Fu & Mount, 2002). Moreover, the millennial generation has shown an increasing intention to leave the industry mainly due to job conditions (Park & Gursoy, 2012). These factors, along with labor shortages and high turnover problems in the industry, have drawn attention to the need to attract older workers and elevate their satisfaction with the job (Fu & Mount, 2002).

Managing generational differences among workers is challenging in the workplace due to different perceptions among the different generations. It is sometimes suggested that older workers are likely to be physically incapacitated, unintelligent, inflexible, and hard to train, as well as less motivated, less productive, and less able to adapt (Fu & Mount, 2002). On the other hand, organizations prefer older workers due to the advantages they hold, including reliability; carefulness, responsibility; stability; a deep sense of work ethic; and loyalty (Fu & Mount, 2002). To retain older workers, researchers have highlighted the importance of good communication in this area, showing that communication satisfaction affects older workers’ job satisfaction and helps keep them in the organization (Fu & Mount, 2002). Job conditions that organizations can
implement or improve to retain older workers include effective vertical communication and a sense of work cooperation.

As organizations work to retain older workers, they should also acknowledge the younger generations’ requirements and attempt to increase their job satisfaction by understanding their psychological and communication needs. In particular, younger generations are heavily dependent on technology and prefer email communications, unlike older workers who favor face-to-face communications (Gursoy, Maier, & Chic, 2008). Chiang et al. (2008) indicated that hotel workers who are acquiring high level of effective and satisfied communication are more likely to preform better and motivated toward their workplace. Although factors that contribute to retain older employees’ job satisfaction have been identified, factors used to retain young are not sufficient (Mao & Hale, 2015). Some factors that have been discovered contributing to younger employees’ job satisfaction are the use of effective downward communication and corporate information (Fu & Mount, 2002). Mao and Hale (2015) indicated that younger generation workers are in need of sufficient information about their job and organization to be satisfied with their communication. Avery et al. (2009) and Dawson et al. (2014) suggested carefully examining and paying attention to the effective communication with a multiculturally diverse workforce in the hospitality and tourism industry will help retain young generation and identify factors influencing job satisfaction.

Leadership in organizational communication is a sensitive issue for top management as well as for all people working in the supervisory positions. Communication has been found to play a role in shaping the leadership traits within an
organization (Clifton, 2012). Communication skills and behaviors are desired and appreciated, and they enhance performance (Keyton et al., 2013). Strategic and effective communication by leaders satisfy followers as it positively linked to operational effectiveness, as well as increased overall effectiveness of the organization (Seyitoglu & Yüzbaşıoğlu, 2015). Operational effectiveness is influenced by cultural elements of communication and organization adapted by managers (Seyitoglu & Yüzbaşıoğlu, 2015). Moreover, Madlock and Kennedy-Lightsey (2010) have addressed how positive relationships and subordinates’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and communication satisfaction are affected by negative communication behaviors delivered by supervisors.

Wolvin (1994) conducted a study that examined communication in the hospitality industry and findings illustrated how the educational background of graduates such as speaking, listening, and interaction significantly impact internal communication in hospitality organizations. Thus, organizations should acknowledge the importance of communication training so that employees, managers, and executives can communicate effectively (Wolvin, 1994). Hospitality managers’ success is determined by the effectiveness of interaction with employees, which is influenced by communication skills. On the contrary, poor communication creates negative attitudes, high turnover and absenteeism, and increase stress (Thomas, 1991).

The significance of effective communication in multicultural workforce is to boost employees’ contribution to the work effort. Culturally diverse members face obstacles to contribute in a creative and innovative environment due to serious
miscommunication with their managers (DA, 2014). According to DA (2014) multicultural employees “have different norms and beliefs may also have different values and work ethics” (p. 323), such a differences increase the managers’ practices challenges due to ambiguity, complexity, and confusion while communicating with them. The negative consequences of diversity can hurt feelings, low group cohesion and morale, and even bullying (DA, 2014).

**Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem has been defined as one of the dimensional constructs of an individual, an individual’s overall self-evaluation of his or her competencies, and general sense of worth (Rosenberg, 1965; Wu, Birtch, Chiang & Zhang, 2016). In addition, self-esteem is an evaluation of what people perceive about themselves, Korman (1970) pointed out that self-esteem reflects the degree to which an individual “sees him [her]self as a competent, need-satisfying individual” (p. 32). Kessler, Price, and Wortman (1985), view self-esteem as an individual’s component of coping capacity; thus, self-esteem is correlated with positive psychological outcomes, such as psychological adjustment, positive emotions, and prosaically behavior (Bajaj, Robins & Pande, 2016; Leary & MacDonald, 2003). An individual with high self-esteem tends to have a favorable personal sense and like their component as if he or she is capable, accepted, and valued by others (Korman, 1966; Pelham & Swann1989; Reitz, Motti-Stefanidi & Asendorpf, 2016; Rosenberg, 1986; Stets & Burke, 2003).

Numerous studies have examined the role of self-esteem in the context of organization. It has been found that self-esteem provides individuals with the ability to
manage and tolerate and uncertainties (Hodson, Hogg, & MacInnis, 2009; Thau et al., 2007); whereas, uncertainty threatens individuals’ sense of self-coherence (De Cremer & Sedikides, 2005). Thus, Campbell (1990) indicated that a person with high self-esteem has the ability to define the concept of self, whereas uncertainty has an impact on his or her self-concept or sense of self-coherence (Campbell, 1990). Individuals with high levels of self-esteem tend to be capable of managing their ability to overcome issues threatening their selves (Greenberg et al., 1993; Reitz et al., 2016). Furthermore, these individuals do not perceive that it is possible to lose their organizational membership (Callero, 2003). Individuals with high self-esteem are less likely to experience anxiety, stress, or other negative emotions affecting their well-being because high self-esteem enhances the capacity for coping and promotes physical and mental health (Bajaj et al., 2016; Greenberg et al., 1992; Taylor & Brown, 1988). Well-being was found to be a key factor that is correlated to self-esteem (Bajaj et al., 2016; Kong, Zhao, & You, 2013; Krieger, Hermann, Zimmermann, & Grosse, 2015; Lin, 2015).

In contrast, low self-esteem is more likely to drive a person to perceive his or her competency negatively as if he or she does not have access to personal and external resources to resolve uncertainties (Baumeister, 1993; Greco & Roger, 2001; Reitz et al., 2016). A person may avoid seeking personal and external resources because they fear negative feedback (Dandeneau & Baldwin, 2004). Within this realm, low self-esteem was found to diminish an individual’s ability to use cognitive skills and external resources to cope (Dandeneau & Baldwin, 2009; Danielsson & Bengtsson, 2016). Nahum-Shani, Henderson, Lim, and Vinokur (2014) and Dandeneau and Baldwin (2009)
noted that a high level of self-esteem provides an individual with the ability to focus his or her attention on positive information, to manage uncertainty, and to consider the availability of external resources, such as social support.

Scholars who contributed to research on the enhancement of self-esteem such as Randal, Pratt, and Bucci (2015) conducted a study examining mindfulness and self-esteem. Results revealed a strong, positive relationship between mindfulness and self-esteem; individuals with higher mindfulness appeared not to absorb the negative feelings and thoughts that contribute to low self-esteem (Pepping, O’Donovan, & Davis, 2013). Negative feelings and critical thoughts are associated with low self-esteem (Rhee, Chang, & Rhee, 2003; Wu et al., 2016). Within the organizational context, Pierce and Gardner (2004) in their conducted review of self-esteem for the past decades indicated that an individual’s self-esteem in the workplace plays an important role in his or her motivation, attitude, behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, role performance, and turnover intention.

Pierce and Gardner (2004) addressed several factors determine self-esteem, including the following:

(1) the implicit signals sent by the environmental structures to which one is exposed, (2) messages sent from significant others in one’s social environment, and (3) the individual’s feelings of efficacy and competence derived from his/her direct and personal experiences. (p. 593)

Within work environments, developing social systems reduces employees’ self-esteem because people develop mistrust beliefs (Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016;
Korman, 1971). The attitude and behavior toward others attributed to sense of self and cognitive consistency (Latham & Cummings, 2000). Korman (1970) and Reitz et al. (2016) noted that individual with high self-esteem tend to have a positive attitude toward organization involvement which can enhance individual evaluation of the self. Another important factor that determines self-esteem is the social messages received (Baumeister, 1999; Brockner, 1988; Khan, Gagné, Yang & Shapka, 2016). Receiving messages and internalizing them through social construction communicative ways by the person who evaluate the individual’s work will impact an individual’s evaluation of his or her self-concept (Khan et al, 2016; Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Moreover, successful people tend to see themselves positively based on personal experience; this can boost an individual’s self-esteem (Khan et al, 2016; Pierce & Gardner, 2004).

Tan and Peng (1997) and Culbertson and Jackson (2016) investigated the relationship between job complexity and self-esteem. They found a positive relationship between job complexity (such as complex feedback, task identity, and job significance) and an employee’s self-esteem. When an employee receives positive feedback regarding to outstanding performance in the organization, individual will “experience a sense of achievement” that impacting self-esteem positively (Tan & Peng, 1997, p. 378).

In addition, self-esteem is found associated with organizational culture, specifically, in the message process in the organization (Baumeister, 1999; Brookover et al., 1964; Reitz, Motti-Stefanidi & Asendorpf, 2014); thus, the source of the message (trusting relationships, supportiveness, leader–member relationship, and workplace discrimination) also is a key factor shaping self-esteem (Huang, Wang, Wu & You, 2016;
Pierce & Gardner, 2004). Low self-esteem is associated with high oral-communication apprehension (Richmond & Falcione, 1977; Wu, Birtch, Chiang & Zhang, 2016), making an individual unwilling to engage in self-disclosure and causing feelings of isolation and ineffective social interaction (Heston & Andersen, 1972; Wu et al., 2016). Ineffective communication practices from supervisors toward employees tend to be damaging to a person’s self-esteem because it plays a significant role in information sharing (Enz & Siguaw 2000; Hughes 2003; Richmond & Falcione, 1977; Srivastava & Vyas, 2015).

Information and knowledge are essential elements to empower, motivate, aspire employees at work. On the contrary, lack of information and knowledge resulted from ineffective communication cause decrease in employee’s level of trust, freedom, innovation, and sense of belonging to the organization (Srivastava & Vyas, 2015).

Several studies examined the impact of self-esteem on organization, which can affect employees’ attitudes in terms of job satisfaction (Bowden, 2002; Gardner & Pierce, 2001; Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016; Pierce & Gardner, 2004; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004) and also play a key role in an individual’s organizational identification (Bowden, 2002; Shamir & Kark, 2004), and job coping with organization (Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016; Staehle-Moody, 1998). Covin et al.’s (1992) study reported a significant relationship between self-esteem and aspects of job satisfaction, such as the kind of work an employee performs, supervision, pay, and general satisfaction. Similarly, Bowden (2002) and Kashyap & Rangnekar (2016) found the correlation between self-esteem and job satisfaction plays a positive role in employee’s personal feelings of fulfillment. Along with the impact of self-esteem on employees’ job satisfaction, researchers investigated
the relationship between self-esteem and employees’ commitment. A positive relationship between self-esteem and commitment was found in the literature, where individuals with high self-esteem were more likely to be committed to their job than individuals who reported low self-esteem (Gardner & Pierce, 2001; Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016; Lee, 2003; Tang, Singer & Roberts, 2000; Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004).

In addition, researchers reported a positive relationship between self-esteem and feedback-seeking behavior (Brockner, 1988; Van Dyne et al., 1990; Whelpley & McDaniel, 2016). The findings suggested that individuals with high self-esteem tend to have positive feedback-seeking behavior, using the information to cope and perform better. Korman (1970) indicated that an individual who is motivated to perform better at work was found to have a positive self-image and self-cognition, leading to engagement in positive behaviors and controlled attitudes. High self-esteem was observed to be correlated with self-enhancement; therefore, researchers found that individuals with high self-esteem had strong self-efficacy, which in turn elevated their level of performance (Gardner et al., 2000; Gardner & Pierce, 1998; Marion-Landais, 2000; Pierce et al., 1989; Wu et al., 2016). Meanwhile, studies predicted that self-esteem can influence turnover and turnover intention (Bowden, 2002; Gardner & Pierce, 2001; Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016; Norman, Gardner, & Pierce, 2015; Phillips & Hall, 2001; Vecchio, 2000). These studies suggested that individuals with high self-esteem feel that they are valuable to their organizations and do not attempt to leave their workplace.
**Information Seeking**

Managing behavior in organizations has evolved over time, and communication behaviors within organizations reveal critical aspects of organizational settings, ranging from human attitudes in the workplace to relational maintenance behaviors among employees in the same working environment. Keyton et al. (2013) have identified ten common communication behaviors that occur in the workplace, two of which are sharing information and seeking feedback. The communication of information as part of the human behavior of organizations is complicated for a variety of reasons including: context, demographics, expertise, psychological factors, information users’ needs, information providers’ needs, motivating and inhibiting factors, features of the information seeking process, characteristics related to the information, and source factors (Robson & Robinson, 2013).

Information seeking is an activity that engages employees and managers in the workplace and takes place when employees seek or need information regarding a knowledge gap with respect to their task duties (Robson & Robinson, 2013). If subordinates seek feedback and information in their work environments, this tends to help them cope better and learn as it enhances their performance as a result of their ability to understand their duties more clearly (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013; Dawson et al., 2011). Furthermore, satisfaction with the information provided is associated with employees’ job satisfaction and reduces intention to leave (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013). Chen, Lam, and Zhong (2007) assert that improved performance based on
information seeking correlates with the development of a higher quality leader-member exchange relationship.

However, there are concerns that some individuals may not be motivated to communicate with their superiors for a variety of reasons. Cognitive avoidance from subordinates is a key factor affecting the communication process with respect to seeking information (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013). The avoidance of information seeking is attributed to the fact that it might affect employees’ self-esteem and indicate their weakness, especially in the case of seeking negative feedback (Ashford, Blatt, & VandeWalle, 2003).

Another factor related to information seeking is the source of the information; employees might not take action or communicate with their supervisors because they question the credibility and characteristics of the information source (Robson & Robinson, 2013). In such cases employees may dismiss the new information and stick with the existing information. In addition, some subordinates may not wish to seek or develop better relationships in order to avoid being involved and to contribute more effectively to teamwork and to the organization; therefore, managers perceive them as unfavorable and undesirable workers and fail to provide them with adequate information for future tasks (Chen et al., 2007). Organizational members may seek information directly or indirectly from their immediate managers, or seek information from third party such as colleagues. Direct information-seeking reveals the strength relationship between leaders and members that provide accurate information. On the other hand,
indirectly asking for information can indicate the level of discomfort between manager and subordinate (Lee et al., 2007).

In seeking information, a perceived transformational leadership style has been found to lead subordinates to be more eager to seek information from supervisors (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013). Moreover, a high quality relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate enhances the exchange of information. Leaders should therefore promote better quality supervisor–subordinate relationships to overcome these information seeking issues (Chen et al., 2007). Transactional relationship processes foster levels of trust and help to maintain knowledge, skills, and abilities by influencing people based on communication and information. Furthermore, individuals need to overcome the obstacles to seeking information in order to become trustworthy and to avoid being seen as part of the out-group. They are able to develop their career and enhance the organization’s performance by focusing on behaviors such as self-assessment, self-improvement, self-enhancement, and self-verification (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013).

In this research study, the source of the information will be under investigation due to the critical role that managers play in the hospitality and tourism industry. When managers are the source of information, they can encourage information and provide clear messages to subordinates (Brownell, 1991) or they can control scarce resources, such as decision processes, boundaries, and knowledge and information (Morgan, 1986). In addition, abusive managers may withhold critical information from their employees in order to practice their power (Crommelinck & Anseel, 2013).
In addition, this study will examine the information seeking acting as a mediator of the relationship between effective communication and job satisfaction, engagement, and turnover. A mediator variable is known as a variable that explains the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The independent variable influence the mediator variable, then the mediator influences the dependent variable. Studies on the influence of information seeking on communication and on the relevance to fostering job satisfaction, engagement, and turnover intention provided a basis for the consideration of information seeking as a mediating variable in the job outcomes linkage. Some scholars assume that individuals who are motivated to seek information lead to more satisfaction with their jobs and engaged more in workplace and lower employee turnover (Butler, 1993; Morrison, 1993; Santosa, Wei & Chan, 2005; Venkatraman, 1990).

The hospitality and tourism industry involves multinational employees, and the quality of the information is based on the source if he or she able to empathize and understand others’ viewpoint to overcome cross-cultural communication (Brownell, 1992). Because of the special characteristics and high context culture of the Saudi nationals such as indirect communication style and hierarchy sensitivity, especially female workers, the study will explore whether the source of information influence employees to seek information because of status differences or not.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is an essential element determining the work quality of life of an employee (Karatepe & Karadas, 2015). Organizations strive to overcome any obstacles
that might affect employees’ well-being to achieve optimal performance that can be affected by feelings and emotions generated from workplace (Pak, 2007). Hoppock (1935) addressed the psychological and environmental conditions, and how they fit in the organization and play a role in an individual’s satisfaction with a job (Ellickson, 2002). Job satisfaction refers to “an attitude that individuals have about their jobs, results from their perception of jobs, and the degree to which there is a good fit between individuals and organization” (Ivancevich, Olekalns, & Matteson, 1997, p. 91). Employees’ job satisfaction builds upon the perceptions of job aspects along with whether the job has met the expectations that have been determined by the ideas, beliefs and values of the individuals (Chan, Pan, & Lee, 2004; Locke, 1969). Although job satisfaction has been long confirmed as outcome factor, it is considered as the most reliable indicator of employee’s well-being (Faragher, Cass & Cooper, 2005; Stengård et al., 2016). Numerous studies have investigated job satisfaction in the workplace (e.g., Hoppock, 1935; Karatepe & Karadas, 2015; Lester, 1987; Wanous & Lawler, 1972; Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016; Sun, Gergen, Avila, & Green, 2016), and its impact on job performance (e.g., Fitzgerald, 1972; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Mangione & Quinn, 1975; McGuigan, McGuigan & Mallett, 2016; Saputro, Paramita, & Gagah, 2016), absenteeism (Clegg, 1983; Saputro, Paramita, & Gagah, 2016; Steers & Rhodes, 1978) and turnover (Coomber & Barriball, 2007; Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016).

Researchers investigating job satisfaction vary in their attitudes and values based on aspects of job satisfaction (Lester, 1987). Other researchers have conducted studies
that have indicated job satisfaction as both an independent and dependent variable (Wanous & Lawler, 1972). Within the hospitality and tourism industry, job satisfaction has been examined from different perspectives. Some investigations have been focused on the role of leader–member relations (George & Hancer, 2004; Liao, Hu, & Chung, 2009; Wang et al., 2016); leadership (Kim & Brymer, 2011; Mohamed, 2016); job characteristic (Ozturk, Hancer & Im, 2014); employee empowerment (Domínguez-Falcón, Martín-Santana, & De Saá-Pérez, 2016; Elbeyi, Yuksel, & Yalcin, 2011; Gazzoli, Hancer, & Park, 2010); stress (Kim, Murrmann, & Lee, 2009; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhipongs, 2016; Zhao & Ghiselli, 2016); emotional labor (Han, Bonn, & Cho, 2016; Lam & Chen, 2012); and turnover intention (Cheung & Wu, 2012; Han, Bonn, & Cho, 2016; Kim & Brymer, 2011; Lu & Gursoy, 2016; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhipongs, 2016).

Lee and Moreo (2007) conducted a study examining job satisfaction and attitude toward the workplace from seasonal employees working in the lodging industry. Lee and Moreo (2007) asserted that management and personal feelings were significant factors that influence job satisfaction more than the difficulty of the job and work environment. Results indicated that employees who were satisfied with their managers’ practices scored higher job satisfaction and that supervisory position holders must have leadership skills, especially regarding the use of feedback. Dierendonck, Haynes, Borrill, and Stride (2004) also affirmed that providing feedback is a significant leadership skill that essentially enhances employees’ well-being. In addition, the ability to communicate with co-workers and supervisors within the culturally diverse setting was found to be another
factor employees mentioned as vital to a healthy work environment (Lee & Moreo, 2007).

As previously discussed, personal control and feelings of helplessness were found to be significant predictors of well-being (Spector, 2002). Personal control is related to the well-being broadax which is displeasure pleasure, anxiety comfort, and depression enthusiasm (Warr, 2007). Also, personal control has been linked to another well-being category containing subjective well-being, workplace well-being, and psychological well-being (Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009). Subjective well-being at work refers to “the degree to which one’s satisfaction with their job contributes to their overall life satisfaction” (Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009, p. 446). Scholars claim that life satisfaction is correlated with job satisfaction, while others consider job satisfaction as contributing to overall life satisfaction (Rode, 2004). Workplace well-being within organization structures promotes healthy organizational behavior (Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009) and organizational scholarship (Cameron & Caza 2004; Cameron et al. 2003). Page and Vella-Brodrick (2009) proposed that “subjective and psychological well-being should be viewed as core components of employee mental health and represent positive feelings and positive functions respectively” (p. 443). Furthermore, mental health can be defined as the presence of psychological well-being rather than the absence of illness (Keyes 2006; Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009). Organizational health necessitates preserving and promoting mental health as it affects turnover and performance (Cotton & Hart, 2003; Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009)
A study by Spector (2002) suggested that personal control is beneficial to handle workplace stressors where personal control of employee well-being is the key. Spector and Fox (2002) indicated that high self-control increases positive behavior that in turn increase individual’s self-esteem, and vice versa. Another study suggested that personal control is valuable for well-being due to the ability personal control provides to an individual to achieve the desired goals. Some of the desired goals will increase employee’s well-being, such as having access to work-related and performance-related information (Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008). Deprivation of such work related information decreases job satisfaction causing stress and worry (Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008), which negatively impact an employee’s well-being (cf. Spector, 2002). In spite of the negative consequences resulting from information deprivation, it also generates helplessness, which can be linked to feelings of depression, anxiety and physical illness (Peterson et al., 1993; Seligman, 1975).

**Job Engagement**

Christensen, Hughes, and Rog (2008) have pointed to the importance of human resource strategic management as a means of paying more attention to employee engagement beyond a focus on recruitment and retention of employees. Employee engagement is defined as “a heightened emotional and intellectual connection that an employee has for his/her job, organization, manager, or co-workers that in turn influences him/her to apply additional discretionary effort to his/her work” (Gibbons, 2006, p. 5). Schaufeli et al. (2002) have defined work engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption” (p.
According to Hewitt and Associates (2004), an individual’s high level of engagement contributes to the success of an organization or business in ways such as service quality, customer satisfaction, productivity, sales, profitability, and employee performance (Karatepe, 2013; Takeuchi et al., 2007). Thus, employees have a desire to remain in their workplaces, which in turn reduces turnover (Christensen et al., 2008). Studies have confirmed that employees with high levels of enthusiasm are able to apply learned expertise during work, which also increases organizational commitment (Ahmad & Bakar, 2003; Bartlett, 2001; Facteau et al., 1995).

Previous studies have identified factors that influence work engagement in the hospitality and tourism industry. These include career growth, workplace pride, coworkers’ attitudes, employee development, nature of the job, personal relationships with managers, trust and integrity, feedback from managers, and managers interacting with subordinates (Gibbons, 2006). In addition, Gibbons (2006) claims that managers are expected to behave with integrity, treat employees with respect, communicate effectively, and foster personal relationships with direct reports in order to elevate employees’ involvement in the workplace. Other studies show that training, empowerment, and rewards are indicators of employee engagement (Boselie et al., 2005; Pfeffer, 1994) and leadership quality (Christensen et al., 2008; Day & Lord; 1988; Morton, 2005).

Perrin (2005) indicated that the level of engagement varies from organization to organization based on the size and cultural background of the organization; the global average engagement rate is 14 percent. The results showed that employee engagement differs among nations, such as Mexico (40%), Brazil (31%), the US (21%), Belgium
Perrin (2003) also reported that 66% of engaged employees aim to stay in their organizations. In addition, hospitality and tourism firms are facing obstacles with high turnover and engaging employees (Christensen et al., 2008; Karatepe, 2013). That is, work environments in hospitality and tourism organizations require employees to serve customers in a challenging and competitive market (De Jong & De Ruyter, 2004). Whereas, employee engagement at workplace can determines customer satisfaction (Moliner et al., 2008).

A multicultural workforce has raised concerns regarding language fluency’s effects on job engagement and commitment (Sanchez, 2006). This impacts employees’ morale, productivity, and quality (Loosemore & Lee, 2002). Also, language fluency causing frustration maximizing employees’ sensitivity with different cultural backgrounds (Christensen-Hughes, 1992), as employees are reluctant to communicate with managers. Balhs (1998) reported that lost productivity caused by workers with limited English skills cost $65 billion annually. Misunderstanding the cultural differences can result in ineffective directing, motivating, communicating, and rewarding of employees (Lee & Chon, 2000).

Ten, Brummelhuis, Bakker, Hetland, and Keulemans (2012) examined the effects of new ways of working on work engagement and exhaustion. The new ways of working involve diversifying communication interactions in the workplace, and the study found engagement positively correlated with communication. In addition, the relationship with daily exhaustion was influenced by effective and efficient communication. Effective and efficient communication boost work engagement and provide employees with more
control over their work processes (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Further, fast-paced information sharing and constant connectivity facilitate effective communication among coworkers (Katz & Aarhus, 2002). At the same time, continuous connectivity and interruptions can cause work disengagement (Spiegelman & Detsky, 2008). Work engagement and effective communication can prevent employees from being isolated (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Walther, 1992). Russel (2003) indicated that work engagement and exhaustion are sub-dimensions of burnout, which affects well-being. Burnout is the state of emotional, physical, and cognitive exhaustion, which is also associated with poor health (Hock, 1988; Maslach & Jackson, 1984; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Maslach et al., 2001; Pines & Aronson, 1981). To prevent low levels of work engagement and exhaustion, effective communication in the work environment is needed to help employees feel enthusiastic, energized, and motivated in their jobs (Christensen et al., 2008). Shuck et al. (2013) pointed out that measuring employee engagement is based on employee’s active psychological state unlike the measure of employee job satisfaction which focuses on work attitude and general employee sentiment.

Previous research has investigated the relationship between burnout and engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Pienaar and Willemse (2008) examined the relationships between burnout, engagement, coping, and general health of employees in the hospitality industry of a South African city. It was found that employees’ well-being was influenced by their avoidant coping strategies and personal feelings, which refers to emotional labor. Face-to-face communication with customers involves emotional anxiety
(Sandiford & Seymour, 2007). Within the hospitality and tourism industry, employees who have emotional labor are experiencing high level of stress, frequent turnover, and low levels of satisfaction (Pizam, 2004). Researchers have identified an increase in occupational stress in the hospitality and tourism industry during the last 15 to 20 years (Murray-Gibbons & Gibbons, 2007).

**Turnover Intention**

Organizations worldwide identify employee turnover as a serious issue that human resources management has to deal with. Academics and professionals have been heavily involved in attempts to control turnover (Cascio, 2003; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Hongvichit, 2015; Mowday et al., 1982). High employee turnover rate has been identified as a common factor associated with reducing the overall productivity of hospitality and tourism organizations and increasing the costs associated with replacing and recruiting new employees (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000; Cascio, 2003; Iqbal, 2010; Niode, 2011; Tiwari, 2015). High level of turnover not only affects the organization itself; it can also influence other employees working in the same environment to leave their jobs (Louden, 2012). The cost of employee turnover can reach between 1.5 and 2.5 times the current employee’s annual salary (Cascio, 2003). Moreover, losing employees is linked to a loss of business revenue (Tiwari, 2015).

The hospitality and tourism industry has acknowledged concerns regarding the high costs of replacing and recruiting employees as a result of high turnover of staff (Carbery, Garavan, O’Brien, & McDonnell, 2003; Denvir & McMahon, 1992; Madera, Dawson, & Neal, 2014). According to the U.S. Department of Labor (2013), turnover is
50% higher in the leisure and hospitality industries (4.8% per month) compared to other industries with overall turnover rates of 3.3% per month. From an economic point of view, the average cost of employee replacement is $13,996 (O’Connel, 2007). When replacing an employee after two or more years of employment costs an organization an average of $47,000 (Avery et al., 2011). In the United States, the annual employee replacement is over $25 billion (McKeown, 2010). Meanwhile, organizations lose $300 billion a year in lost productivity because of the dissatisfied employees (James & Mathew, 2012). This situation is not exclusive to the United States. Employee turnover in Saudi Arabia is costing its businesses SR35bn ($9.3bn) annually (Al-mansour, 2013).

Not only hospitality organizations show great deals of concerns regarding to the cost of recruiting and training new employees, but also concerns regarding to the quality service and the image of the organization have been addressed (Harrington & Keating, 2006; Tiwari, 2015). New employees cannot perform at the same level of departed employees (Tiwari, 2015). Thus, the quality of services delivered by new employees can negatively impact an organization’s image.

Heneman and Judge (2009) show that turnover can be divided into two categories: voluntary and involuntary turnover. Involuntary turnover includes discharging an employee due to discipline or job performance issues and downsizing actions by organizations. Examples of voluntary turnover include psychological contract and the cognitive ability of employee (Clinton & Guest 2014; Maltarich, Nyberg & Reilly 2010). Voluntary turnover can be avoided by taking actions such as pay raises and improved management practices, while unavoidable turnover occurs in out-of-control
circumstances. Previous studies have identified factors that cause turnover, including a toxic workplace environment, poor managerial styles, insignificant hiring practices as well as a lack of a competitive compensation system and recognition (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000).

According to Mor Barak et al. (2001), turnover intention refers to “seriously considering leaving one’s current job” (p. 633). Turnover intention has been found to be the most accurate predictor of actual turnover (Brewer, Kovner, Greene, & Cheng, 2009; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Turnover refers to an individual leaving his or her job voluntarily or involuntarily, and the replacement cycle for a new employee includes training (Woods, 1995). Researchers have found that one of the greatest predictors of employee turnover is a deficiency of job satisfaction (Johnson, Parasuraman, Futrell, & Black, 1990). Neglecting the importance of employee development leads to poor performance and a high turnover rate (Mincer, 1988). In addition, managers may not favor spending more time, money, and effort on the development of employees assuming they have a high tendency to leave within months (Niode, 2011). A growing body of evidence attributes employee turnover intention in Saudi Arabia to work attitudes (e.g., Alkhaldi, Burgess, & Connell, 2015; Alshanbri et al., 2015; Bhuian & Al-Jabri, 1996; Jehanzeb, et al., 2015). Examples of work attitudes include insufficient training programs, lack of supportive working environment, and lack of knowledge sharing (Alshanbri et al., 2015; Jehanzeb, et al., 2015).
Wright and Bonett (2007) measured the relationship between job satisfaction, well-being, and voluntary turnover. It was found that both job satisfaction and well-being significantly affect employee turnover.

Furthermore, effective management is significantly associated with job satisfaction, especially in a multicultural work environment (Tran, 2016). Bhuian and Al-Jabri (1996) claim that managers’ attitudes during job feedback is critical; if employees are satisfied with timely information about them, they tend to stay in an organization. Shoenfelt and Battista (2004) indicate that positive job satisfaction reduces turnover. Moreover, job satisfaction is positively associated with organizational commitment and negatively associated with employee turnover intention (Almalki, 2012). Similarly, Rahman, Naqvi, and Ramay (2008) suggest that there is a relationship between negative job satisfaction and turnover intention. In the context of the economic transformation in Saudi Arabia, organizations that endeavor to maintain a high international market share are experiencing lower rates of turnover intention and higher levels of commitment due to the quality of work carried out (Al-Kahtani, 2002). Thus, employees working in healthy work environments are more likely to remain in their jobs rather than leave.

In addition, performance appraisal and feedback are reported to be contributors to turnover in Saudi Arabia (Iqbal, 2010). Most organizations provide a lack of authentic feedback regarding performance in order not to hurt employees’ self-esteem (Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Mills, & Walton, 1985). Criticizing employees’ performance as a part of regular feedback is perceived as hostile in Saudi Arabia (Gopalakrishnan, 2002).
Saudi employees may take feedback personally when it compares their performance with that of foreign workers in ways that mostly favor the foreigners (Iqbal, 2010). Furthermore, ineffective communication by managers in Saudi organizations plays an important role in employee turnover (Iqbal, 2010). There is a noticeable lack of long-term planning in Saudi organizations, including the absence of a philosophy for quality, a vision, or a mission to make the organization communicate effectively with its employees (Wang, 2008).

Based on a survey of 500 managers and employees in the Gulf Council Countries (GCC), the Hill and Knowlton company found that a lack of effective communication by managers makes employees look for needed information from other sources such as external media and friends (as cited in Iqbal, 2010, p. 278). The study notes that managers often fail to convey their message. Al-Kinani (2008) asserts that only 53 percent of Saudi Arabian employees see their managers as a useful source of information, while the rest seek out friends or external resources to get information.

The hospitality and tourism industry has made efforts to retain employees for a longer period of time in order to achieve business success. However, this has proven to be very difficult because of the poor image of the industry. Without a doubt, O’Leary and Deegan (2005) found that hospitality and tourism graduates report a negative image of the sector due to its high turnover rate. By contrast, an exciting work culture, professional development, and a friendly management system contribute to employee retention (Tiwari, 2015).
Research Propositions and Hypotheses

Based on the discussed studies, the following research questions and hypotheses were proposed in order to provide a foundation to collect and analyze data examining the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes. The specific research questions and hypotheses are:

1. What are the most barriers that affect effective communication in the hospitality and tourism workplace in Saudi Arabia?
2. Are there significant differences between employees’ ethnicity and effective communication?

Hypothesis 1: There will be a positive relationship between employees’ background information and information seeking behaviors.

3. Are self-esteem and information seeking mediate the relationship between effective communication and three types of job outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement and turnover rate)?

Hypothesis 2: Effective communication will predict job satisfaction while controlling the background and career related information, self-esteem and information seeking.

Hypothesis 3: Effective communication will predict job engagement while controlling the background and career related information, self-esteem and information seeking.
Hypothesis 4: Effective communication will predict turnover intention while controlling the background and career related information, self-esteem and information seeking.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the use of human subjects, and also describes the participants, procedures, and instrument design that were employed in this research. The reliability of each scale is discussed as well. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes (e.g., intention, attitudes, and behaviors). The research objectives of the study were to (1) explore factors that could improve effective communication, (2) examine the mediating effects of two job factors (self-esteem and information seeking) on communication and job outcomes, and (3) investigate if effective communication has a relationship with overall employee wellbeing (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement) and intention to leave.

Human Subject Review

The researcher in the study completed human subjects training and is certified by Kent State University (KSU). The KSU Human Subjects Review Board approved the proposal application for this study and it met the criteria for Level-1 Exemption under federal regulation, which means the research had minimal risk to human subjects.

Participants

The sample for the study was obtained from full- and part-time employees from various hotel operations located in the state of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The reason for choosing to survey hotel employees in Riyadh was due to the high level of professionalism in the training and development of hotel employees in the city. Human
resources in Riyadh’s hotels are considered to provide advanced management practices compared to other cities in Saudi Arabia. In addition to that, Riyadh is one of the top tourism destinations in Saudi Arabia (SCTNH, 2016) so it attracts both local and foreign workers.

The survey was distributed to employees at both brand and independently owned hotels that were rated three stars and above. The number of licensed hotels in Riyadh is 85 hotels, and 35 hotels in the center of the city were included for analysis because of their location in an important business area. Furthermore, the chosen hotels were considered to be employing a large number of workers, domestic or foreign, which could provide intended sample size and types of participants. According to the rule of thumb, the expected sample size to achieve statistically significant results was at least 210 subjects (Knofczynski & Mundfrom, 2007). Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) indicated that to determine sample size when using six or more predictors, the number of the participants should be 30 per variable and the minimum of sample should be 10 per variable. Because an evaluative study is a descriptive study, the larger the sample size, the better, so as many subjects as possible were enrolled during the enrollment period. The literature review revealed no evaluation studies conducted that could help to determine the exact adequate sample size (Burns & Grove, 2005).

**Procedure**

Hotel employees were surveyed, and data was collected during Fall 2016. Hotels’ human resource directors were contacted via emails and phone calls to seek their permission and approval to distribute the survey to employees in their organizations.
Participants returned the survey in a sealed envelope and collected by a research assistant. The research assistant collected the sealed envelopes and mailed them back to the researcher. The survey language was English and it was administered using paper-pencil format. Furthermore, a consent form was provided to the participants to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

Snowball sampling was used to gain more participants from employees not included in the chosen 35 hotels. The purposive and snowball sampling method was chosen because both enable the identification of participants with the required knowledge and characteristics that suit the needs of the study (Bailey, 2008).

**Instrument Design**

Mix-methods, non-experimental, and exploratory survey was used in this study. The survey included three sections. The first section of the survey used seven scales to investigate the key variable, communication and job related variables (i.e., effective communication, self-esteem, information seeking, job satisfaction, engagement, and intention to leave). The second section of the survey measured effective communication in multicultural settings and included open-ended questions. The third section examined employees’ backgrounds and demographic information (e.g. age, gender, membership status, and ethnicity). The reliability of each scale measured is shown in Table 3.

**Effective Communication**

Both scales, the Conversational Effectiveness Scale by Spitzberg and Phelp (1982) and the Communication Effectiveness Scale developed by Jain and Mukherji (2015), were used to measure the dimensions of effective communication (in
multicultural settings) with the original items modified to reflect the effectiveness of supervisor–subordinate communication at workplace. The ten items that comprised the Conversational Effectiveness Scale had a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to indicate the perceived level of effectiveness of direct supervisor communication. The respondents rated how much they agreed or disagreed with items such as: “The conversations between my supervisor and me are very beneficial.” The Chronbach’s alpha coefficient of the scale was .91 in a study conducted by Eichhorn (2009). The Communication Effectiveness Scale was adapted from Jain and Mukherji (2015), and the original questions were open-ended questions to assess effective communication in a multicultural work environment. The researcher modified the questionnaire into a seven-point Likert scale. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with eight statements based on the scale. The eight statements were ranked from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). One of the leading questions was “Do you think cultural diversity in teams is a major cause of anxiety and uncertainty?” The internal consistencies of the scale indicated a coefficient alpha of 0.984 (Jain, 2015).

**Self-Esteem**

Ten items that were included in the Self-esteem Scale survey developed by Pierce et al. (1989) were used to measure individual’s self-esteem. The scale items were responded to by self-assessment. A sample item is “I am taken seriously.” Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). Pierce et al. (1989) have used the scale in numerous studies, and the internal consistency
of seven samples was determined by Cronbach’s alpha, which ranged between .86 and .96 with an average of .91.

**Information Seeking Scale**

The information seeking items were measured by Miller’s (1996) Information Seeking Tactic scale. Six direct ($\alpha = .74$) and four indirect ($\alpha = .87$) items measured the extent to which participants sought information directly from a supervisor and indirectly from different information sources in the workplace environment. Participants responded to statements on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (very little extent) to 5 (very great extent). A sample item of the subscale indirect information-seeking is “I would indicate curiosity about the topic without directly asking for the information”, and a sample item of the subscale direct information-seeking “I would identify what I did not know and ask for the information.” The importance of measuring both direct and indirect information seeking behaviors is to distinguish between individuals’ behaviors from a cross-cultural perspective. Also, measuring direct and indirect information seeking behaviors helps to understand an individual’s high or low status identity (Ashford, Blatt & Walle, 2003).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was assessed through six items derived from Hackman and Oldham’s Job Diagnostic Survey. Items were scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Participants were asked to respond to statements such as “I’m very satisfied with my supervisor.” The internal consistency of the Job Satisfaction Scale was demonstrated in several studies (e.g., Zaniboni, Truxillo,
Fraccaroli, McCune & Bertolino, 2014) with the coefficient alpha in Zaniboni et al.’s (2014) study being 0.94. The Job Diagnostic Survey is related to an extensive range of important individual and organizational outcomes (e.g. satisfaction), which can predict work-related wellbeing (Rothmann, 2008).

**Job Engagement**

The Job Engagement Scale was developed by the Gallup Workplace Audit (1993–1998). The instrument constituting 12 items was used to measure employee perceptions about their workplace. The Gallup Workplace Audit has been the most frequently used for the study of job engagement. In the proposed study, respondents rated aspects of their engagement on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (extremely dissatisfied) to 5 (extremely satisfied). The leading statement for employee engagement is “I know what is expected of me at work.” Avery et al. (2007) have confirmed the reliability and the construct validity of the scale. The validity coefficient of the Gallup Workplace Audit Scale was 0.88. The scale consists of three psychological conditions promoting engagement, which are meaningfulness, psychological safety, and availability. The Job Engagement Scale is an important scale to understand how workers engage differently in their work based on work-related interactions (Gallup Workplace Audit, 1993).

**Turnover Intention**

Four items were developed by Suar et al. (2006) to measure turnover intention. The scale included questions such as “How often do you think of quitting your present organization?” The items were ranked based on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The coefficient alpha was .74.
**Background and Career Related Information**

Questions related to background information were developed based on the research purpose of this study and from related literature (Jain, 2015). Career related information was adopted from related studies (e.g., Chuang, 2010; Chuang, Walker & Caine-Bish, 2009; Shinnar, 2007). Questions concerning career factors (e.g., career aspiration and intentions, impacting factors of career), and barriers impacting communication in workplace were included in this section of the survey.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected were analyzed by the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Data was analyzed via the following methods: (a) Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic, background, and career related information; (b) Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to measure the internal consistency of each measure used; (c) mean ranking and a t-test were used to summarize communication factors and investigate the differences in information seeking behaviors between Saudi nationals and foreign workers; (d) a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to examine the mediating impact of self-esteem and information seeking on communication and job outcomes.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The main research purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes. The questionnaire was distributed by hand. Out of 320 hard copies of the questionnaire that were distributed among 35 hotels’ employees, 153 valid responses were generated with a response rate of 48.9%. After the initial response, snowball sampling was used and those employees represented more than 10 different hotels. A total of 30 responses were received, 17 of which were usable, resulting in a usable response rate of 50.1%. A total of 170 valid responses were used in the analysis. Some surveys were invalid due to missing data.

Sample Profiles

The participants were 97.6% male hotel employees (n = 166) and 2.4% female hotel employees (n = 4) as shown in Table 2. The study sample included a total of 34.7% Saudi national workers (n = 59) and 65.3% foreign workers (n = 111). Of the participants, 25.3% were from India (n = 43) and 21.8% were from Asia (n = 37). Most participants (32.9%) were between 26 years old and 30 years old, followed by 29.5% in the age group of 25 and less. Most participants (n = 103 or 60.6%) worked in five star hotels, with the average hours worked per week being 51-60 (n = 60). The participants worked in different hotels segments, such as the front desk (n = 77), customer service (n = 15), and the call center (n = 7).
### Table 2

**Respondents’ Demographic Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without kids</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with kids</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced without kids</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced with kids</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (HS)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association (Asso.)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor (Bach.)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued)

*Respondents’ Demographic Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Office</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years working in the current job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years working in Hospitality and Tourism industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry segment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel-Related Business</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel rating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three star hotel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four star hotel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five star hotel</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued)

Respondents’ Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work hour (per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No managerial experience</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of employees supervised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=170.

Measurement Quality

The alpha value of the coefficient, the mean, and the standard deviation for each scale are shown in Table 3.
Table 3

Summary Scale Statistics of Communication Effectiveness and Employees’ Job Outcomes Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Seeking-Direct</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Seeking-Indirect</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Engagement</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>42.04</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Conversational Effectiveness</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication in Multicultural</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=170.

The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the current study ranged from .53 to .86. Results of reliability tests to measure the internal consistency of each of the scales used indicated that majority the measurements used in this study were highly reliable with the exception of the Information Seeking-indirect and Turnover Intention scales. This suggests good internal consistency reliability for the scale.

Communication Factors

The participants were asked to respond to questions in order to provide a deep understanding of organizational communication from their perceptions and its impact on their workplace, and to examine workplace behaviors that were not contained in the
survey instrument (RQ1). The first question aimed to reveal whether there was an attitude (e.g., job satisfaction) experienced by foreign workers regarding to their workload and pay. When the participants were asked to what extent they perceived that they worked much harder than a Saudi employee while being paid significantly less, 15.9% \((n = 27)\) of the respondents indicated an indifferent reaction, 7.1% \((n = 12)\) of the respondents indicated a dissatisfaction reaction, and 12.4% \((n = 21)\) of the participants perceived they were satisfied with this matter. In addition, most participants \((n = 68, 40.0\%)\) indicated that they perceived interpersonal communication in the organization indifferently, and 27.1% \((n = 46)\) of the respondents ranked that they were satisfied. The third question asked participants whether they perceived any communication problems existing in their department, company, or organization. Participants’ responses were 28.2% \((n = 48)\) indifferent, 22.4% \((n = 38)\) a minor problem, and 17.1% \((n = 29)\) a moderate problem. In addition, participants were asked “Does your supervisor’s communication affect your job performance?” and 27.6% \((n = 47)\) of participants indicated that supervisor communication had a moderate effect on their job performance, while 25.3% \((n = 43)\) said they were indifferent, and 15.9% \((n = 27)\) ranked it as having a minor effect. Meanwhile, participants perceived the appropriateness of the communication/feedback from their middle management as 30% \((n = 51)\) slightly inappropriate, 15.9% \((n = 27)\) neutral, and 14.7% \((n = 25)\) inappropriate.

On a management level, participants were asked how they viewed managerial communication in their department, company, or organization when compared to other managerial functions (e.g., planning and staffing). Participants’ responses were 21.8% \((n
slightly important and 21.2% \((n = 36)\) neutral, while 18.2% \((n = 31)\) perceived it as a very important managerial function. The seventh question asked employees’ perceptions regarding the extent to which management communication barriers would make them want to leave their job. The majority of participants \((n = 69, 40.6\%)\) had a neutral reaction, whereas 24.1% \((n = 41)\) responded with likely and 8.2% \((n = 14)\) indicated that it was extremely likely they would want to leave their jobs. The eighth question asked participants about their satisfaction with working under the supervision of someone from a different ethnic group. Most of the participants \((n = 75, 44.1\%)\) perceived it indifferently and 38.2% \((n = 65)\) responded that they were satisfied. The last question was about employees’ understanding of intercultural communication. Participants’ responses were positive, with 51.2% \((n = 87)\) indicating that they had a good understanding and 31.8% \((n = 54)\) reporting a very good understanding of intercultural communication.

**Factors Impacting Career Path**

In order to identify barriers or obstacles (i.e., lack of motivation, lack of recognition, and stress) that hinder participants’ job intention, attitudes and behaviors or overall wellbeing in the industry and thus impact Saudi nationals and foreign workers career paths, participants were asked to specify the top barriers. After identifying each barrier, participants were asked to indicate to what extent that barrier affected their career path on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from not at all influential to extremely influential. Mean scores of the 15 items for the ranked barriers were computed. Table 6 lists the top career-barriers (highest mean scores). Saudi nationals perceived managers’ ego,
work hours, and lack of opportunities for promotion as having the most impact on their career paths, whereas foreign workers perceived lack of education, stereotypes and self-doubt about their career, and lack of recognition in their organization as having a greater impact on their career path. Although, Saudi nationals did not cite fear of changing their career at all, these were ranked as the lowest factors affecting foreign workers’ career path. Furthermore, foreign workers did not cite managers’ ego as a top concern likely to interfere with their career path. Participants’ responses can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4

*Perceived Barriers Hinder Participants’ Career*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Saudi Nationals</th>
<th>Foreign Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ ego</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family conflict</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and financial problems</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/friends pressure</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public image</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of change</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*  
^a^ not ranked by Saudi nationals  
^b^ not ranked by foreign workers
Independent Samples t-Tests

A t-test was conducted to determine if differences existed between Saudis employees and foreign employees on communication factors and information seeking behaviors (i.e. direct and indirect information seeking) (RQ2; H1).

There were no statistically significant differences found for the variables with the exception of management communication barrier lead to leaving job and conversational effectiveness. The means for Saudi nationals and foreign workers on management communication barrier lead to leaving job ($t = 2.09, p = 0.03$) were statistically different. Results indicated that Saudi nationals showed greater mean scores for management communication barrier lead to leaving job ($M = 3.60, SD = .79$) than foreigner workers ($M = 3.32, SD = .76$). This result could possibly suggest that when Saudi nationals perceive management communication, they are more likely to leave job. Also, the means for Saudi nationals and foreign workers on conversational effectiveness ($t = -3.36, p = 0.01$) were statistically different. Foreign workers had higher mean score for conversational effectiveness with their managers ($M = 3.33, SD = .53$) than Saudi nationals ($M = 3.06, SD = .37$). Results of the t-test suggest that foreign employees were more agreeable with managers’ conversational effectiveness. Table 5 illustrates the summary of the t-test results.
Table 5

*Ethnicity Differences on Communication Factors and Job Outcomes Related Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working harder than a Saudi employee and that you are being paid significantly less</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal communication in the organization</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication problems existed in your department/organization</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication affecting job performance</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from middle management</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial communication</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communication barrier lead to leaving job</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working under supervision from different ethnic group</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication understanding</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communication barrier lead to leaving job</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication understanding</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communication barrier lead to leaving job</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural communication understanding</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial communication</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect information seeking</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct information seeking</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job engagement</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational effectiveness</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural communication effectiveness</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational effectiveness</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural communication effectiveness</td>
<td>Saudis</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural communication effectiveness</td>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05

Hierarchical Multiple Regression

A series of hierarchical multiple regression was performed. A separate one for each dependent variable: job satisfaction, job engagement, and turnover intention (RQ3;
H2; H3; H4). For each case, the controlling variable (e.g., demographic and background information) will be entered first in the model. For the dependent variable job satisfaction, the second model of variables entered in the regression (information seeking and self-esteem) resulted in a statistically significant increase in explained variable $R^2 = .253$, $F(3, 136) = 15.424$, $p < .001$, as did the third variables (conversational effectiveness and multicultural communication effectiveness) entered into the regression equation $\Delta R^2 = .082$, $F(3, 136) = 188.7361$, $p < .001$. The results of this regression analysis indicated that information seeking and self-esteem can explain 26% of the variance of the dependent variable. Information seeking, self-esteem, conversational effectiveness, and multicultural communication effectiveness provided additional 8.2% explanation of variance on job satisfaction. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

*Summary Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$df1$</th>
<th>$df2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>15.424</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>8.307</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; **p** < .01; ***p** < .001.

A regression coefficient with each independent variable was computed to examine which independent variable can explain most statistical significant. The value of the standardized regression coefficient for each entered variable is presented in Tables 7.
The results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis revealed three variables predicting the dependent variable, job satisfaction, which are conversational effectiveness, multicultural communication effectiveness, and direct information seeking. However, the other independent variables are not able to contribute enough to predict workplace deviant behavior. These findings suggest that conversational effectiveness, multicultural communication effectiveness, and direct information seeking may indeed be important for employees’ job satisfaction. Employees who are more likely to seek
information directly from managers and perceive the conversation effectively, they tend to have a high level of job satisfaction.

A second hierarchical multiple regression were performed to examine the impact of independent variables: age, work experience, nationality, direct/indirect information seeking, conversational effectiveness, and multicultural communication effectiveness on the dependent variable, job engagement. The results of the regression analysis showed that model two accounted for an additional 23% of the variance in job engagement, $\Delta R^2 = .225$, $F(3, 133) = 13.211, p < .001$, while only 5.6% of variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the model three $\Delta R^2 = .302$, $F(2, 131) = 5.291, p < .01$. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 8.

### Table 8

**Summary Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>13.211</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>5.291</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.*

The regression coefficient analysis showed that self-esteem, direct information seeking, conversational effectiveness, and multicultural communication effectiveness did provide statistically significant explanation of variance on job engagement. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 9. These findings suggest that employees with high
level of self-esteem and seek their information directly found to have a higher level of job engagement. Also, when the communication and conversation with an individual’s manager is effective, an employee sought to be more engaged at workplace.

Table 9

The Predictors of Job Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-9.607</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Info Seeking</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Info Seeking</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Info Seeking</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Info Seeking</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational Effectiveness</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Communication Effectiveness</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

The final hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed to examine the impact of the abovementioned independent variables on turnover intention. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 10. The first model \( \Delta R^2 = 0.050, F(3, 136) = 2.386, p > .05 \), and second model \( \Delta R^2 = 0.036, F(3, 133) = 1.724, p > .05 \) did not provide statistically
significant explanation of variance on turnover intention. Only the third model of variables entered in the regression resulted in a statistically significant increase in explained variable $\Delta R^2 = .199$, $F (2, 131) = 2.386, p < .001$. In this model, the two communication variables of conversational effectiveness and multicultural communication effectiveness were entered as a block. As shown in Table 11, these two variables explained a statistically significant increase in the variance of turnover intention. The results of this analysis indicated that conservational effectiveness is a strong predictor of turnover intention. These findings suggest that conversational communication may indeed be important in employees’ retention. If so, focusing on effective conversation from managers may be important for maintaining their employees in the organization.

Table 10

*Summary Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta F$</th>
<th>$df_1$</th>
<th>$df_2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>18.230</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; **p* < .01; ***p* < .001.
Table 11

*The Predictors of Turnover Intention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Info Seeking</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Info Seeking</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;T Experience (Work Experiences)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Nationals</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Info Seeking</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Info Seeking</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational Effectiveness</td>
<td>-.536</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Communication Effectiveness</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

**Open-Ended Questions**

The qualitative results for this study were collected through the part of the questionnaire that specifically targeted qualitative data (RQ1). In particular, the questions were structured in an open-ended manner so that the respondents could provide their own perceptions and understandings of the concepts assessed without being limited or controlled by the form of the questions. The advantage of using qualitative data (e.g., open-ended questions) is “to analyze textual data of various kinds and is aimed at generating detail and depth” (Forman & Damschroder, 2008, p. 6).
Qualitative Findings

In total, there were eight questions, seven of which were general questions, with two questions relating to career in the hospitality and tourism industries. The general questions were related to effective communication, ineffective communication, communication in multicultural situations, precautions when interacting with people from other cultures, deviant behaviors due to management’s ineffective communication, and ways to solve the communication barriers that would improve employee wellbeing.

Due to the fact that the questions were designed in an open-ended manner, the respondents were able to provide many different answers. This approach was chosen specifically to enable the participants to add diversity to their responses and introduce ideas and perspectives that were both common and rare. In that way, when answering the same question, some of the respondents provided similar or identical answers, and some mentioned concepts and interpretations that were unique to their particular points of view.

Results are indicated in Table18. In terms of question one, there were several common answers with the majority of responses ($n = 25, 57\%$) indicating that “clarity of the information” was one of the most common indicators of effective communication. Basically, respondents treated this question as a request to define effective communication. The second most common answer was “listening” along with “respect,” which were both given by 17 respondents. On the other hand, the most commonly named trait of ineffective communication was “loud” ($n=19$). One respondent said that: “Yelling at one another is ineffective.” One more statement for this response was: “When people
The next cluster of popular responses involved “ignoring the employees” ($n = 17$), “lying” ($n = 9$), “attitude” ($n = 8$), and “not paying attention” ($n = 5$).

The third question asked participants to name scenarios of effective communication and ineffective communication in multicultural situations. The responses to this question mainly revolved around one’s understanding of cultural differences or lack thereof. Some of the common responses involved “speaking different languages,” “talking politely,” “not being open-minded,” and “when managers communicate with a high ego.” The statements the respondents supported their answers with included: “It is important to keep an open mind when talking to different people, and not judge them according to your own life experience.” In addition, as to the managers’ communication with the staff, one participant said: “Often, managers can be ignorant and treat workers with disrespect. When the workers notice this, communication becomes less of teamwork and more of a conflict.”

Meanwhile, when respondents were asked what precautions must be kept in mind when interacting with people from other cultures, the majority’s ($n = 23$) answer to this question was “respect others’ traditions and culture.” A respondent said: “We meet many people at work, from all around the world, cultural differences should be respected and not rejected.” In addition, another common response was “not offending others;” a participant said that: “a hospitality worker should be educated and mindful as to potential differences to avoid doing or saying offensive things”.

scream, the listening stops and the communication becomes ineffective.”
The fifth question had responses of two different types – the behaviors that occur as a response to ineffective communication and the ones that represent it. The answers to the former were reflected in responses such as “skipping work” and “low productivity,” and the latter – “stereotype,” “inappropriate behavior,” and “unprofessional work.” A participant noted that: “ineffective communication leads to stress at work and desire not to go there.” Furthermore, some respondents stated that: “when feedback is only negative, it kills the desire to work and improve.”

In addition, participants indicated major reasons why they had considered a career in the hospitality and tourism industry. The most popular answer was “interacting with other cultures” \( (n = 34) \). The other frequently mentioned reasons include “Job opportunities and growing industry” \( (n = 26) \) and “I like traveling and tourism activities” \( (n = 25) \). In particular, the respondents stated that hospitality was a robust industry, with one saying “hospitality is never going out of business it offers great growth opportunities.” In addition, they associated it with travelling and meeting new people, providing responses such as “I like new experiences, and hospitality is perfect for this – so many different interesting people, it’s like learning something new about the world every day.” However, participants indicated some reasons behind not planning to work in the hospitality/tourism industry in the future. “Too much work (long hours)” \( (n= 26) \) was the most common answer; and the participants also named such reasons as “low payment” \( (n = 23) \) and “low morale among managers” \( (n = 19) \). Specifically, some stated that: “Hospitality looks good on the outside but it’s actually very difficult and not paid
well.” Besides, some mentioned that “It is discouraging when your work is other people’s rest, you keep wondering – when am I going to be like them?”

For the last question about things that should be carried out by management to solve the communication barriers, only a small number of the employees answered. The participants named “providing sufficient information clearly” \((n = 14)\) and “respect” \((n = 12)\) as some of the primary ways to solve the issues related to communication. They stated “If only duties were explained better and we had someone to consult when we need help – it would make things much easier.” Furthermore, they said that “The managers are unavailable and we’re on our own, they need to show more respect to our work and be more available for help”.

Based on the literature review, the results of all the questions can be grouped into six main categories – understanding of effective communication, understanding of ineffective communication, outcomes of ineffective communication, motivators in the hospitality and tourism industry, demotivators in the hospitality and tourism industry, and eliminating ineffective communication. A selection of statements responding to each of the categories is presented in Table 12 (RQ1).
### Summary Table of Participants’ Responses to Open-Ended Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of effective Communication</td>
<td>Showing respect while communicating is vital as it affects others’ emotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I appreciate my managers when they listen to me with attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body language and eye contact can keep you engaged with the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm while interacting increases the level of effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politeness with employees helps to promote comfort and a healthier working environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of ineffective communication</td>
<td>Speaking inappropriately loud, or yelling at one another is harmful and hard to follow up with the information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lying to your teammates or your workers and untrusting them to share work related information prevent employees from development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When the manager is ignoring employees’ requests and complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not paying attention to what people ask you to help with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude such as ignorant behavior, as if you are better than everyone else (about managers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When someone is being rude, it is not effective, everything can be solved in a peaceful way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of relationship between coworkers, no communication, information gets lost, and people do their work inefficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of ineffective communication</td>
<td>Ineffective communication leads to stress at work and a desire not to go there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When feedback is only negative, it kills the desire to work and improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication becomes less of teamwork and more of a conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New workers are stereotyped as useless and are not educated to be more helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes some information is not told to employees that should know it and its leads to unprofessional work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When a manager does not know how to communicate, he or she starts inappropriate behaviors – yelling, disrespect, misusing language – it is negatively affecting the entire company, not just the manager or the worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivators in hospitality industry</td>
<td>I like new experiences, and hospitality is perfect for this – so many different interesting people, it’s like learning something new about the world every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitality is never going out of business, it offers great growth opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like travelling and tourism activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a growing industry, you can build a career if you are passionate about this industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 12 (continued)

*Summary Table of Participants’ Responses to Open-Ended Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demotivators in hospitality</td>
<td>Hospitality looks good on the outside but it’s actually very difficult and not paid well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td>It is discouraging when your work is other people’s rest, you keep wondering – when am I going to be like them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When you are a bottom level employee in this industry – you should not be counting on a good salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers often treat their workers with disrespect, do not give adequate feedback, do not offer help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating ineffective</td>
<td>It is important to give information clearly and directly and to make sure that there is no misunderstanding and everyone is clear about their duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>The managers are unavailable and we are on our own, they need to show more respect to our work and be more available for help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I wish we had better training and could ask managers for help without being judged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive feedback could improve relationships between workers and managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The main objectives of this study were to (a) explore factors that could improve effective communication, (b) examine the mediating effects of two job factors (self-esteem and information seeking) on the communication and job outcomes, and (c) investigate if effective communication has a relationship with employee overall wellbeing (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement) and intention to leave. The results of this research indicated that Saudi nationals perceive management communication is more likely to lead to turnover more than foreign workers. The findings revealed that self-esteem and information seeking mediate the relationship between effective communication and employees’ job outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, engagement, and turnover intention). Results of this research may provide human resource managers especially those working in the hospitality and tourism industries.

Open-Ended Questions

The analysis of the qualitative data was conducted to explore factors that could improve effective communication (RQ1). Results indicated that effective communication factors in Saudi hospitality and tourism industry were identified clearly by hotel employees. This finding supports Gong’s (2008) conclusion that the hospitality and tourism industry is one of the spheres that faces the greatest challenges of intercultural communication. This is partly because, as Grobelna (2015) points out, intercultural communication does not only refer to the interactions between the employees and their clients, it also covers many communication concerns that arise between managers and the
rest of the staff, and due to the seasonal nature of the work, hospitality and tourism establishments often use the services of contingent workers who may come from abroad.

In addition, Jameson (2007) explains multiculturalism in this industry by the ongoing growth of the influence of globalization. Overall, the qualitative part of the questionnaire showed that the respondents fully understood and acknowledged the challenges of communication between people of diverse cultural backgrounds. Moreover, the participants knew how to deal with these challenges, including what to do and what not to do when encountering people from different cultures. Their answers demonstrated awareness of the importance of understanding, mindfulness, inclusion, keeping an open mind, and showing respect to the traditions and background of the others. Managing a culturally diverse workforce is definitely a challenging and complicated task. Devine, Baum, and Hearns (2009) emphasize that the differences may be both visible (e.g., ethnicity) and invisible (e.g., religion, language); moreover, the scholars add that age and gender are also aspects of cultural diversity that need to be taken into consideration.

The responses from the participants showed they could name the causes and consequences of ineffective communication and realized how harmful it could be to the workplace environment (RQ1). This result is consistent with findings of previous research (Bell & Roebuck, 2015; Keyton et al., 2013; Lauring, 2011). Namely, the following causes of ineffective behavior were identified: yelling, disrespectful treatment, lack of clear delivery of information, and failure to offer guidance and help. As for the consequences of the ineffective communication, the respondents named absenteeism,
stress, conflict miscommunication of information, and low performance. Goutam (2013) reported very similar causes and outcomes when researching versatile spheres of management and career fields. It was not surprisingly that clarity of the information was the most cited factor identifying effective communication. This finding indicated that the lack of information and knowledge is a major reason misguiding employees. This finding of the research did agree with past literature that clarity and accuracy of content of the information lead to high level of success in multinational organizations (e.g., Downing, 2011; Eichhorn, 2009).

Surprisingly, employees reported speaking loudly and yelling while communicating is one of the fact that named to be ineffective communication. Madlock and Kennedy-Lightsey (2010) pointed out managers’ behaviors such as speaking loudly and verbal aggression are associated with employees’ job satisfaction and the relationship between employees and their supervisors. Managers’ cultural background influence the way how they speak and they can assume it is acceptable to speak in such way. Madlock (2012) provided strong support for the role that cultural congruency plays in managers’ behaviors. Participants specifically addressed the issue of managers’ cultural background and its effect the way how they communicate and deliver information as reflected by one of the employees “It is important to keep an open mind when talking to different people, and not judge them according to your own life experience.” In addition, there was a noticeable indication, which is a lack of educational role in organizations to train employees about others’ culture and backgrounds to take precautions while interactions with multicultural employees.
The findings imply that workers are aware of the problems that need addressing and are willing to work on the solutions to these issues. Some of the most deviant behaviors and withdrawal behaviors were skipping work and low productivity resulted from the challenges of ineffective communication. These results are in accordance with previous literature. Dawson et al. (2011) pointed out communication across cultures at workplace had a strong impact on employees work productivity as the information can be delivered improperly. Moreover, there is a need to know which measures to be taken to eliminate the existing challenges and create a more pleasurable work environment, thus stimulating productive performance.

Finally, as shown by the responses to questions regarding reasons why considering a career in the hospitality and tourism industry, some employees see the lack of effective communication with management as a serious threat to their future career in hospitality. That is why the issues need to be addressed as soon as possible and take into account to improve the Saudi hospitality and tourism industry. More answers were indicated by Saudi employees are that managers’ arrogance and work hours are the major reasons affecting their career. Idris (2007) indicated the managers’ cultural background and attitudes are strong barriers to Saudi employees. Additionally, long workhours duties were cited (Mellahi, 2007). This finding indicated that the private sector in Saudi Arabia still employ workers on the maximum work hours compared to public sector, which Saudi employees perceive the employment in the private sector is undesired. On the other hand, foreign workers reported education as the major reason hinder their career. This finding is supported by Chuang’s (2010) study. The majority of the participants
were holding an associate degree, thus academic advancement is required for promotions and managerial positions.

**Comparison Between Saudi Nationals and Foreign Workers**

According to the data, Saudi nationals showed greater mean scores than foreign workers for the item “To what extent do management communication barriers (or ineffective feedback) make you want to leave your job” (RQ2; H1). This result may possibly suggest that Saudi nationals perceive management communication as a more likely reason to leave their job, and that is consistent with the findings of previous studies examining possible reasons why Saudis leave their jobs (Iqbal, 2010; Sadi & Henderson, 2005). The above phenomenon can be explained by Alshanbri et al. (2015), which led to the finding that the work environment in Saudi organizations is not conducive to effective managerial communication or proper feedback to employees. Meanwhile, an assessment of employees’ background information in terms of communication and information-seeking behaviors in multicultural settings revealed that foreign workers perceive their conversations with managers as more effective than Saudi nationals do. Previous research suggests that effective employee-manager conversations can reduce employee turnover (Al-Jabri, 1996; Tran, 2016). In addition, if employees are satisfied with the communication and the amount of information they are receiving from their managers, low turnover intentions can be perceived (Bhuian & Al-Jabri, 1996). One of the ways in which managers can achieve effective communication is through the provision of clear information (i.e., sending messages, receiving messages, and information feedback), along with demonstrating a high level of respect for employees. In response to open-
ended questions regarding effective communication factors (RQ1), it is important to impart information clearly and directly, and to make sure that there are no misunderstandings and that everyone is clear about the employees’ duties. In this study, information clarity alone was not the sole reason to affect managers’ communication effectiveness; employees’ psychological emotions were also found to be a major factor. Specifically, it was stated that managers should show respect when communicating, as failure to do this may affect employees’ emotions. Managers act as an information resource for employees by sharing knowledge with them and offering guidance. Thus, it is important for managers to focus on the psychological aspects of communication, so that clear information can be delivered and better relationships established with employees. Disrespecting employees, speaking inappropriately loudly, or yelling at employees is harmful and is unlikely to lead to the communication of information. Conversely, politeness has been found to be helpful in promoting comfort and a healthier working environment, which may also address poor relationships between coworkers. Poor relationships lead to less communication, meaning that information gets lost and people do their work less efficiently.

**Effective Communication and Job Satisfaction**

The results of a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses indicated that effective communication positively influences employees’ job satisfaction (RQ3; H2). This is consistent with the research of Dawson, Madera, Neal, and Chen (2014). Employees in the field of hospitality and tourism who perceived effective communication as a predictor of job satisfaction, were found to have a high level of self-esteem and
likely to engage in direct information-seeking behavior. Previous studies suggest that strong and positive supervisor-employee relationships can increase job satisfaction (Lam, Huang & Snape, 2007; Volmer, Niessen, Spurk, Linz, & Abele, 2011). As suggested in Lam, Huang, and Snape (2007) research, both conversational effectiveness and direct information seeking can be used to explain employees’ behavior and supervisor-employee relationships. According to the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory, employees who seek information directly and perceive that their direct supervisors communicate effectively tend to be favored in-group members (Ilies et al., 2007).

In-group members typically experience a higher level of job satisfaction than out-group members. According to Lunenburg (2010), in-group member “work within the leader’s inner circle of communication” as they given more attention and responsibilities by the leader (p.1). Whereas, out-group member works outside the leader’s inner communication and treated with formal rules and policies (Lunenburg, 2010).

In the current research, direct information seeking and self-esteem were treated as one controlling block, so that the impact of effective communication on employees’ job satisfaction could be determined. However, employees who were found to seek information indirectly did not appear to have any predictive power regarding job satisfaction. In addition, the influence of direct information seeking and effective communication on job satisfaction can be explained by the job characteristics theory (JCT). The JCT implies that a job’s characteristics affect employees’ job outcomes. Feedback is one of the five job characteristics derived from the theory, and this is an area in which direct information seeking and effective communication provide employees
with the necessary information to perform their duties smoothly. In response to open-ended questions (RQ1), employees identified that such clarity is important in the provision of clear and direct information, and in the prevention of misunderstandings to ensure that everyone is clear about their duties. Employees also added that positive feedback could improve relationships between workers and managers.

**Effective Communication and Job Engagement**

The results of the current study indicate that perceived effective communication can predict job engagement (RQ3; H3), and this was consistent with the findings of previous research (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Walther, 1992). In particular, the results of the regression analysis showed that self-esteem and direct information seeking were strong controlling variables predicting the impact of effective communication on job engagement. Levels of self-esteem and information-seeking avoidance can be determined by numerous factors (Mauno, Kinnunen & Ruokolainen, 2007). Previous studies have attributed employees’ low self-esteem and information-seeking avoidance to emotional and psychological factors (Keyton et al., 2013). The job engagement scale used in the current study measures engagement based on three psychological conditions, namely, meaningfulness, psychological safety, and availability.

The open-ended questions demonstrate that speaking inappropriately loudly or yelling at people is harmful and can rarely be followed up with effective information exchange, which is likely to impact employees’ emotions. This finding supports those of previous studies (Keyton et al., 2013). Also, employees indicated that managers’ lack of attention to their requests for help was at variance with the purpose of the job
engagement scale, as managers’ availability to provide feedback, address employees’ concerns, and support their progress influences employees’ engagement in the organization and vice versa.

**Effective Communication and Job Turnover Intention**

The results of this study indicate that effective communication can predict turnover intention behavior in employees (RQ3; H4), and this finding supports that of previous research (Kim & Lee, 2009). When employees experience ineffective communication, they are likely to exhibit greater intention to leave their jobs (De Vries, 1992). Sager et al. (2015) pointed out that ineffective communication by managers is perceived to be a common issue facing organizations with regard to retaining their employees. Specifically, the results of this research highlighted that Saudi national employees’ mean scores showed they were more likely to quit their jobs because of ineffective communication. Previous studies have shown similar findings (Iqpal, 2010). In this study, the Saudi nationals responded to different communication factors that aimed to assess their perceptions of effective communication.

When asked to what extent ineffective communication by managers would increase the likelihood that they would leave their jobs, 32.3% of the participating employees indicated that such ineffective communication would likely cause them to leave their jobs. In this context, the Saudi employees mentioned managers’ egos, their own work hours, and lack of opportunities for promotion as having the most impact on their decision to leave their jobs. On the other hand, foreign workers perceived lack of education, stereotypes, self-doubt about their career, and lack of recognition in their
organization as having a greater impact on their career path. These findings, along with the results from existing literature discussed above, were the main reasons behind the high turnover level of Saudi employees. Also, Saudi employees typically ranked work issues, such as being ignored and not being respected, as being serious enough to make them leave an organization.

Comparing the qualitative and quantitative results indicated that effective communication is a serious issue affecting employees’ intention to leave. Employees are the most valuable asset of organization. Ineffective supervisory communication can cost Saudi organizations replacing employees. Also, Saudi hospitality and tourism organizations face difficulties maintaining a stable workforce. The results of this study show that the relationship between managers and employees is a critical relationship as it influences employee’s decision to leave their jobs. Therefore, hospitality and tourism organizations are recommended to foster leader and member relationship and implement strategies to share information in order to provide a healthy workplace.

**Implications**

More effort is needed from human resources to encourage or reinforce a change in attitude among managers to promote effective communication. The respondents had suggestions as to the practices that could help eliminate ineffective communication. In particular, they named the timely provision of feedback, respectful treatment of the workers, clear and comprehensive delivery of information, and accessible help and guidance on the part of the managers. In order to maintain effective intercultural communication, managers advised to communicate simply. Even though English is
considered to be the first international language, many employees learned it as a second language which are limited more than native speakers. It is also important for managers to learn more than language if they are working abroad.

Based on these findings, managers are recommended to make the following adjustments in their treatment of the workers: (a) provide better guidance and help to the workers (especially new ones); (b) be more available for assistance, offer help, and inquire if the workers are facing any difficulties; (c) provide feedback on staff’s performance regularly; (d) avoid yelling at workers, getting annoyed, and using a disrespectful tone; and (e) establish clear communication (explain rules in a comprehensive manner, repeat and clarify if needed, perhaps create a leaflet with FAQs and tips, provide employee handbooks, and use reminders).

To increase employee engagement and reduce turnover intention, managers are recommended to meet the employees half way and practice mutual understanding and support by means of establishing friendly and trustworthy relations. Namely, the findings show that workers suffer from exclusion and feel underappreciated by managers, so the following changes are essential: (a) more frequent communication with employees (for example, discussions of important work-related issues and allowing the workers to contribute to solutions and offer ideas); (b) provision of appraisal for good performance and advice instead of criticism when the performance is low; and (c) daily interactions with the employees to minimize the division between managers and the rest of the staff.

Managers are encouraged to identify employees’ perceived barriers so that they can provide career assistance to employees by asking them directly in order to tackle the
reasons that impede their career interests in the hospitality and tourism industry. Saudi employees raised a concern regarding to their work hours as a major barrier, thus managers should take into considerations the commuting time and family obligations to the Saudi nationals as they are not provided with housing comparable to foreign workers. In addition, organizations are in need to create personal development plans for both national and foreigner employees within the context of career, education, and self-improvement to fulfil employees’ needs, and help them with reaching their professional goals in the hospitality and tourism industry.

**Limitations**

Due to the design of this research, this study has some limitations. The main significant limitation is the sample size for this research, which was small due to extremely strict organizational policies. Most Saudi organizations where the data set was collected from the city of Riyadh prevented employees from participating in this study because permission had to be gained from the human resource department. Thus, the number of participants gained from snowball sampling is very small. Also, the small sample size is attributed to some organizations’ decision that they were willing to distribute as few as two or three surveys or no more than 20 surveys in their organization.

Furthermore, the sample size and the quality of the scales used (e.g., turnover intention scale and conversational effectiveness) could be the cause for low reliability value and no significant results found to answer the proposed hypotheses. In addition, it could be also the participants included in this study perceived these scales differently from the original intent. The quality of the scales might have been affected by one of the
instruments (e.g., turnover intention) as it only contained four items, which might be the reason for the low Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of the scale. The scale should be modified and include additional items for future research. The turnover intention scale fell below the .70, that is the recommended level for social science research. Polit and Lake indicated that: “with multiple predictors, it is unusual to find $R^2$ that is not significantly different from .00. Moreover, $R^2$ could be significant, yet very imprecise, especially if the sample size is small” (2009, p. 240).

The used a Likert scale for all measurements can be biased due to self-rating, which can be noted when comparing the qualitative and quantitative results. Participants’ responses varied in the qualitative analysis where they indicated there are managerial communication issues, whereas the quantitative results showed no significant relationship. This research investigated participants’ behavior and attitudes, which may require participants’ honest responses. As indicated by Kim, Kim, Carlson, and Carlson (2016), hospitality employees tend to have a higher level of agreement ratings between employees and supervisors because this “is associated with higher levels of leader-member exchange (LMX)” (p. 721). Thus, participants may under-report their behaviors.

Given the nature of the work environment in Saudi Arabia, the vast majority of the participants were male employees. This may have produced a less representative sample for female employees. Future studies should investigate females’ perceptions about work related to their career. In addition, the estimated time to complete the questionnaire ranged from 15 minutes to 20 minutes, which might have led to additional
error or variance in the results for those who took a longer time to complete it as a result of concentration loss.

Generalizing results of this study might be limited due to sample size and data collection from one city. Considering different major cities in Saudi Arabia for data collection will provide better understanding of communication problems affecting the homogeneity of culturally diverse workforce that negatively reduce achievement of organizational goals in the hospitality and tourism industry. In addition, collecting data from different cities can predict more precisely the relationship between multicultural workforce attitudes and behavior and effective communication. Even with those mentioned limitations, this study is significant due to the fact that it predicted significant results indicating the relationship between effective communication and employees’ behaviors and attitudes. Also, the study shed the light on communication factors influencing managerial effective communication in the Saudi hospitality and tourism industry.

Future Research

This study was intended to be an important step towards paving the way for future research on effective communication in multicultural settings and employees’ job outcomes in the Saudi hospitality and tourism industry. Since many results in this study indicated that effective communication, self-esteem, and information seeking were important to employees’ job outcomes, further research can include other determinants such as self-report and self-efficacy measurements. Moreover, further research is needed that evaluates a wider range of employee job outcomes (e.g., commitment) and examines
the role of effective communication in boosting employees’ performance and commitment, as employees indicated in their qualitative answers in that effective communication affects their job performance. Moreover, managers’ perceptions (i.e., trust) toward each surveyed group should be measured to investigate to what degree the relationship between employees and their direct supervisors may influence employees’ job outcomes.

The results of this study indicated that female employees reported interpersonal communication dissatisfaction more often than male employees. However, due to unequal gender sample size, the results of this report removed from this study. Thus, there is a need to examine the interpersonal communication of female employees in their organizations. This study was exploratory and provided preliminary evidence by examining the relationship between effective communication and multicultural employees’ job outcomes.

Future research should be conducted examining effective communication that includes a self-construal scale to measure the strength of an individual’s independent and interdependent cultural differences, which might make it possible to gain a better understanding of the impact of effective communication. In addition, further research is needed to broaden the sample by including hospitality and tourism organizations from different areas in Saudi Arabia.
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Consent Form

Consent Form: “The Relationship between Communication Effectiveness and Multicultural Employees’ Job Outcomes”

I am conducting research within the hospitality and tourism industry that aims to examine the relationship between effective workplace communication and employees’ job outcomes. The information provided will help increase our understanding of managerial communication and its effects on employees’ well-being and how it influences employees’ turnover.

Findings of this research will provide hospitality and tourism educators and practitioners with information regarding the effects of managerial communications and how to enhance effective communication. This information, when applied within a working environment could result in a healthier workplace, thus reducing employee turnover.

There will no professional or personal risks involved as a result of survey participation. Please submit the complete survey by Thursday, October 20, 2016. The survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. The information collected is for academic research and individual answers will not be shared with anyone including your employers. To provide managers within the Hospitality and Tourism Industry, a completed response is sincerely appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the survey and want to know more about this research, please feel free to contact me at aaltokha@kent.edu, or Dr. Chuang at nchuang@kent.edu. This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about your rights as a participant or complaints about the research you may call the IRB at (001) 330. 672. 2704.

Thank you very much for your support and completion of the survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Abdulelah Al-Tokhais  
Graduate Student  
Hospitality & Tourism Management  
Kent State University  
330-906-2959  
aaltokha@kent.edu

Ning-Kuang Chuang, Ph.D., CHE  
Associate Professor  
Hospitality Management  
Kent State University  
330-672-2303  
nchuang@kent.edu
Appendix B

Questionnaire

Please answer every question to the best of your knowledge by filling in the blank or checking the correct response. Thank you for your participation in the study.

Section A.

I. Think about communication at workplace (or when you communicate with your managers in your organization), please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am taken seriously.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am trusted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can make a difference.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am valuable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am helpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I count around here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am cooperative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is faith in me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am efficient.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Please circle the response that best reflects the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very little extent</th>
<th>Little extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Through my nonverbal behavior, I would hint to my supervisor or coworker that I would like to know this information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would ask questions about the subject in such a way that they would not sound like questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would let my supervisor or coworker know indirectly that I would like to know the information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would indicate curiosity about the topic without directly asking for the information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct information-seeking

1. I ask my supervisor if I am meeting all my job requirements.
2. I ask my supervisor how I am doing.            
   | Very little extent | Little extent | Some extent | Great extent | Very great extent |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
3. I would ask specific, straight to the point questions to get information I wanted.  
   | Very little extent | Little extent | Some extent | Great extent | Very great extent |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
4. I would identify what I did not know and ask for the information.  
   | Very little extent | Little extent | Some extent | Great extent | Very great extent |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
5. I would go directly to my supervisor or coworker and ask for information about the matter.  
   | Very little extent | Little extent | Some extent | Great extent | Very great extent |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
6. I would not beat around the bush in asking for information.  
   | Very little extent | Little extent | Some extent | Great extent | Very great extent |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

III. Please circle the response that best reflects the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am generally satisfied with my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am satisfied with my personal growth and development in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I’m satisfied with my work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I’m satisfied with my pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I’m satisfied with the amount of job security I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I’m very satisfied with my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Please circle the response that best reflects the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is someone at work who encourages my development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At work, my opinions seem to count.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The mission or purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My associates or fellow employees are committed to doing quality work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have a best friend at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In the last six months, someone at work has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
talked to me about my progress.

12. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.

V. Please circle the response that best reflects the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you think of quitting your present organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How long do you intend to remain in this organization?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would you prefer another ideal job than the one you work in?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How frequently are you applying for jobs in other organizations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Please circle the response that best reflects the following statements when you communicate with your managers regarding to work-related conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The conversations between my supervisor and me are very beneficial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The conversations between my supervisor and me are useless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Usually the conversations between my supervisor and me are advantageous.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor conversations are ineffective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor conversations are unprofitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My supervisor is a smooth conversationalist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I get what I want out of the conversations between my supervisor and me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I achieve everything I hope to achieve in the conversations with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sometimes, I do not know what is going on in the conversation with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am uncomfortable throughout the conversations with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Effective communication- Please circle or answer the best

1. Think if you are working in a multicultural settings, please indicate the level of agreement with the following statements.
1. It is necessary to change one’s behavior when interacting with persons from other cultures.

2. It is necessary to prepare in advance when one is away from the host country.

3. Does mindfulness play an important role when communicating with people from other cultures.

4. Do you think cultural diversity in teams is a major cause of anxiety and uncertainty?


6. It is important to be flexible and open minded when placed in a multicultural environment.

7. Do you think non-verbal communication is important in multicultural settings.

8. It is important to learn the language when operating in other cultures.

2. Name three words when mentioning about “effective communication?”

3. What do you consider as ineffective communications?

4. Name one or two scenarios of effective communication and ineffective communication in multicultural situations. 

5. What precautions must be kept in mind when interacting with people from other cultures?

6. Name three deviant or withdrawal behaviors that might arise due to management’s ineffective communication/feedback or communication barriers. (Examples of deviant behaviors such as low morale, absenteeism, lower productivity, not committed to the company, make fun of others ethnicity, religious, or race at work, low level of citizenship behavior, etc.)

7. To what extend do you perceive that working under supervision by someone from different ethnic group? 

8. To what extent is your understanding of intercultural communication?
Section C: Demographic and Background Information

1. Please indicate your gender: ___ Male / ___ Female
2. What is your age? ______
3. What is your marital status?
   ___ A. Never married ___ B. Married without Children ___ C. Married with Children
   ___ D. Divorced without Children ___ E. Divorced with Children ___ F Separated
   ___ G. Widowed ___ H. Other
4. What is the highest educational degree earned?
   ___ A. Elementary ___ B. Junior middle school ___ C. High school ___ D. Associate degree
   ___ E. Bachelor’s degree ___ F. Master’s degree ___ G. Doctoral degree
4. What is your race/ethnicity (place check mark)? ___ Saudi / ___ Middle-Eastern /
   ___ African / ___ Indian / ___ Asian / ___ European / ___ Other, please specify ______
6. What is your job title? ___________________
7. How long have you worked at your current company? ________ years
8. How long have you worked in the tourism or hospitality industry? __________ years
9. In what segment of the tourism industry are you currently employed (or have you had employment in the past)?
   ___ A. Lodging and other Accommodation
   ___ B. Restaurants and other Food Service
   ___ C. Clubs (Private and Public)
   ___ D. Travel-Related Business (including Attractions)
   ___ E. Others, please specify: _______________
   ___ F. Not employed in the hospitality/tourism industry, please specify: _____________
10. What is the star rating of your hotel?
    ___ A. One star hotel
    ___ B. Two star hotel
    ___ C. Three star hotel
    ___ D. Four star hotel
    ___ E. Five star hotel
    ___ F. N/A
11. The size of the hotel you are currently employed? __________ guestrooms, __________ employees
12. On average, how many hours do you work per week?
    A. Less than 40 hours   B. 41 to 50 hours   C. 51 to 60 hours   D. More than 60 hours, please specify_______
13. How many years of experience do you have as a manager? _________ years
14. How many employees do you currently supervised?
    ___ A. 0-5     ___ B. 6-10     ___ C. 11-15     ___ D. 16-20
    ___ E. More than 20, please specify_________
15-1. Please indicate the major reason(s) why you consider a career in the hospitality/tourism industry?
15-2. Please indicate the reason(s) why you plan “not” to work in the hospitality/tourism industry in the future:
16. To what extend do you perceive that you are working much harder than a Saudi employee and that you are being paid significantly less?


17. Do you see any barriers stand in your way in your career path? Please specify the top barriers and circle the extent you feel those obstacles and barriers hinder your career (or satisfaction, engagement, motivation, performance, or overall wellbeing) in the industry?

(Examples of career barriers such as lack of motivation, lack of recognition, stress, burnout, lack of support, self doubt, financial problems, fear of change, pressure by family and friends, work/family conflict, gender related stereotypes, public image, etc.)

       _______  1. Not at all influential  2. Slightly influential  3. Somewhat influential

       _______  1. Not at all influential  2. Slightly influential  3. Somewhat influential

       _______  1. Not at all influential  2. Slightly influential  3. Somewhat influential

        4. Very influential  5. Extremely influential

       _______  1. Not at all influential  2. Slightly influential  3. Somewhat influential

        4. Very influential  5. Extremely influential

       _______  1. Not at all influential  2. Slightly influential  3. Somewhat influential

        4. Very influential  5. Extremely influential

18. To what extent you perceive the interpersonal communication in the organization


       __5. Very satisfied

19. Do you perceive any communication problem existed in your department /company /organization.


       __5. Serious problem. Please specify the problem(s): ____________________________

19. Does supervisor’s communication affect your job performance?


       __5. Major effect problem

20. To what extend do you perceive the appropriateness of the communication/feedback from your middle management.

       __1. Absolutely inappropriate  __2. Inappropriate  __3. Slightly inappropriate


21. Compared to other managerial functions, how do you view managerial communication in your department/company/organization.

       __1. Not at all important  __2. Low importance  __3. Slightly Important  __4. Neutral

       __5. Moderate important  __6. Very important  __7. Extremely important

22. To what extent the management communication barrier (or ineffective feedback) will make you want to leave the job?


       __5. Extremely likely

23. Name three things that should be carried out by management to solve the communication barriers which you feel those methods would improve your satisfaction, engagement, motivation, performance or overall wellbeing?
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