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Abstract:
The purpose of this study is to examine the hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management, MTN Nigeria Limited, Lagos and Benin City branch was adopted as the case study. Three research questions and hypotheses were raised to solve the research problem. Descriptive survey technique using quantitative analysis method was adopted as the research design. The population of study comprises of the full-time employees of MTN Nigeria Limited from Lagos and Benin City branch and 123 respondents were randomly selected for the study. The instrument for data collection is the carefully structure questionnaire. Findings revealed that hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder; hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder; and hierarchical communication differences does significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management. The study however recommended that supervision of concerned stakeholders in the communication system should be taken seriously; managers should ensure a good negotiation with the stakeholders that will offers a practicable solution; and there should be proper consideration of necessary indicators by the stakeholders before critical decisions are made.
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1. Introduction
Largely, shareholder management is vital to the attainment or collapse of a task (Aaltonen & Kujala, 2010). Nonetheless, it is imperative for stakeholders to be identified at the commencement of the tasks by acknowledging and seeing to their requirements in addition to their anticipation; as this will promote the creation of the right conditions and act as a stimulus for the success of the undertaking (Aaltonen & Kujala, 2010). Investor management may well be accomplished via the setting up of suitable and apt communication medium which addresses the needs of shareholders. This entails offering administrators the needed data as well as getting response to guarantee a sequence between task objectives and investor prospects. As stated by Olander & Landin (2015) investor management remains one out of the many dynamics with the ability to upsurge the success level of the task (Project Management Institute, 2017). Additionally, a study carried out in the United Kingdom comprising 150 project managers drawn from eight various firms revealed that shareholders’ concerns remain the leading measure for project accomplishment (Collins & Baccarini, 2004). Each single undertaking is made up of various interests, with owners of these interests referred to as project investors (Johansen, Elk-Andresen & Ekambaram, 2014). Nevertheless, for the success of a project to be guaranteed, it is crucial to recognize major investors at the commencement of the venture and design a shareholder’s roster which will be operated all through the lifespan of the venture (Johansen, Elk-Andresen & Ekambaram, 2014). This roster will hold data and relevant info regarding investors and assist to prioritize them; prioritizing is essential since it is impractical to dedicate equivalent time and attention to the entire investors. The input and role of investor management in the processes and activities involved in executing projects in Africa cannot be overstated; as they envisage the notion, devise project proposals, carry out the designs, take tactical decisions, and so on. Thus, seeing to their needs and anticipations is key to the success of any project (Beringer, Jonas & Kock, 2013). Project management activities play a major part in diverse sectors and firms. Project management is advocated to be a strategic administrative element which drives novelty, transforms vision into actuality and creates value.

Survival of firms in evolving markets such as Nigeria is oftentimes associated with unrestricted access to beneficial resources within the management of shareholders (Amaeshi, 2017). Investor management is a developed area of knowledge vital for management of projects. Chinuyo & Olomolaiye, (2010) disclosed that awareness and information on investor management is fundamental to organizations nowadays. In spite of this, investor management remains effectual once there is actual communication for effective team administration (Ekung, 2013c). Movement of timely and accurate data, in a well-structured way ensures the efficiency of the project crew and these procedures begin to yield in due course such that it positively influences the outcome of the project (Ekung, 2013c). Amongst several factors that determine project aftermaths, significant and dominant stakeholder traits and more essentially, their thoughtfulness in addition to efficient deployment and management are pinpointed as the basis of project accomplishment (Idoro, Iyagba & Odusami, 2017).
Lately, hierarchical communication variances have increasingly played a key role in firms with regards to organizational interaction and team work (Bourne & Walker, 2015). Everybody is constantly communicating, irrespective of their gender, economic status, age, religious affiliation, or ethnicity; this is due to the fact that humans possess the capability to interact with one another in their own way with the aid of communication devices (Bourne & Walker, 2015). By means of categorized communication, people can interrelate and associate in an establishment given that the firm requires communication in order to restructure their undertakings based on a pecking order (Cavaliere & Lombardi, 2015). Graded communication variances in the establishment normally enue in an official establishment whereby interaction within the firm make up the sending process, whilst the entire organizational missive may be received by the official and unofficial groups within the firm (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2012).

Classified communication variances have over time turn out to be adept at enhancing organization-wide data gathering and exchange of knowledge devoid of being conditioned by geographic and departmental confines (Ivancevich, Matteson & Konopaske, 2015). These interaction and alliance activities are to a certain extent made official, subject however to the kind of establishment. In a constitutional or conventional establishment, the difference in communication hierarchy may be quite stringent; whereas in a network-oriented firm, official roles appear owing to the allocated assignments (Diefenbach&Sillince, 2011). Whatever the circumstance, official managerial pecking order remains a fundamental and prevalent organizational attribute. The tiered communication variances allotted by official tasks and classified ranks, profoundly impact social interaction, leading to the buildup of network constructs thus influencing the manner by which personnel interact and work together (Knowlton & Berger, 2017).

Communication tiered variances together with specified superior team members, predominantly comprising of business or system analysts and top managerial staff, interrelate with customers in an attempt to understand and delineate the three major limitations to the communication variances (Owalabi, 2014). As soon as the key determining factors of any task are deciphered, they are shared with the team directly in charge of executing the project as much as pertinent, with respect to the part played by each team participant. The chief supervisor is usually the project manager who is in charge of the complete supervision and overseeing of communication and interactions from its commencement to the end.

Stakeholder communication management is vital at the onset and in due course as the project progresses, since it concurrently deals with hierarchy communication variances within the project crew (Zhao, 2010). Thus, efficiency in the management of stakeholder communication is crucial for the attaining success in executing the project. It remains widely acknowledged that the stakeholder agreement and fulfillment is attained via effective communication (Ajla, 2016). Pragmatic stakeholder anticipations may be identified via efficient communication practices. Inadequate communication and dearth of stakeholder alliance are amongst the commonest drivers of unintended modification triggers and un-checked change determinants of a project (Zhao, 2010). Building effectual communication procedures amongst stakeholders necessitates significant effort and attentiveness throughout the project planning and development period. These effectual communication practices assist in preserving stakeholders’ confidence and to also keep an eye on the project adjustments in a bid to avert the development of undesirable events (Ojesina, 2019). Based on this aforementioned, this current research is investigating hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Stakeholder management remains a tactical tool which drives innovation in addition to creating value. Yet, there exists shortcomings and difficulties in the cost of international companies, organizations and government fortunes every year owing to hierarchical communication variances (Bakens, Foliente & Jasuja, 2015). Several global developmental projects also end up being issue of monumental failures and huge setbacks owing to ineffectual communication coupled with pitiable stakeholder’s supervision. As opined by Robbins & Jones, (2014) ‘poor stakeholder management or ignorance’ remains one of the major factors responsible for failure of projects. Outcomes show that affairs within the shareholders’ surrounding are largely connected with the stakeholder dominant traits and conducts in addition to their consideration and supervision, which entails in-depth evaluation, expansive know-how, and all-ensnapping management approach, methodology and instruments in a bid to efficiently be evaluated, applied and handled so as to guarantee the well-being of projects and its accomplishment (Ojesina, 2019).

Notwithstanding the import of projects and project management, the astronomical failure rate coupled with difficulties faced remains a main source of anxiety both in the industry and within academic circles. As revealed by the survey conducted by Alen (2014), the major dynamics resulting in effectual stakeholder actions in Africa includes amongst other things contracting a project manager who has great proficiency, apparent assessment of the alternate panaceas; making sure of effectual and actual interaction between the stakeholder and the particular project, laying down mutual project goals and objectives, and then investigating the requirements and anticipations of the stakeholder. With regards to this case, all through the past decade numerous research surveys have examined dynamics which actually resulted in successful project completion. Factors affecting the completion of construction projects were studied by (Peter et al, 2016) in Rwanda. Study findings disclosed that the contract duration of the construction, delivery technique for the project, planning of the project, project funding and scrutiny constitute the main contributors to delays in project execution. It is obvious that the researcher failed to foresee the external stakeholders’ engagement as a factor amongst others capable of giving rise to failure of project. Thus, having reviewed these research studies, only some of them made an attempt to pinpoint stakeholder engagement as one of the main and crucial part of project attainment. It is vital to be aware that no research survey has been carried out on hierarchical communication differences in addition to its impact on stakeholder administration both in the domestic and international setting, nevertheless, this obvious disparity necessitated this research study.
1.2. Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to examine hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management.

The specific objectives are:
- To analyze the impact of hierarchical communication differences in monitoring the concerns of stakeholder.
- To find out the effect of hierarchical communication differences in negotiating with stakeholder.
- To find out the effect of hierarchical communication differences on decision making in stakeholder management.

1.3. Research Questions

- What is the impact of hierarchical communication differences in monitoring the concerns of stakeholder?
- What is the effect of hierarchical communication differences in negotiating with stakeholder?
- What is the effect of hierarchical communication differences on decision making in stakeholder management?

1.4. Hypotheses

- H01: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder
- H02: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder
- H03: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management

1.5. Significance of the Study

- The outcome of this study will enlighten government, policy makers, stakeholders and the general public on hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management.
- The findings from this study will constitute a basis for future research and also contribute to the body of knowledge since it will be used as empirical literature.
- Outcome of this study will also be a guide for policy formulation both at national and state level.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study will include hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management. It will additionally encompass matters spanning between 2013 to 2017.

1.7. Operational Definition of Terms

- Hierarchy: this denotes a practice whereby members of an organization or society are categorized based on comparative position or authority.
- Hierarchical communication: is described as information sharing in addition to the impacts on members of the establishment, owing to the fact that there exists some level of participation amongst one and another or in between the workforce and the administrator in proper establishments. Furthermore, it could well be described as a communication construct wherein team members interact and converse with their direct boss and their proximate underlings.
- Stakeholder: may be described as an individual or a group of persons who has shares in a commercial venture. It is also not out of place to delineate it as a party with interest or who expresses an interest in a firm and may either influence or be affected by the business.
- Stakeholder management: is defined as the methodical recognition, planning, analysis, and the carrying out of actions calculated to engage with relevant stakeholders.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This section presents the appraisal of related studies that are considered relevant to the variables under study. It is divided into conceptual framework, theoretical framework and empirical review. Concept of hierarchy, hierarchical communication, hierarchical communication differences, concept of Stakeholder, stakeholder management and hierarchical communication in stakeholder management were appraised within the conceptual framework. Stakeholder Theory was adopted as the theoretical foundation for this study. Critical appraisal of relevant literature on the subject under study was also carried out.

2.2. Conceptual Review

2.2.1. Concept of Hierarchy

Hierarchy remains the organization of a particular set of people into levels or positions or levels. It is possible to have multiple hierarchies (owing largely to the measurement taxonomy or sorting-system), wherein certain dimension echelons are ignored in a bid to even-out the configuration (Zhao, 2017). Also, hierarchy may well be an organization of things (names, objects, categories, values, etc.) wherein these objects may be signified as being ‘above’, ‘below’, or ‘at similar echelon as’ each other. Hierarchy, remains a quite significant notion in a broad range of disciplines, like
organizational theory, philosophy, computer science, mathematics, systems theory, in addition to the social sciences particularly in political philosophy.

A hierarchy is capable of connecting things together both directly or indirectly, and either diagonally or vertically. The sole direct nexus existent in a pecking order, as far as it’s hierarchical, is to an individual’s proximate superior or to one of his/her juniors, even though a predominantly hierarchical system may likewise include optional pecking order (Dawkins, 2016). Ranked nexuses may well spread ‘vertically’ downwards or upwards by means of numerous links in the same course, following a track. Every single aspect of the pecking order not vertically linked to each other yet may be ‘horizontally’ connected via a course by moving up the chain of command in search of a collective direct or indirect boss, and then down all over again. This is similar to the instance of two colleagues or co-workers; wherein each relates to same boss, however have same comparative level of influence. Organizational constructs which are equally alternate and correspond to hierarchy exists. Majority of hierarchies adopt a more particular vocabulary relevant to their field, but the notion behind them remains constant (Simon, 2012). For instance, objects are regarded as nodes, bosses termed parents whilst juniors are referred to as children in the setting of data structures; whereas in a business environment, a superior remains the supervisor or manager while a peer is a co-worker.

The extent to which branching occurs denotes the number of direct juniors or progenies possessed by an object (in graph theory, equal to the number of other vertices linked via outgoing curves, in a directed graph) a node has (Simon, 2012). Hierarchies may be classified according to the ‘maximum degree’, i.e. the topmost degree extant within the entire system. Thus, classification in this manner gives rise to two extensive categories; branching and linear.

The highest obtainable degree in a linear hierarchy is 1. That is to say, the entire objects can be seen in a line-up, with every single object barring the topmost and bottommost ones having precisely one exact underling and one exact boss (Zhao, 2017). It is noteworthy that this does not refer to the levels but denotes the objects; and each hierarchy possesses this attribute with regard to levels, however, generally every single level may possess an immeasurable number of objects. An example of a linear hierarchy is the hierarchy of life.

Within a branching pecking order, one or more objects possess a degree of two or more, therefore the least degree is two or greater. In most instances, as seen with many persons, the term ‘hierarchy’ instinctively bring to mind a picture of a branching pecking order (Douglas, 2012). Branching pecking orders are extant in several systems, as well as establishments and categorization structures. The wide-ranging classification of branching pecking orders may be additionally split with respect to the degree. A branching hierarchy, wherein the maximal degree moves towards infinity, that is, has an extensive span is termed a flat hierarchy (Douglas, 2012). Routinely, systems instinctively considered as hierarchical at most has a medium span. Hence, a flat hierarchy is usually not regarded as a hierarchy whatsoever. For instance, graphite and diamonds are flat hierarchies of countless carbon atoms which may be additionally disintegrated into subatomic bits.

A branching hierarchy wherein at least each object possesses two parent objects is termed an overlapping hierarchy (Lehmann, 2016). For instance, a graduate student may be assigned two co-supervisors to whom he/she equally and directly reports to, with these co-supervisors having equivalent levels of influence within the university chain of command (that is they possess equivalent rank or span status). Typically, a hierarchy is described as a pyramid, wherein each level’s height signifies that level’s rank and then the breadth of each level denotes the number of objects on that level comparative to the entire pyramid. For instance, few executives of a corporation could be at the top, and the bottom could consist of thousands of persons with no underlings.

Characteristically, these pyramids are outlined pictorially with a triangle or tree drawing (however, it is worthy of note that not every pyramid or triangle diagrams are hierarchical; for instance, the 1992 USDA food guide pyramid), with both serving as a means of highlighting the differences in size amongst these levels. The illustration of hierarchies within an establishment is termed an organizational chart, and is portrayed in tree form in establishments.

In recent times, since computers have permitted the navigation and storage of increasingly larger data groups, a variety of approaches have been advanced in a bid to symbolize hierarchies in such a manner that makes more effective utilization of obtainable space on a computer monitor (Lane, 2016), and instances of these comprises of Radial Trees, Fractal Maps, and Tree Maps. In the design aspect, chiefly graphics design, content formatting and successful layouts on paper are greatly reliant on the statues of visual hierarchy. Visual hierarchy is also imperative in an attempt to achieve suitable arrangement of files on computers.

An instance of visually representing hierarchy is via the Nested clusters. The Nested cluster denotes hierarchical associations by utilizing tiers of info. The child component lies inside the parent component, as seen in a Venn diagram. This arrangement of representing hierarchy remains the most effectual in demonstrating modest relationships. For instance, when leading a person to access a file on a computer desktop, one may first lead them towards the major folder, then the subfolders inside the major folder. This implies they will continue to open files inside the folders till the indicated file is found.

The stair arrangement denotes hierarchical associations via the utilization of visual stacking. Visually picture the top of a downward staircase which begins at the left and descends on the right (Lane, 2016). The child components are in the bottom direction of the stairs whilst the parent components sit on the top. This particular structure is quite effective when denoting more intricate hierarchies wherein steps are not positioned in apparent successions. Additional steps are often obscured except the entire steps are shown in succession. In the instance of the computer desktop, a highly sought-after file may only be retrieved as soon as another file is opened, and the link to the required file lies inside a different document. All these steps must of necessity be taken till the ultimate aim is achieved.

Arithmetically, in its most common form, a hierarchy denotes a partly ordered set or poset, and the structure in this scenario is the complete poset, made up of components. Inside this arrangement, every single component shares a
distinct definite attribute (Kopisch & Günther, 2012). Items having the same property value are clustered together, with each of the ensuing levels referred to as a class.

‘Hierarchy’ is specifically employed when referring to a poset which has its classes well-structured with regards to cumulative intricacy. Functions such as addition, division, subtraction, and multiplication are usually implemented in a particular order or sequence. Mostly, subtraction and addition functions are carried out after division and multiplication have been already employed for solving a problem (Kopisch & Günther, 2012). Also, the usage of parenthesis is one of the ways of representing hierarchy, since they reveal which procedure is to be completed first prior to the ensuing ones. However, once the parentheses are put, it implies that one should understand and realize that the functions inside the parentheses must first be done afore continuing on with the rest of the problem. These conventions are generally prevailing in algebraic problems, particularly the ones which usually comprise of a number of steps to resolve. The application of hierarchy in arithmetic is useful and advantageous in swiftly and effectively solving a problem devoid of going through the long process of gradually dissecting the problem. A good number of these rules are now recognized as the suitable way of solving specified equations.

Similarly, a hierarchical arrangement of nested groups is referred to as nested hierarchy or inclusion hierarchy. This notion of nesting is typified in the Russian matryoshka dolls. Individual doll is embodied by another doll, all the way through to the external doll. The external doll accommodates all of the inner dolls; while the subsequent external doll contains all the residual inner dolls, etc. Matryoshkas signifies a nested hierarchy wherein every single echelon has just an item, i.e., there is just one of each doll size; a comprehensive nested pecking order gives room for numerous items within levels but with every object having just a parent at every echelon (Parsons, 2012). Also, a square may always be described as a shape, quadrilateral, or polygon, in this sense, it is a hierarchy. Conversely, considering the set of polygons with respect to this ordering, a square can solely be a quadrilateral; and under no circumstances can it be a triangle, or hexagon, etc.

Classifications may frequently change (as often seen in biological taxonomy), however, the fundamental notion of nested pyramids is constantly the same. In several programming taxonomies and syntax prototypes alongside fractals in mathematics, nested pyramids, as well as Russian dolls, are as well utilized for illustrating the attributes of self-similarity and recursion. Recursion itself is encompassed as a subgroup of hierarchical programming; in addition, recursive thinking may well be the same with a form of hierarchical logic and thinking (Parsons, 2012). A common instance of a containment hierarchy is depicted in class inheritance in object-oriented programming.

The two forms of containment pyramids include the compositional containment hierarchy and the subsumptive containment hierarchy. The subsumptive pecking order ‘subsumes’ its children, whereas a compositional hierarchy is ‘composed’ of its children. Additionally, a hierarchy may well be subsumptive and compositional at the same time. In subsumptive containment hierarchy, groups of objects are categorized from the wide-ranging to the exact. This hierarchical type is also referred to with other names such as ‘taxonomic hierarchy’ and ‘IS-A hierarchy’. The last term depicts the relationship between respective levels—a lower-level object ‘is a’ component of the upper set (Kopisch & Günther, 2012). The taxonomic arrangement delineated directly above is a subsumptive containment pecking order. Again, exploiting the instance of Linnaean taxonomy, it is quite apparent that an object which is part of the Mammalia level ‘is a’ component of the level Animalia; more particularly, a human ‘is a’ primate, and a primate ‘is a’ mammal, et cetera. The subsumptive pecking order may also be exactly defined as a pyramid of ‘concepts’. For instance, with the Linnaean pyramid delineated above, an entity’s designation such as Animalia remains a way to classify all the species which corresponds to the notion of an animal (Lane, 2016).

The compositional containment pyramid remains an organization of the components which make up a structure and this structure is ‘comprised’ of these components; and majority of engineered structures, regardless of it being artificial or natural, may be broken down in this way. The compositional hierarchy encountered by every single individual at one moment or the other is the hierarchy of life (Kopisch & Günther, 2012). Each and every individual may be abridged to organ systems; which are basically made up of organs; essentially consisting of tissues; which in turn are made up of cells; that are composed of molecules; invariably comprising atoms. As a matter of fact, the last two levels pertain to all matter, in any case, at the macroscopic scale; besides, every single one of these levels take over all the attributes of their ‘children’.

In this specific instance, there also exists up-and-coming attributes whose purposes may not be apparent at the lower level (for example, intellect is not an attribute of neurons but is exclusively of the brain; for a scalar quantity also, molecules are larger than atoms, cells are larger than molecules, and so on). These concepts both generally occur in compositional pyramids, but they generally are not a required conventional attribute. The hierarchies at this level are typified by a bi-directional causation. Upward causation includes lower-level objects causing some attributes of a higher-level entity; children objects may interrelate to bring about parent objects, and parents are made up to some extent by their children. On the other hand, downward causation denotes the impact that the integration of item x into a higher-level object may bear on x’s attributes and communications. In addition, the objects seen at each level are independent.

Kulish, (2002), stated that nearly every single organizational system applicable to the world is hierarchically ordered. Going by their conventional meanings, every country has a government and this government is often hierarchical. Socio-economic schemes are classified into a societal hierarchy (a social stratification of civilizations), plus every systematic classification system (taxonomy) are hierarchical. Majority of ordered religions, notwithstanding their inner administrative arrangements, function as a hierarchy under God. Several Christian denominations run an autoccephalous ecclesiastical hierarchy of leadership. Similarly, families are also regarded as a hierarchical arrangement with regards to cousinship (for instance, first cousin once removed, second cousin, and so on), lineage (as portrayed in a family tree) and legacy (heirship and succession). The whole rudiments of an accomplished life and existence can be structured by applying
Maslow's hierarchy of human desires. Knowledge acquisition must always follow a hierarchical system—in a bid to learn differential equations, one must start by learning calculus; in an attempt to learn calculus, one must of necessity first study basic algebra; and so, on and so forth. Nature itself even possesses its own unique hierarchies, which various systems like the biomass pyramids, Linnaean taxonomy, and the organization of lifeforms, make effort to authenticate. Hierarchies are so imbued into daily living such that they are regarded as inconsequential (Lane, 2016).

Although, the above cited instances are usually visibly illustrated in a hierarchical manner and remain standard instances, hierarchies occur in various systems wherein this branching arrangement is not instantaneously obvious. For instance, majority of postal code schemes are hierarchical. In the case of the Canadian postal code system for instance, the top echelon's requisite notion is the 'postal district', and is made up of 18 entities (letters). The subsequent level downwards is the 'zone', wherein the entities are the digits 0–9 (zero to nine). This remains an instance of overlying hierarchy, since every single one of these 10 entities has 18 parents. This hierarchy further continues downward to produce, in theory, 7,200,000 distinctive codes of the format A0A 0A0 (the second and third letter positions permit 20 entities each).

Majority of library categorization schemes are also hierarchical. The Dewey Decimal System is viewed as markedly ranked owing to the fact that there is no fixed bound on the total amount of digits that can be used after the decimal point. Organizations may be arranged as a dominance hierarchy. Within an organizational pyramid, a single individual or group is existent which often yields the most authority and influence, with each next level signifying a lesser clout. Majority of organizations are ordered in this way, encompassing governments, organized religions, firms, and the militia. The groups or individuals within an establishment are represented hierarchically on an organizational diagram (Lane, 2016).

Hierarchical communication variances have increasingly played a key role in firms with regards to organizational interaction and team work (Bourne & Walker, 2015). Everybody is constantly communicating, irrespective of their gender, economic status, age, religious affiliation, or ethnicity; this is due to the fact that humans possess the capability to interact with one another in their own way with the aid of communication devices (Bourne & Walker, 2015). By means of categorized communication, people can interrelate and associate in an establishment given that the firm requires communication in order to restructure their undertakings based on a pecking order (Cavaliere & Lombardi, 2015). Graded communication variances in the establishment normally ensue in an official establishment whereby interaction within the firm make up the sending process, whilst the entire organizational missive may be received by the official and unofficial groups within the firm (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2012).

Classified communication variances have over time turn out to be adept at enhancing organization-wide data gathering and exchange of knowledge devoid of being conditioned by geographic and departmental confines (Ivancevich, Matteson & Konopaske, 2015). These interaction and alliance activities are to a certain extent made official, subject however to the kind of establishment. In a constitutional or conventional establishment, the difference in communication hierarchy may be quite stringent; whereas in a network-oriented firm, official roles appear owing to the allocated assignments (Diefenbach & Sillince, 2011). Whatever the circumstance, official managerial pecking order remains a fundamental and prevalent organizational attribute. The layered communication variances allotted by official tasks and classified ranks, profoundly impact social interaction, leading to the buildup of network constructs thus influencing the manner by which personnel interact and work together (Knowlton & Berger, 2017).

Communication tiered variances together with specified superior team members, predominantly comprising of business or system analysts and top managerial staff, interrelate with customers in an attempt to understand and delineate the three major limitations to the communication variances (Owalabi, 2014). As soon as the key determining factors of any task are deciphered, they are shared with the team directly in charge of executing the project as much as pertinent, with respect to the part played by each team participant. The chief supervisor is usually the project manager who is in charge of the complete supervision and overseeing of communication and interactions from its commencement to the end.

Stakeholder communication management is vital at the onset and in due course as the project progresses, since it concurrently deals with hierarchy communication variances within the project crew (Zhao, 2010). Thus, efficiency in the management of stakeholder communication is crucial for the attaining success in executing the project. It remains widely acknowledged that the stakeholder agreement and fulfillment is attained via effective communication (Ajila, 2016). Pragmatic stakeholder anticipations may be identified via efficient communication practices. Inadequate communication and dearth of stakeholder alliance are amongst the commonest drivers of unintended modification triggers and un-checked change determinants of a project (Zhao, 2010). Building effectual communication procedures amongst stakeholders necessitates significant effort and attentiveness throughout the project planning and development period. These effectual communication practices assist in preserving stakeholders’ confidence and to also keep an eye on the project adjustments in a bid to avert the development of undesirable events (Ojesina, 2019).

In a reverse hierarchy, the theoretical order of authority is turned upside-down, such that the peak is at the bottom and the pedestal is at the top. This approach exemplifies the notion that members of the upper levels are accountable for the members of the lesser class.

2.2.2. Hierarchical Communication

Hierarchical communication is described as the exchange of information and authority between the members of an organization, since there is some form of interaction between team members or between personnel and the manager in a formal organization. It may also be described as a communication arrangement wherein members interact with their direct superiors and their proximate underlings (Simon, 2017). A hierarchical communication within an establishment is
an organizational configuration in which each object within the organization, excepting one, is junior to a distinct other object. This structure is a type of hierarchy.

In an establishment, the pecking order normally comprises of a singular or group of influence at the apex with succeeding levels of authority below them. More often than not, this remains the prevailing type of organization amongst big corporations; most organizations, organized religions, criminal organizations, and governments are hierarchical establishments with various levels of governance, influence or control (Simon, 2017). For instance, the extensive, top-level general idea of the over-all configuration of the Catholic Church comprises of the Pope, followed by the Cardinals, then the Archbishops, et cetera.

Administrators and executives often provide five types of information via interactions with the workforce, such as job directives, job motives, organizational practices and procedures, performance feedback, plus the indoctrination of organizational objectives. Apart from these, personnel may pass across certain information about themselves to the director and other co-workers such as their challenges, organizational policies and practices, what needs to be done and how to go about it.

Team members of hierarchically structured enterprises mostly interact with their direct superiors and proximate underlings. Arranging firms in this manner is partly advantageous and beneficial since it is capable of diminishing communication overhead by restricting the flow of information (Miller, 2018). The hierarchy communication procedure involves the approach adopted in sending missives to the recipient in a bid to generate a significant equation amid the donor and receiver’s info. This communication process purposes to produce an effectual communication (in keeping with the goal of communication at large).

In keeping with the notion of hierarchy, communication may also drift sideways or vertically. The vertical aspect is split into two courses, which is upwards and downwards. Communication which moves from one level of a set or establishment to a lower level is downward communication. Descending communication prototypes are utilized by executives to interact with their personnel. Also, this type of communication is adopted by leaders and team leaders for the purpose of defining goals, giving work directives, informing staff about procedures and policies, pointing out challenges which demands immediate attention, in addition to providing performance feedback (Miller, 2018). Oftentimes, this communication model does not automatically occur as a form of oral or heads-on exchange, such as by dispatch or electronic mail.

Ascending communication models attain a higher level in groups or establishments and it is a communication model employed for the purpose of giving upward feedback. It is a communication model that keeps executives cognizant of how personnel regard their jobs, their contemporaries, and the organization at large (Richard, 2016). Administrators and executives also depend on this communication model in order to gain facts for refining things. For instance, a statement of monetary operations prepared by the lower management staff for appraisal by mid-level and top management, the suggestion box, a review of personnel behavior, the deliberations amongst bosses and juniors, in addition to unofficial ’criticism’ periods wherein staff possesses the capability to pinpoint and talk over challenges with the person in charge or assistant from the top-most managerial level (Richard, 2016). The sideways communication system happens whenever interaction takes place amongst membership of the same workgroup, amid members of the team at the same level, amongst executives at the same rank, or between personnel who exist in the similar way horizontally.

Whilst horizontal communication is usually carried out in a bid to save time and expedite proficiency, sideways interaction has official authorization. This interaction system is unofficially crafted in a bid to evade the erect hierarchy and expedite action (Terry, 2018). Sideways communication on the side of management could be bad or good and close conformity with an official upright arrangement for the entire interactions is capable of hampering the effectiveness and exactness of information transmission, hence, sideways interaction prototypes may be beneficial. In some instances, this interaction takes place with the expertise and backing of superiors, however, in contrast, it may further generate a flawed dispute wherein this vertical medium violates regulations, in instances when the members of the team pass to their bosses any info on tasks to be carried out, or sometimes when the supervisor, realizes that certain actions are taken or decisions made without his/her knowledge (Athanasoglou, Brissimis & Delis, 2018).

A hierarchy is characteristically envisaged as a pyramid, wherein the altitude of the ranking or individual represents their authority status and the breadth of that level signifying just how many persons or corporate categories are present at that echelon compared to the total. The topmost class comprise individuals who are at the peak, and there are quite a few of them; whereas, the bottom may comprise of thousands of individuals with no underlings. These chains of command are characteristically represented by a triangle or tree figure, thus producing an organizational chart or organogram (Terry, 2018). Individuals closest to the zenith hold more influence than persons proximate to the base, and there exists lesser people at the summit than at the base. Consequently, higher-ups in a pecking order largely have bigger status and commands larger compensations than their juniors. Every single government and majority of firms possess related constructs. Conventionally, the monarch remained the peak of the state, however, in several nations, manorialism plus subjugation paved way for an official communal configuration which founded hierarchical relations at each societal echelon, such that the monarch sits at the top.

In contemporary post-feudal nations, the titular peak of the hierarchy nonetheless remains the head of state; an individual who may be a constitutional monarch or the president, even though in several modern-day federations, the authority of the head of state is allotted amongst diverse entities (Bain, 2015). Further down the head, there exists generally a senate, congress, or parliament, which in rank usually assigns the everyday administration of the nation to a prime minister. As seen in several democracies, the citizens are regarded as the theoretical peak of the hierarchy, right above the head of state; however, in actuality, the citizen’s influence is limited to balloting at the polls.
With regards to business, the entrepreneur conventionally seats on the pinnacle of the enterprise. As seen in most contemporary big firms, nowadays, there is no longer a sole foremost stakeholder, and the combined influence and control of the business proprietors is largely delegated to a board of executives, who in turn assigns the everyday operations of the firm to a Chief Executive Officer or a managing director. Once again, even though the investors of the firm make up the nominal zenith of the hierarchy, in actuality several corporations are managed nonetheless partly as private fiefdoms by their management; while corporate governance regulations remain an effort at mitigating this inclination (Blair & Placone, 2018).

Hierarchical reasoning and hierarchies have over time been critiqued by several persons, including Susan McClary in addition to a political philosophy strongly against hierarchical structuring; anarchism. Hierarchy remains the most frequently propositioned substitute for hierarchy and this has been blended with answerable independence by Gerard Fairtlough in his research work on Triarchy concept. The most advantageous facet of a hierarchical establishment is the obvious control that is instituted. In spite of this though, hierarchy may be disassembled by abuse of authority. In the middle of perpetual advancements in information and communication technologies (ICTs), hierarchical dominance structures are granted access to bigger decision-making liberty for citizens and more adaptable delineations of job undertakings. This novel approach to work poses a confront to existent organizational customs, and this is evident as certain research surveys have contrasted the conventional organizational norms against clusters functioning as cyber communities which are exemplified by individual drive coupled with the gratification of liberty to make one's individual choices (Boone & Weigand, 2018). In as much as the entire echelons of an establishment has right to use communication and information through digital medium, power configurations arrange further as a hierarchy, thus facilitating the flow of authority and power to be founded not just on hierarchical echelons, but also on information, credibility, trust, with an emphasis on outcomes.

With regards to communication, a command hierarchy denotes a group of persons who execute orders as issued by other people's powers inside the group. It may be regarded as a segment of a power structure, wherein it is often regarded as the most susceptible and also the most influential portion (Boone & Weigand, 2018). With respect to the military, the pecking order remains the line of authority and obligation down which orders are given within a military unit and also amongst various divisions. Simply put, this chain of command is the sequence of leaders through which this command is affected and implemented. Directives are handed down this chain of command, from a superior in charge, such as a commissioned officer, to a lesser-classified underling(s) who either personally carry out the directive or pass it down the chain of command as applicable, till it is gotten by those who are to implement it. 'Command is often exerted by virtue of the office in addition to the unique task of members of the Armed Forces holding military rank and are qualified for exerting authority'.

Generally, military officers issue orders solely to ranks directly underneath them in the pecking order and also take orders solely from ranks directly over them. A service member who is experiencing some difficulty in carrying out an order or performing a task and pleads for respite directly from an officer just one step above his direct commanding officer in the chain of command, is highly likely to be punished for disrespecting the chain of command. In the same way, an officer is normally supposed to issue directives solely to his or her direct underling(s), even if it is just to hand down an order to another officer much lower in the chain of command than the particular underling (Akhwanzada&Tahar, 2012).

The notion of chain of command also suggests that being a high-ranking officer alone does not give the higher-ranking official the right to issue directives to just anyone of lesser ranking. For instance, an officer in unit ‘A’ is not supposed to directly issue orders to lesser-ranking officers of unit ‘B’, and he is mostly expected to speak to an officer of unit ‘B’ if he so expects an action to be carried out by members of that unit. The pecking order implies that specific members will only receive directives from just a superior and solely issue directives to a distinct group of individuals directly beneath them.

Thus, if a unit ‘A’ officer directly issues command to a lesser-ranked member of unit ‘B’, it would be regarded as quite strange (a kind of gaffe, or an odd situation, for instance a time deficit or failure to consult with the commanding officer of unit ‘B’) as the officer ‘A’ will be perceived as undermining the powers of the officer in charge of unit ‘B’. Contingent on the conditions or the customary practices of the military organization, the lesser-ranked member being commanded may opt to execute the directive nevertheless, or advise that the directive has to be cleared first with his or her own chain of command, which in this case, clearance would be gotten from officer in charge of unit ‘B’. This is owing to the fact that refusal to execute a directive is practically always regarded as mutiny, with the sole exception being if the directive issued was in itself unlawful (implying that the officer executing the issued directive would be breaching the law).

Additionally, within combat units, line officers make up the chain of command, whereas staff officers in various specialist disciplines (like medical, legal, dental, chaplaincy and supplies) are not part of the chain of command, except within their respective specialties (Balci, 2014). For instance, a medical officer in an infantry battalion would be obligated and accountable for the combat medics in that unit, however may be unable to command the battalion or any of its subsidiary units. This term is also applied in the setting of a civilian management delineating analogous hierarchical structures of authority. Structures such as these are encompassed and seen in Police Departments, Fire Departments, and other establishments with a paramilitary power or command configuration (Balci, 2014).

Hierarchy communication construct is regarded in sociology as the most perceptible component of a 'power network'. In this model, social capital is perceived as being activated as a form of response to directives which flow through the chain of command giving rise to the phrase ‘communication and control’. Nevertheless, individuals with such like-minded views usually hold related systemic prejudices since they are from the same culture (Barratt, Choi & Li, 2011).
As a way of addressing these challenges, several contemporary management sciences have fixed on lessening the dependence on hierarchy communication particularly for information movement, seeing as the communication cost is now cheaper, whereas the cost of management blunders is greater. Furthermore, it is much easier to change managers, so a personal interest is developed with greater responsibility distribution and possibly more consensus at decision making activities. The ever-present command and control advances in military establishments, depicts an overview from pyramids to networks which permit the use of chain of command whenever they are suitable, and non-hierarchical networks when deemed unsuitable. This comprises the concept of mission agreement, to support ‘edge in’ in addition to ‘top-down’ movement of purpose (Barratt, Choi & Li, 2011).

2.2.3. Hierarchical Communication Differences

Graded communication variances within an organization's communication systems comprise the study of communications within firms (Chen & Fong, 2013). Information flow could either be official or unofficial. Interpersonal or one-on-one communication amongst persons may be in various modes. This communication may be oral (that is to say, articulated in words), or non-oral as seen with the use of gestures, postures (‘body language’) and facial expressions. Non-verbal communication may even arise from reticence. Habitually, executives do not require answers in order to run a productive business; what they need is questions. Thanks to the advantages of the numerous high-tech electronic communication devices at our disposal today, answers may emanate from anybody, anytime, and anywhere globally. This has transformed the actual managerial task into ascertaining what exactly it is the business must know, in addition to the who, where, what, how and when of understanding it (Balci, 2014). In an attempt to efficiently resolve glitches, grab available opportunities, and attain target goals, managers need to ask questions, since they are the people accountable for the smooth running of the firm as a whole.

In an ideal situation, meanings sent out are the meanings gotten. This is usually the situation whenever the communications relate to things which may well be objectively substantiated. For instance, ‘this piece of pipe fits the threads on the coupling’; in this instance, the recipient of this message may attempt to prove the sender’s words by a real test, if needed (Alkhwanzada & Tahar, 2012). Nevertheless, if the sender’s terminologies express an opinion or a feeling regarding what may not be objectively crosschecked, connotations may turn out to be very vague. This work is too hard’ or ‘Watergate was politically justified’ constitute instances of feelings or opinions which may not be verifiable, hence, they are dependent on clarification and thus to one-sided connotations. The recipient’s backdrop of learning and experience may sufficiently vary from that of the sender such as to give rise to considerably differing views and an appraisal of the subject of discourse, and these differences constitute a major impediment to interactions (Ding et al., 2018).

Non-verbal content always goes along with the voiced content of messages. Speaking about non-verbal interactions, Birdwhistell declared that ‘it is complementary to (meaning ‘adds to’) instead of being redundant with (or repeating of) the verbal attitude’. For instance, if a person were to be discussing about an object’s length, they might stretch out their hands as a way of giving a visual estimation of it, and this is rational and evident in the instance of direct communication. As pointed out by Virginia Satir, folks cannot help but interact symbolically (for instance, via their clothes, possessions or fashion taste) or by means of some kind of body language (Ding et al., 2018). For messages which are transmitted via the phone, through an emissary, or a letter, the circumstance or setting in which the communication is dispatched turns out to be an aspect of its non-verbal communication. For instance, if the firm had been losing funds, and in a message to the production unit, the front office issues a directive on the restructuring of the delivery and receiving divisions, this could be interpreted to imply that certain individuals were in fact going to be dismissed from their duty posts except if it were explicitly made clear that there would be no job losses (Fang & Marle, 2012).

A good number of variables affect communication effectiveness; some of these variables originate within the setting wherein the communication occurs, some are found in the personas of the recipient and the sender, and others in the extant relationship between dispatcher and recipient (Fang & Marle, 2012). These diverse variables put forwards certain challenges arising from communicating with understanding amongst two individuals. The disseminator wishes to frame an idea and pass it across to the recipient. This urge to communicate and interact may stem from his feelings, thoughts or it may have been prompted by certain things in the environment. This communication could also be affected by the existent rapport between the disseminator and the recipient, like differences in their status, a teacher-learner relationship, or a staff-line rapport (Evanoff & Fortier, 2018).

Regardless of its source, information flows through a sequence of filters, both within the disseminator and within the recipient, and this is impacted by various means, before this idea can then be conveyed and reproduced in the recipient’s psyche. Natural capabilities to see, smell, hear, touch and taste differs between individuals, such that the picture of reality could be misrepresented even before the mind begins to work and process the info. Also, in addition to sense or physical filters; cognitive filters, or the manner by which a person’s mind understands the world surrounding him, would most certainly impact his feelings and assumptions (Fang & Marle, 2012). Also, these filters would decipher what the sender of the message states, the manner by which he said it, and with what intent. Filters are resident also in the recipient, generating a twofold intricacy which once spurred Robert Louis Stevenson to declare that human interaction is ‘doubly relative’, seeing as it takes one person to say one thing and another person to determine what he said.

Cognitive and physical, as well as semantic filters (which decimals the meaning of words) come together to make up a part of our memory system which assists us in responding to reality. In this regard, March and Simon compared an individual to a data processing system (Ding et al., 2018). Compartment is an outcome of a communication between an individual’s inner state and environmental spurs. Information acquired through past experiences develops into a register, or database, made up of goals or values, sets of presumptions and expectations regarding the aftermath of behaving in one way or another, as well as diverse possible manner of response to prevailing circumstances. This memory system also
dictates the things we would observe and react to in our surroundings. Simultaneously, environmental stimuli also aid in the determination of what section or portion of the memory system would be galvanized; thus, the memory and the environment constitute a communicating system which instigates our conduct (Akhwanzada & Tahar, 2012). As this communicating system reacts to novel experiences, fresh knowledge acquisition occurs which not only feeds back into the memory but also progressively alters its content. This is the process by which individuals acclimatize to a rapidly changing world.

Formal and informal communications channels are utilized in an organization. Communication moving via formal routes is downward, upward and horizontal whereas communications flowing through the informal medium are usually labeled as gossip (Teixeira, Koufteros & Peng, 2012). Informal communication, which is often linked with horizontal, interpersonal communication, was chiefly perceived as a potential barrier to efficient organizational performance. However, this is no longer the scenario as informal communication has now become more crucial in ensuring the effectual execution of tasks in modern-day firms.

Grapevine remains a haphazard, off the record mode of informal communication. It sweeps rapidly across an establishment with access to personal clarification in form of gossip, single-strand messages, and rumors (Swink & Song, 2017). Grapevine communication is fast and typically more open compared to formal communication. An employee who gets most of the grapevine information and refuses to pass it on to others persons is regarded as a dead-end. Any worker who receives lower than half of the grapevine data is termed an isolate. Grapevine may contain disparaging miscommunication, yet this may also be useful as it allows for the expression of feelings, in addition to boosting employee productivity.

Top-down approach: This is otherwise known as downward communication. It is an approach often employed by the upper level management in handing down important information to the lower levels in the establishment (Teixeira, Koufteros & Peng, 2012), and this method is applied in the implementation of policies, guidelines, and so on. With regards to this form of organizational communication, misrepresentation of the real information ensues, and this could further be made active via responses.

According to Shockley-Zalabak, the functional convention remains ‘a means of understanding organizational communication through the description of what the messages do and how they flow within the organization’. There exist various functions within this process which all work in unison, in a bid to play a part in advancing the overall achievements of the organization, and these roles crop up in the course of the recurrence of various communication patterns which the members of the organization take part in (Swink & Song, 2017). The first categories of functions are message functions and these include ‘the role played by communication and/or how it contributes to the overall running of the organization’, and these message functions are delineated in three differing classifications which include change functions, relationship functions and organizational functions.

Organizational functions as stated by Shockley-Zalabak, are ‘messages which create the rules and regulations of a specified environment’. These messages may include objects such as handbooks or newsletters for a particular organization, available for people to study and learn the strategies and prospects for a particular firm. Relationship functions are ‘communication which aid people in defining their part in addition to evaluating the congruity of personal and organizational goals’. Thus, these relationship functions make up a significant portion with regards to how people associate with a firm and in turn helps them foster their sense of belonging which has the propensity to profoundly impact on their quality of work (Paulraj & Chen, 2017). The third and last subgroup within message functions are change functions, and this is delineated as ‘messages which aid firms and businesses in adapting to what they do and how they do it’. Change messages takes place in diverse choice making decisions, and they are vital to meeting the needs of the employee in addition to recording success with persistent adaptations within the establishment.

2.2.4. Concept of Stakeholder

In an organization, a stakeholder is a member of groups, without whose backing the organization may find it difficult to survive, as described in the first use of the term in a 1963 internal memo at the Stanford Research Institute (Freeman & Reed, 2013). This theory was subsequently advanced and advocated by R. Edward Freeman in the 1980s, and since then it has garnered widespread recognition in business practice and in theorizing relative to tactical management, corporate governance, corporate social responsibility (CSR), and business purpose. The definition of corporate responsibilities via a categorization of shareholders to be considered has been critiqued as initiating a fake contradiction between the ‘shareholder model’ and the ‘stakeholders’ model’ or a false similarity of the responsibilities towards shareholders as well as other parties who have expressed interest (Alen, 2014).

An individual, group of persons or organization expressing interest or concern with regards to an organization is termed a stakeholder, and these stakeholders may impact or be influenced by the firm’s activities, policies and objectives. Certain instances of major stakeholders include creditors, proprietors (shareholders), directors, government (and its agencies), employees, unions, suppliers, as well as the environment from which the enterprise gets its resources. Not all stakeholders are at par, for instance a firm’s clients are entitled to reasonable market routines however, they are not entitled to the same consideration being the company’s workforce (Frémond, 2018).

Stakeholders in a firm include the persons and constituencies which give, whether willingly or reluctantly, to the organization’s wealth-generating capability and undertakings, and thus remain its possible beneficiaries and/or risk takers’. This description varies from the previous definition of the chosen shareholder in Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 2013) which similar comprises of contenders as the shareholders of a firm. Robert Allen Phillips offers a moral ground for stakeholder theory in Stakeholder Theory and Organizational Ethics. Here he defends a ‘standard of stakeholder impartiality’ according to the work of John Rawls; coupled with a difference between derivative normative legitimate and
stakeholders. Real stakeholders, branded stakeholders; real stakeholders with a genuine stake, the devoted associates who makes effort to gain mutual advantage. Stakeholders own and deserve a claim in the organization. Stakeholder reciprocity could be a pioneering standard in the corporate governance argument as to who ought to be given recognition on the panel. Corporate social responsibility also ought to denote corporate stakeholder obligation (Frémond, 2018).

Whichever action is taken by any group or organization is capable of affecting those individuals who are connected to them in the private sector. For instance, these comprises of parents, children, proprietors, clients, staff, partners, suppliers, contractors, associates, as well as people who are related in one way or another or even situated close by. Key stakeholders are typically internal stakeholders, and they consist of those people who involve in monetary dealings with the enterprise (for instance investors, clients, contractors, employees, and creditors). Secondary stakeholders are normally external stakeholders, and even though they are not directly engaged in straightforward financial transactions with the firm – they are also affected by or retain the capacity to affect the firm’s activities (for instance, the general public, activist groups, communities, media, and business support groups). Stakeholders who are excluded include persons such as children or the neutral public, since initially they have no economic impact whatsoever on commercial activities (Heath, 2016). Even now as the notion assumes an anthropocentric viewpoint, and certain groups such as the general public are identified as stakeholders, others remain excepted. Such a standpoint does not permit animals, plants, or even geology to have a voice as stakeholders, but just an instrumental value with regards to individuals and/or human groups.

A tight mapping of a firm’s shareholders may categorize the following stakeholders which encompasses; communities, employees, creditors, shareholders, investors, proprietors, government, clients, managers, and financiers (Heath, 2016). An expansive mapping of a firm’s stakeholders may also comprise of; suppliers, government regulatory agencies, professional bodies, distributors, labor unions, NGOs and other advocacy groups, government legislative bodies, industry trade groups, government tax-collecting agencies, competitors, prospective customers, prospective employees, local communities, media research centers, national communities, and the public at large (global community), schools, and future generations analysts.

In the corporate governance discipline as well as corporate accountability, the ongoing debate is centered around if the organization or firm should be operated chiefly for stockholders (shareholders), stakeholders, clients, or others (Carroll, 2019). Advocates in accordance with stakeholders may center their viewpoint on these ensuing four major declarations;

Value may best be produced by attempting to make the best use of shared after-effects. For instance, in line with this thinking, programs which is capable of satisfying both employee needs and stockholders’ wants are twice as valuable since they focus on two valid sets of stakeholders at the same time. Furthermore, there is indication to show that the collective impacts of such a strategy are not merely additive but also multiplicative. For example, by dealing with customer wishes as well as employee and stockholder interests at the same time, both of the latter two groups will also profit from upsurge in sales (Lin, 2018). Adherents also have issues with the outstanding roles handed to investors by several business intellectuals, particularly in times past. The bone of contention is that debt holders, suppliers, and employees also contribute to the firm and thus take certain risks in building a successful organization.

These regulative debates would have mattered diminutively assuming shareholders (stockholders) had total influence in managing the enterprise. In spite of this, several people are of the belief that owing to certain kinds of board of director’s make-ups, top-level managers such as Chief Executive Officers are predominantly in charge of the organization (Certo&Certo, 2015). The greatest value a company has is its brand and image, and by making efforts to satisfy the needs and wants of various individuals ranging from the local inhabitants and clients to their very own employees and proprietors, firms can avert any form of damage to their image and brand, forestall the loss of large amounts of sales and displeased clients, as well as avoid expensive legal expenditures (Shiller, 2013). Whilst the stakeholder standpoint has a bigger cost, several organizations have decided that the idea enhances their reputation, upsurge sales, diminishes the risks of liability for corporate laxity, and makes them less probable to be the target of pressure groups, NGOs and advocacy groups.

A corporate stakeholder has the capacity to affect or be affected by the activities of a business as a whole. Although shareholders are often the group with the most straightforward and perceptible interest at stake in making business decisions, they are just one of the numerous subcategories of stakeholders, seeing as clients and personnel similarly hold stakes in the result (Shiller, 2013). In the most developed sense of stakeholders with respect to actual corporate accountability, the bearers of externalities are involved in stakeholder-ship.

In the latter decades of the 20th century, the term ‘stakeholder’ became more frequently applied to imply an individual or enterprise who expresses a genuine interest in an entity or a project. With respect to the discourse on the decision-making processes for establishments together with big commercial companies, governmental agencies, and non-profit bodies—the idea has been expanded in order to encompass everyone who has an interest (or ‘stake’) in what the firm does (Lin, 2018). This comprises not just vendors, clients or employees, but also members of the host community wherein its workplaces or industrial plant may disturb the domestic economy or atmosphere. In view of this, a ‘stakeholder’ comprises of not just the trustees or directors on its governing board (who in the traditional sense of the word are indeed stakeholders) but also the entire individuals who bought into the figurative stake and the people to whom it may be ‘paid out’ (with respect to a ‘payoff’ in game theory, indicating the consequence of the business deal). Thus, in an attempt to effectively involve a group of stakeholders, the firm’s management must of necessity be conscious of the stakeholders, recognize their expectations and wants, comprehend their behavior (neutral, supportive, or opposed), as well as be able to give precedence to the members of the entire community in order to target the firm’s sparse resources on the most important stakeholders (Certo&Certo, 2015).
For instance, in the event of a professional landlord carrying out the renovation of certain rented apartments which is occupied even while the work is being done, major stakeholders would then be the residents, neighbors (who views the work as a nuisance), as well as the tenancy-management team and maintenance team contracted by the landlord. Other relevant stakeholders would be financiers and the design-and-construction crew (Carroll, 2019). To this end, bearers of respective distinct interest types in the body’s dealings are referred to as a constituency, thus there may exist a constituency of stockholders, a constituency of contiguous property holders, a constituency of banks the entity is owing money, et cetera. In this context, ‘constituent’ stands as a synonym for ‘stakeholder’.

In an ideal situation, meanings sent out are the meanings gotten. This is usually the situation whenever the communications relate to things which may well be objectively substantiated. For instance, ‘this piece of pipe fits the threads on the coupling’; in this instance, the recipient of this message may attempt to prove the sender’s words by a real test, if needed (Ahkwanzada & Tahar, 2012). Nevertheless, if the sender’s terminologies express an opinion or a feeling regarding what may not be objectively crosschecked, connotations may turn out to be very vague. ‘This work is too hard’ or ‘Watergate was politically justified’ constitute instances of feelings or opinions which may not be verifiable, hence, they are dependent on clarification and thus to one-sided connotations. The recipient’s backdrop of learning and experience may sufficiently vary from that of the sender such as to give rise to considerably differing views and an appraisal of the subject of discourse, and these differences constitute a major impediment to interactions (Ding et al., 2018).

Non-verbal content always goes along with the voiced content of messages. Speaking about non-verbal interactions, Birdwhistell declared that ‘it is complementary to (meaning ‘adds to’) instead of being redundant with (or repeating of) the verbal attitude’. For instance, if a person were to be discussing about an object’s length, they might stretch out their hands as a way of giving a visual estimation of it, and this is rational and evident in the instance of direct communication. As pointed out by Virginia Satir, folks cannot help but interact symbolically (for instance, via their clothes, possessions or fashion taste) or by means of some kind of body language (Ding et al., 2018). For messages which are transmitted via the phone, through an emissary, or a letter, the circumstance or setting in which the communication is dispatched turns out to be an aspect of its non-verbal content. For instance, if the firm had been losing funds, and in a message to the production unit, the front office issues a directive on the restructuring of the delivery and receiving divisions, this could be interpreted to imply that certain individuals were in fact going to be dismissed from their duty posts except if it were explicitly made clear that there would be no job losses (Fang & Marle, 2012).

2.2.5. Stakeholder Management

Stakeholder management involves business administration, resolution of dispute, decision making processes, environmental health sciences, project management, and industrial ecology (Aaltonem, 2013). Stakeholder management is the procedures involved in the assessment of a system as well as the likely changes it may undergo as it relates to pertinent and concerned groups (stakeholders). This information is often employed in evaluating just how the interests of those stakeholders ought to be handled in a project policy, program, plan, or other actions (Aaltonem, 2013). Stakeholder scrutiny makes up a crucial aspect of stakeholder management. In the handling of an issue by adopting the stakeholder management approach, steps have to be taken to weigh and balance the entire contending requests made from a company by every single individual or groups who have a claim on it, in an attempt to work out the firm’s responsibility in a specified instance. A stakeholder management does not rule out the stakeholder’s interests while disregarding the interests of other affected stakeholders, rather, it ensures that all the people affected will be taken into account. Stakeholder management is commonly utilized in the preparatory stage of a project in order to evaluate the stance of the stakeholders with regards to the prospective modifications. Stakeholder analysis may be carried out once or on a regular basis so as to keep track of the noticeable changes in stakeholder attitude over a period of time (Assudani, 2010).

In project execution, stakeholder management is ‘the lasting development of relationships with stakeholders solely for the aim of attaining a positive and productive project outcome’. Given that a project may be regarded as a momentary alliance between stakeholders with the view to creating something together, inputs from this robust alliance of supportive and high ranking stakeholders are vital to the successful implementation of a project and it is the duty of the project crew to ensure such input and participation via effective management of the stakeholders (Bourne, 2015). In reality, stakeholder management is thus all about advancing the support of, and managing the anticipations of, important stakeholders such that they can give their input to the project in a way that will be beneficial as required. Indeed, several research studies have indicated that project ‘failure is profoundly linked to stakeholder’s view of project value and their rapport with the project crew’.

Furthermore, project teams largely presume that supportive stakeholders who may be presumed to be more compatible with the project needs rather than stakeholders who are in some level of opposition. This makes the recognition and management of unsupportive stakeholders, with greater authority and impact over the project space, a critical demand for successful stakeholder management (Boyden, 2012). Stakeholder management remains a key aspect to the successful execution of any project, programme or activity (Assudani, 2010). A stakeholder is any person, group or establishment that can affect, or be affected by, or perceives itself to be affected by a programme. In short, the stakeholder management encompasses four steps which comprise: recognition, identification and acknowledgement of stakeholder; this determines the impact and interest of stakeholder; it also establishes communication management strategy, and lastly, it engages and impacts on the stakeholder. Stakeholders may be both firms and individuals, who eventually must communicate with people.

Within the marketing field, it is thought that clients remain one of the most significant stakeholders for managing its long-standing values, as well as a firm’s main goal being the management of client gratification at all costs (Doloi, 2011). It is a well-known fact that any given enterprise will have numerous stakeholders comprising, but not restricted to,
clienteles, suppliers, employees, shareholders, et cetera. It is possible to map out these stakeholders on an Interest or Power Grid, and also classify them according to their interest and power. Also, numerous other instruments exist for mapping out stakeholders and also how to impact them, for instance, a superior is expected to possess a greater influence and power with regards to the projects within an organization as well as high interest. For clarification purposes, one's family may show great interest in an individual, however they are very much unlikely to have power over him or her.

Stakeholder management attempts to engender positive interactions with stakeholders via the proper management of their agreed objectives and expectations. Furthermore, stakeholder management is a set of procedures and control measures which must be strategic and directed by fundamental values (Gerard, 2010). Within businesses, enterprises, and/or projects, stakeholder management formulates a tactic by making use of data (or intelligence) garnered in the course of following everyday processes. As part of stakeholder management approach, a stakeholder register is employed in the description of who (personal or group) is imparted by a project, as well as their influence and bearing on the project. Ideally, this is finalized early in the project in a bid to make certain the appropriate engagement of stakeholders (Eskerod, 2013). Register sources for the stakeholder management processes comprises of project charter, project sponsors, project business case, senior leadership, subject matter experts as well as analysis or research.

Additionally, stakeholder management is also the detection, appraisal, and risk prioritization (as described in ISO 31000 to be the impact of ambiguity on objectives) which is followed by an organized and careful use of resources in an attempt to monitor, control, and minimize the likelihood or effect of disastrous events whilst maximizing available opportunities (Smith, 2014). Risks may arise from numerous sources such as financial markets uncertainties, natural causes and disasters, credit risk, accidents, pressures from project failures (which may manifest at any stage in the plan, development, creation, or sustenance of life-cycles), premeditated assault from a rival, incidents of uncertain or unpredictable root-cause as well as legal liabilities (Wong, 2019). Basically, there are two major types of occurrences i.e. negative occurrences which could be categorized as risks whereas positive occurrences are regarded as opportunities. An assortment of risk management measures has been crafted by different bodies, such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Project Management Institute, ISO standards in addition to actuarial societies. Approach, objectives and delineations widely vary with respect to whether the risk management technique is within the perspective of project management, industrial processes, security, actuarial appraisals, engineering, public health and safety or financial portfolios (Yang, 2015).

Threat management strategies (ambiguities with negative aftermaths) typically comprise efforts tailored towards evading the threat, diminishing the negative effect or likelihood of the threat, reassigning all or some part of the risk to another party, in addition to also holding on to some or all of the actual or potential aftermaths of a specific threat, coupled with the reverse for opportunities (uncertain future circumstances with advantages). Some risk management ideals have been critiqued for lacking a quantifiable improvement on risk, while the confidence in approximates and choices appears to surge (Wong, 2019). For instance, a study discovered that one in six Information Technology projects were 'black swans' with enormous overruns (cost overruns were around 200%, while schedule overruns were 70%).

In stakeholder management, communication is the methodical preparation, execution, supervision, and review of the entire communication channels inside an establishment, and amongst firms; likewise, it involves the arrangement and propagation of new communication dictates linked with an organization, communications technology, or network (Flyvbjerg, 2013). Parts of communications management comprises the development of official communication policies, devising internal and external communications edicts, as well as overseeing information flow together with online communication.

A modest and well-known communication technique is termed the weekly reportage approach: each worker puts together an e-mail report, once a week, comprising info about their accomplishments in the previous week, their plans for the next week, plus any other facts considered important to the larger group, keeping in mind considerations regarding length (Boyden, 2012). These reports are forwarded to supervisors, who review, abridge and report back to their own bosses, ultimately resulting in an all-inclusive brief headed by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), which is then forwarded to the board of directors. The CEO then dispatches the board’s summation back down the chain of command, wherein the respective managers can affix additional notes or brief before passing it to their staff. In due course, each worker will get a lengthy e-mail, encompassing several or the whole of the afore-mentioned sum-ups, at every management level; and going through the whole outcome is seldom a necessity (Bourne, 2015). Nonetheless, ambitious and/or curious employees are regarded as more likely to study the result; while task-oriented personnel, may not.

2.2.6 Hierarchical Communication in Stakeholder Management

A project stakeholder is a person or group 'who is capable of affecting or is influenced by' the project outcomes (Freeman, 2017). The role of stakeholders as influential participants is all-inclusive, but also complicated as well, thus, the proper management of stakeholders’ prospects is significant for each project and also in the change management course (Bourne & Walker, 2015). Stakeholder communication is key; however, it is not enough to only notify stakeholders about project modifications (Davis, 2016). In view of this, the author's viewpoint is that stakeholder input and contributions must be encouraged (and facilitated) all through the change management process, starting from identifying the change. This management process ought to ensure the timely distribution of messages as well as learning about expectations; however, it is somewhat difficult in actuality to attain with prevalent ineffectual communication procedures, and this in turn calls for a focus on integrative and people-oriented aspects of project traditions (Zuo et al., 2019). Communication which is effective activates the stakeholder's coordinating abilities towards the integration of their anticipations such as to ensure high quality job delivery as well as handling changes to project at optimal cost and on time. Basically, it implies that
active communication practices must result in last minute stakeholder agreement with respect to required already identified or future changes.

It is widely known that most of the project manager's time is expended in interacting with stakeholders. For instance, Ahuja et al. (2019) conducted a stakeholder collaboration survey with regards to success in construction business, and he found that communication accounts for seventy-five (75%) to ninety (90%) percent of project manager's work period. While communicating both pertinent and extraneous information to the entire stakeholders may not seem like a sensible option, it is wise to strive for a different communication method intended for differing stakeholder groups. Correspondingly, the project management experts and managers are tutored on just how to shape their communication schedules (Agbim, 2013). In view of this, project communication practices are subdivided by means of the diverse stakeholder analysis methods. For instance, project stakeholders according to their influence and interest are categorized into four groupings to plan adapted communication schedule for each group (Olander & Landin, 2015).

Stakeholder grouping via striking models for stakeholder recognition remains a foremost instrument employed for planning project communication (Yang et al., 2011). The communication practices centered on these models are built, but only once, for the stakeholder engagement right through the life cycle of the project (Yang et al., 2011). Yang also perceived that project change communication schedules required further considerations as compared to the project stakeholder evaluation, and must be restructured in the entire period of the project's existence. Several ICT applications are made available by technological innovations for project implementation, and these tools (applications) provide some capability to improve the efficiency of stakeholder interaction (Amaeshi, 2017). Then again, from an information and communication technology implementation survey, Zhao (2017) perceived that regardless of its recognized advantages, ICT implementation within the construction industry has been confronted by various difficulties, and this is due to the fact that the task-specific adapted ICT application is ignored. Not just that, an over emphasis on ICT also makes communication practices very formal and limited in the course of the change management processes.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

Stakeholder Theory was adopted as the theoretical foundation for this study.

2.3.1. Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory was promulgated by R. Edward Freeman in 1984. Originally, it was designated as the Stakeholder Theory of Organizational Management and business tenets which deal with values and morals in the running of an establishment. His esteemed book, Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach, pinpoints and displays the stakeholders which are stakeholders of a firm, and together depicts and proposes approaches by which management can duly consider the interests of those groups.

Stakeholder theory is a capitalism viewpoint which emphasizes the interrelated associations existing between an enterprise and its clientele, contractors, personnel, shareholders, host communities and other individuals who have a stake in the firm. This theory contends that an organization ought to create value for every single stakeholder, and not only the shareholders. Over time, this theory has turned out to become a significant factor in the analysis of business ethics and has remained a platform for additional studies and advancement for numerous research surveys and published articles of many researchers, including those published online. Also, since the 80s, there has been a significant increase in the theory’s fame, as researchers worldwide continue to inquire and discover just how feasible it is to concentrate on investors’ capital as the most important business objective.

The stakeholder theory remains a theory of business tenets and organizational management which accounts for several constituencies influenced by business units such as personnel, contractors, creditors, native communities, and others. It is a theory which deals with values and morals in the smooth running of a firm, such as those associated with corporate social responsibility, social contract theory, and market economy.

The stakeholder perception of strategy incorporates a market-based view, a resource-based view and adds a socio-political level. A conventional form of the stakeholder theory strives to delineate the particular stakeholders in a business enterprise (the normative theory of stakeholder identification) then in turn investigate the circumstances under which administrators handle these groups as stakeholders (the descriptive theory of stakeholder importance). In certain disciplines such as management, law, and human resources, stakeholder theory excelled at questioning the normal analysis context, by proposing that the needs of stakeholders ought to be put at the start of any activity. Certain scholars, like Geoffroy Murat, attempted to employ the stakeholder’s theory in the field of lop-sided warfare.

As extensively alluded to by Freeman, a stakeholder approach which is the basis of stakeholder theory, includes tactical management, systems theory, corporate planning, corporate social responsibility and organization theory. A relevant research discipline evaluates the notion of stakeholders and stakeholder importance, as well as the significance of different stakeholder groups to a particular organization. These concepts, which make up aspects of Corporate Social Responsibility, first featured in a journal in 1968 published by the Italian Economist Giancarlo Pallavicini, who is also the creator of ‘the decomposition method of the parameters’ and they include issues bordering on ethics, morals, socio-cultural and the environment at large.

More current academic studies on the subject of stakeholder theory which typify conducted surveys and hypothesizing in this area include Donaldson and Preston (1995), Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997), Friedman and Miles (2002), and Phillips (2003). Both Donaldson and Preston contended that the theory comprises of numerous discrete parts which are equally helpful, instrumental, normative, and descriptive. In academic surveys, the descriptive approach is employed for the purpose of describing and clarifying the attributes and performances of businesses, as well as the way...
firms are run, the manner with which the board of directors regard corporate constituencies, the way managers reason as regards managing a company, and the disposition of the company itself.

The instrumental approach employs the use of empirical data in identifying the associations existent between the management of stakeholder groups and the realization of organizational targets (mostly efficiency and profitability goals). The normative approach, which is recognized as the crux of the theory by Donaldson and Preston, assesses the role of the firm and acknowledges the ‘ethical or logical regulations for the running and administration of the firm’. Since this article has been published in the year 1995, it has served as a fundamental citation source for academicians in the field, having been quoted well over 1,100 times.

Mitchell, et al. developed a categorization of stakeholders based on the traits of influence (the degree to which an individual or group has the means to enforce its resolve in an association), legality (publicly acceptable and predictable structures or conducts), and earnestness (the criticality or time sensitivity of the stakeholder's demands). By investigating the blend of these traits in a twofold fashion, eight kinds of stakeholders were developed in addition to their connotations for the firm. Furthermore, Friedman and Miles investigated the consequence of combative relations between firms and their stakeholders by initiating compatible/incompatible interests plus necessary/contingent networks as extra traits with which to assess the pattern of these relationships. Robert A. P. also differentiates between normatively genuine stakeholders (people or individuals to whom a firm owes a moral responsibility) and derivatively valid stakeholders (stakeholders whose position stems from his or her capability to impact the firm or its normatively lawful stakeholders).

2.4. Empirical Review

Imran, Shazia & Kashif (2011) examined the effect of stakeholder communication on project outcomes between July 2007 and April 2009. The study discerned that in the Information Technology (IT) industry operational in Islamabad, Pakistan; outcomes of diverse IT projects were subject to challenges such as schedule overrun, cost, scope creep, in addition to absence of client satisfaction on projects owing to improper management of stakeholder communication. While focusing on stakeholder communication, it was assumed that the quality of stakeholder communication management shapes the outcome of a project. Employing the stratified sampling technique, seventy heterogeneous Information Technology projects from 24 various software firms were chosen. By means of a reliable instrument, data about the value of stakeholder communication invested by project managers with the ensuing results of the IT projects were gathered using a cross sectional method. Data was analyzed by means of frequency distribution, Pearson correlation and linear regression. Findings showed a strong correlation and dependency of project outcomes on stakeholder interactions. It suggested ensuring quality stakeholder interaction since it is a main instrument for defining the project's span, cost and duration. The study offered templates and guidelines to assist project managers in enhancing stakeholder communication proficiency and its documentation.

Mugabo and Mulyungi (2019) assessed the impact of stakeholder engagement on the success of project in Rwanda and Gisenyi Youth New Vision Project was considered as the case study. Descriptive survey design was utilized, and the target population in the study was forty-three respondents made up of project personnel and representatives of stakeholders of the Gisenyi Youth Vision Project. Data obtained was quantitatively analyzed by means of frequencies, multiple linear regressions, and percentages. Findings revealed that 51.2% of respondents strongly agreed that the Gisenyi Youth New Vision Project involves its stakeholders in the determination of the scope of the project, 55.8% of respondents agreed that stakeholders are involved in deciding project requirements; 46.5% of respondents agreed that stakeholders are carried along in the project plan modifications, while 60.5% of respondents agreed that stakeholder’s ideas are welcome concerning the project. From the survey, it was inferred that a positive and strong association exists between engaging stakeholders in the planning processes and the project’s success. Recommendations put forward in this study proposed that project managers and owners should engage the entire project stakeholders in the planning process since it has been proven to exert a strong and positive impact on project feat. The monitoring and evaluation team also must involve the project stakeholders in the supervision and appraisal of project undertakings in a bid to keep the project on track, while keeping to time and scope.

Another scholar, Wong, (2017) examined ICT implementation and evolution; case studies of intranet and extranets in UK construction firms. The study investigated the prevailing force and hindrances confronting small and medium sized contractor and house building firms with regards to using extranets on construction tasks. Study objectives included the identification of characteristics of contractor and house builder companies; and the identification of the extent to which extranets are employed and also investigate the drivers and barriers to the use of project extranets. Extranets are capable of enhancing conventional processes by developing communications, information and documentation exchange between the diverse enterprises involved with a construction project. However, it was discovered that some contractor and house builder firms are confronted with obstacles which could be in form of the schemes and time involved in the execution. The construction industry must of necessity rise above these apparent obstacles so as to reap the profits offered by extranets. This study serves as the foundation for further investigations into the propellers and obstacles of extranets for the expansive sector. Semi-structured interviews were adopted as the primary technique to collect data; while companies’ policy documents and other relevant literature were also appraised to support the whole data collection process.

Yang, et al., (2011) studied a typology of operational approaches of stakeholder analysis and engagement. Six interviews in addition to a questionnaire survey were carried out in Hong Kong, with 15 additional interviews held in Australia. The major finding remains the categorization of practical methods for experts in construction; and a total of thirty methods were included in the typology, and they are categorized by application. In a bid to test the typology's usefulness, action research was used for two realistic projects in Australia. The consequence of this is that the choice of
methods is an art as well as contingency approach, necessitating practitioners’ verdicts. Each approach has its strengths and limitations, so the most appropriate way for effective stakeholder management is to use a combination of elements from each approach as circumstances dictate. The study can serve as a reference for the systematic consideration of the project management team about the operational approaches for stakeholder management in construction projects.

Riemer, Stieglitz & Meske (2015). Investigated ‘From Top to Bottom - the Changing Role of Hierarchy in Enterprise Social Networks,’ Business & Information Systems Engineering. The study explores what influence both a user’s position in the organization’s hierarchy and a user’s contributions on the network have on the ability to elicit responses from other ESN users. The study was drawn on a unique data set of more than 110,000 messages collected from the ESN platform used at Deloitte Australia. The study reveal evidence for both kinds of influence, data also reveals that informal influence has a stronger effect and that, as the ESN community matures over time, communication structures become indeed more inclusive and balanced across hierarchical levels. The study contributes a set of propositions that theorize the ways in which influence and communication pattern are shaped during the process of ESN emergence. The results from the study further underline the potentials of ESN to improve organic, user-driven communication and knowledge sharing within firms.

3. Methodology

The research methodology presents the techniques by which the required data will be gathered, analyzed and presented for this study. It will highlight the research design, target population, sampling technique/size, validity of research instrument and method of data collection and analysis.

This research implemented a case study research design technique that assisted the investigator to gather detailed evidence of the case under study. According to Neuman (2016) case studies is a comprehensive inquiry of a solitary individual, persons, occasion or society. This approach has been adopted because it is the best way to ascertain the hierarchical communication differences and its effects on stakeholder management.

The population for this study was the full-time employees of MTN Nigeria Limited. Purposive sampling technique was adopted and 123 respondents were purposively selected from Lagos and Benin City offices. A self-developed research instrument (questionnaire) was developed and made available to the respondents. The questionnaire distribution process was monitored by the researchers personally to enhance the response rate. The respondents were also guided on how to complete the form especially regarding what each of the responses stands for, and they were assured that information provided will be confidential and used solely for the purpose of research. The data were subsequently analyzed using the tool SPSS and the findings were presented in the subsequent sections.

4. Results

The results and the hypotheses test were presented in this section.

4.1. Restatement of Hypotheses

- H01: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder
- H02: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder
- H03: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management

4.2. Hypotheses Testing

4.2.1. Hypothesis One

- H01: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder

| Model        | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig |
|--------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-----|
| Regression   | 101.200        | 1  | 101.200     | 56.224 | .000b|
| Residual     | 37.600         | 103| 1.544       |        |     |
| Total        | 113.900        | 104|             |        |     |

Table 1: ANOVA

Source: Research Survey, 2020

The above table revealed the ANOVA (Analysis Of Variance) to evaluate the level to which the dependent and Independent indicators correlates with each other, and the findings revealed that P-value gotten is 0.000 which is less than the required 5% which is the level of significance indicated in analysis tool, SPSS software when the analysis is being conducted, consequently, in line with the rule of decision, the alternate hypothesis will be considered as correct, whereas the null hypothesis will be considered incorrect. This means that hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder.
4.2.2. Hypothesis Two

- $H_{02}$: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder

| Model     | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig  |
|-----------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Regression| 108.500        | 1  | 108.500     | 56.285| .000b|
| Residual  | 49.610         | 103| 1.487       |       |      |
| Total     | 139.220        | 104|             |       |      |

*Table 2: ANOVA*<sup>a</sup>

*Source: Research Survey, 2020*

The above table revealed the ANOVA (Analysis Of Variance) to evaluate the level to which the dependent and Independent indicators correlates with each other, and the findings revealed that P-value gotten is 0.000 which is less than the required 5% which is the level of significance indicated in analysis tool, SPSS software when the analysis is being conducted, consequently, in line with the rule of decision, the alternate hypothesis will be considered as correct, whereas the null hypothesis will be considered incorrect. This means that hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder.

4.2.3. Hypothesis Three

- $H_{03}$: Hierarchical communication differences does not significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management

| Model     | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig  |
|-----------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Regression| 109.900        | 1  | 109.900     | 51.737| .001b|
| Residual  | 71.700         | 103| 1.647       |       |      |
| Total     | 169.4          | 104|             |       |      |

*Table 3: ANOVA*<sup>c</sup>

*Source: Research Survey, 2020*

The above table revealed the ANOVA (Analysis Of Variance) to evaluate the level to which the dependent and Independent indicators correlates with each other, and the findings revealed that P-value gotten is 0.001 which is less than the required 5% which is the level of significance indicated in analysis tool, SPSS software when the analysis is being conducted, consequently, in line with the rule of decision, the alternate hypothesis will be considered as correct, whereas the null hypothesis will be considered incorrect. This means that hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Following the data collection and analysis, the following conclusions are discernable:

- Hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence monitoring the concerns of stakeholder
- Hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence negotiation with stakeholder
- Hierarchical communication differences do significantly influence decision making in stakeholder management

Going by the results and conclusions, the following recommendations and raised:

- Supervision of concerned stakeholders in the communication system should be taken seriously.
- Managers should ensure a good negotiation with the stakeholders that will offers a practicable solution
- There should be proper consideration of necessary indicators by the stakeholders before critical decisions are made.
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