

A Comparative Analysis of Mission Statement Content and Readability

James Rajasekar
Sultan Qaboos University, Oman

The mission statement is an important organizational tool that forms the foundation for all other organizational objectives and strategies. Furthermore, it helps a firm present itself favorably to the public, as well as identify and respond to various stakeholders. Mission statements vary in length, content, format, and specificity. Most practitioners and academicians in strategic management suggest that an effectively written mission statement exhibits nine characteristics or mission statement components. Since a mission statement is often the most visible and public part of the strategic management process, it is important that it include most, if not all, of these essential components. The purpose of this research is to evaluate the mission statements of Omani firms to determine whether the components identified in the relevant literature are satisfactorily adopted in their mission statements and to measure the readability levels of these mission statements. The findings indicate that the sample firms generally did not include the needed components in their mission statements. However, the readability level of those documents was optimal overall.

INTRODUCTION

To establish a profitable organization in this competitive business world, one needs to start with an innovative and unique set of ideas. Nevertheless, those ideas should be realistic and economically feasible. In the management literature, such ideas are referred to as the beliefs of an entrepreneur that are translated into a running business. According to Pearce (1982), the typical business organization begins with beliefs, desires, and the aspiration of a single entrepreneur. However, as the firm grows in size and complexity, there will be a need to establish and put in place a formal mechanism to communicate the organization's policies, procedures, plans, and strategies to both internal and external stakeholders.

The mission statement is a crucial element in the strategic planning of any business organization. Universally, mission and vision statements are accepted as effective strategic management tools by both academicians and practitioners. Mission and vision statements influence the performance of organizations in two ways – either positively or negatively (Atrill et al., 2005; Bart & Baetz, 1998; Bart, Bontis & Tagger, 2001; Vandijck et al., 2007; Piercy & Morgan, 1994). In a landmark study, Mullane (2002) argued that not only do the statements help organizations develop their long-term plans, but they also help organizations manage their day-to-day operations.

Creating a mission is a priority, and an organization should prioritize articulating it. The initial mission can be the building block for an overall strategy and the development of more specific functional strategies. By defining a mission, an organization makes a statement of organizational purpose. Hence, most organizations operating in the 20th century adopted a strategic management process as an effective strategic tool. The strategic management process includes six main building blocks: vision and mission

statements, external analysis, internal analysis, strategy formulation, implementation, and performance evaluation.

The mission statement has been defined in several ways by many authors (Table 1). However, they have all emphasized its role as an enduring statement of purpose for organizations that identifies the scope of operations in product and market terms and reflects the organization's values and priorities. For instance, Drucker (1974) argued that a specific business is not defined by its name, statutes, or articles of incorporation, but by its business mission statement. Only a clear definition of the mission and purpose of the organization can result in clear and realistic business objectives. Likewise, more recent literature has revealed the importance of a mission statement by tagging it as a strategic tool and an essential component in strategic planning (Stone, 1996; Bart, Bontis, & Taggar, 2001).

Many firms have employed a strategic planning process as a mechanism to communicate their policies, practices, strategies, and goals, and the mission statement plays an integral part in this process as it facilitates achieving an organization's objectives and enables it to attain its ultimate vision. As described earlier, the strategic management process enables organizations to constantly scan their internal and external environments and take necessary measures to maintain their sustainability. Consequently, it allows a firm to develop effective strategies in response to changing environmental circumstances, market conditions, evolving technologies, and emerging opportunities and to evade risk and threats.

A well-established and documented mission statement provides the foundation for outlining and drafting business objectives that the organization strives to accomplish. In return, those goals become the barometers against which performance is evaluated (Matejka, Kurke, & Gregory, 1993). Furthermore, the mission statement facilitates decision making, planning, creating effective strategies, and formulating policies for the short and long term. Also, the mission statement provides a clear sense of direction that guides and inspires the organization's executives, managers, and employees toward mutual goal attainment. It assists in setting priorities, plans, and allocating resources toward that end (Cochran, David, & Gibson, 2008).

Establishing a mission statement should not be a one-man show, but a team process involving executives, top-level management of the organization, employees, and if required a third-party consultant. Such involvement may mean engaging all stakeholders in brainstorming and discussion sessions in which each member expresses his or her opinion so that divergent views can be revealed and resolved and mutual agreement can be reached (David, 2004). Moreover, connecting many personnel from different organizational levels to this process contributes to creating, learning, documenting, and communicating an effective mission statement, as well as establishing a stronger commitment by all participant parties to achieve the underlying objectives. The process and stages may differ from one organization to another, but the concept is relatively the same.

It is worth mentioning at this point that mission statements can easily become obsolete as a company grows in size and complexity. In addition, as the circumstances surrounding the organization and the environment in which it operates change over time, periodic revisions, reviews, and re-drafting of mission statements is necessary (David and David, 2003).

This research evaluates mission statements in a sample of 45 public companies in Oman in terms of available components and statement readability level. The coming sections are ordered as follows: a review of extant literature on mission statements appears first; this is followed by a brief description of the methodology used to collect and categorize data. The findings are then discussed and communicated in detail, and the study implications and limitations are addressed thereafter. The final section provides a conclusion and offers recommendations based on the conclusion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A mission statement acts as an internal communication tool that conveys an organization's policies, procedures, plans, and strategies, thereby guiding the behaviors and decisions of management and subordinates. Simultaneously, the mission statement serves as an external communication tool to convey the organization's intentions to the general public (Bartkus & Glassman, 2008). The study of mission

statements started in the early 1970s and has expanded since then to take a key place in both the literature and the strategic planning processes of organizations. This trend has granted researching mission statements a focused popularity in academic writings as well as in organizations' strategic management process. Table 1 describes various research studies conducted on the mission statement.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON MISSION STATEMENTS

Reconciliation amongst the organization's stakeholders divergent views and interests	Drucker, 1974; Steiner, 1979; David, 2005
Identity of Customers of the organization, their anticipations, needs, and wants	Drucker, 1974; McGinnis, 1981; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; David, 2005
Identity of markets refers to the geographical markets of the organization where it competes	Pearce & David, 1987; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Miller & Dess, 1996; David, 2005
Identity of the products and/or services of the organization or its utility	Drucker, 1974; Abell, 1980; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Miller & Dess, 1996; Thompson & Strickland, 2003
Identity of use of current technology	McGinnis, 1981; Pearce & David 1987; David, 2005
Fiscal responsibility of the organization towards its stakeholders expressing the concern for survival, growth, and/or profitability which include the commitment to long-term profitability and growth and financial soundness	Pearce & David, 1987; Freeman & Gilbert, 1988; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Miller & Dess, 1996; Hills & Jones, 2002
Social responsibility of the organization towards social, community, minorities, women and environmental issues, that reflects concern for public image	Pearce & David, 1987; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Collins & Porras, 1996; Miller & Dess, 1996; Waddock & Graves, 1997
Statement of the organization philosophy such as basic beliefs, values, aspirations, and ethical priorities	Want, 1986; Pearce & David, 1987; Freeman & Gilbert, 1988; Campbell & Yeung, 1991; Ireland & Hitt, 1992; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Miller & Dess, 1996
Concern for the organization's Employees	Carrol et al., 1987; Miller & Dess, 1996; Waddock & Graves, 1997
Self-concept that points out the distinctive competence or major competitive advantage of the organization in comparison with its rivals	Drucker, 1974; Pearce & David 1987; Campbell & Yeung, 1991; Klemm et al. 1991; Ireland & Hitt, 1992; Rarick & Vitton, 1995; Miller & Dess, 1996; David, 2005
Clarity of a mission statement in the sense that it is broad in scope but neither overly general and detailed nor excessively specific	McGinnis, 1981; Waddock & Graves, 1997
Length of a mission statement should not exceed two hundreds words	Steiner, 1979; David, 2005

Organizations develop a mission statement for a number of reasons. According to King and Cleland (1979), the mission statement provides a standard for allocating resources, facilitates the transition of objectives into a work structure, and specifies unanimous organizational purposes that are translated into objectives for standard performance. Strategic management literature has emphasized the mission statement because of its ability to direct organizations to effective organizational performance. Drucker (1974) and Bart and Baetz (1998) proposed that the development of a mission statement is a big step

toward management effectiveness and that there is a positive relationship between mission statements and organizational performance. Wilson (1992) found that organizations with mission statements (versus those without) achieved a 50% increase in organizational effectiveness and doubled the chances that their employees will follow the direction and priorities established for implementation. Echoing similar results, a *Business Week* study in 1994 showed that organizations with mission statements had average return on shareholder equity of 16.1%, in comparison with 9.7% for organizations without mission statements. Alternatively, another perspective revealed that firms create and publicize the mission statement just because they are expected to have one due to its popularity or as a result of institutional pressures (Peyrefitte & David, 2006). Peyrefitte and David also argued that previous empirical studies on the contents of mission statements are still inadequate and conflicting despite the compatibility observed in definitions of the mission statement. However, considering the mission statement as the most publicized document stating organizational strategic plans has made the process of crafting a sound mission statement challenging for many organizations (Cochran et al., 2008).

Although many research studies have subscribed to the view that having mission statements is positively correlated to organizational performance, much of the management literature on this topic has questioned whether content affects performance. For instance, Bart et al. (2001) maintained that there is no direct relationship between the content of a mission statement and a company's financial performance. Instead, they noted a correlation between mission components and non-financial measures of performance such as satisfaction, mission-organizational alignment, behavior, and commitment. Commenting on this, Bartkus and Glassman (2008) pointed out that a common component of mission statements, such as stakeholder groups, has the least impact on organizations' action or decisions, whereas social issues like diversity and environment have the most significant impact on stakeholder management actions. Another opposing theory offered by Green and Medline (2003) disregards the completeness and quality of mission statements as the main characteristics that have a positive effect on organizational performance.

Other literature has suggested that the mission statement should be unique to an organization and a source of competitive advantage to differentiate it from others (David & David, 2003). This is consistent with Sufi and Lyon's (2003) findings which assume a total difference between every two organizations in terms of ownership, resources, and environmental circumstances, making a specific mission statement personal to each organization. Thus, it is critical for any organization to develop a clear vision for the creation of an effective mission statement since the success of that statement lies in its creativity and comprehensiveness (Matejka et al., 1993). Understanding why and for whom an organization is writing its mission statement is essential in drafting a good document. For example, Gregson (1992) suggested that basic steps for crafting a productive mission statement are, first, clearly defining the authentic purpose of the organization and reason for its existence. Second, the organization must establish a structure that facilitates policy making and goal setting, communicating the organizations' aim, philosophy, and values to all stakeholders and influencing and driving organizational culture. Research conducted by Bailey (1996) also affirmed the need to create a *measurable* mission statement by focusing attention on answering two critical questions: What corporate goals need to be achieved and how can the organization measure their accomplishment? His research suggested that to create measurable objectives, organizations must first scan their internal environment (competencies, skills, capabilities, competitive advantages) and external environment (competitors, customers, suppliers, employees, economy, technology, government regulations, and society) before measuring the comprehension, relevance, and reliability of their mission and objectives.

Several approaches to crafting and revising mission statements have been developed in the management literature. For example, Wickham (1997) proposed a framework consisting of five stages in crafting a sound mission statement. Among them is a stage called *operations* where the author suggested involving management in brainstorming sessions about the business, employees, customers, competitors, and society to arrive at ideas for the mission statement. Furthermore, the organization's internal and external stakeholders are roped in at that stage and their concerns are discussed to resolve any potential or existing conflicts and to better accommodate their interests.

Similarly, Cochran et al. (2008) suggested another framework for developing an effective mission statement based on four stages of analysis: orientation, components, communication, and applicability analyses. In their research to examine and identify the nine components of the mission statement, Peyrefitte and David (2006) concluded that some firms are confronted with institutional forces or demands which in turn stimulate mission statement content. Thus, they suggested that mission statement components are similar across industries and within industries. However, Pearce (1982) showed that three elements of a mission statement are vital for inclusion: product or service, market, and technology. The study revealed that a firm's mission statement should indicate its aim toward survival and continuity as a going concern. Furthermore, according to the author, the company's philosophy or creed statement is a significant source for developing the mission statement. On the other hand, Pearce and David (1987) argued that successfully performing firms have *comprehensive* mission statements containing nine essential components, as follows: specification of target customers and markets, identification of principal products and/or services, identification of geographic domain (i.e., where the company competes), identification of core technology used, expression of commitment to growth, survival, and profitability, specification of key elements of the company philosophy (i.e., its basic beliefs, values, aspirations, philosophical priorities), identification of the company's self-concept (i.e., the firm's view of itself and its competitive strengths), and identification of the firm's desired public image.

David & David (2003) stated that a mission statement should not be too lengthy or too short, should not contain numbers or percentages, and should not contain goals or strategies as they will create distractions for the reader. Furthermore, the study emphasized the importance of amending the mission statement to allow it to encompass all the essential elements. To keep the mission statement relevant and realistic, any parts of the statement that conflict with reality should be removed, and the *SMART* rule should be applied to keep the mission statement Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Trackable. On the other hand, Stone (1996) specified seven main characteristics for a successful mission statement: clearly articulated, relevant, current, written in a positive/inspiring tone, unique to the organization, enduring, and, finally, adapted to the target audience.

Pearce and David (1987) concluded that mission statements of higher performing large companies are more comprehensive than those of less successful firms. However, commenting on this, O'Gorman and Doran (1999) found that the mission statements of high-growth companies did not include the eight desired components suggested by Pearce and David (1987) when compared to low-performing firms. Hence, the comprehensiveness of the mission statement does not correlate to small and medium-sized enterprises' (SMEs') performance and the contradiction between the two studies may be due to many underlying reasons, as argued by O'Gorman and Doran (1999).

Green and Medlin's (2003) study showed no positive relationship between an organization's performance and its mission statement, despite the findings that some specific characteristics of a mission statement may be selectively related to higher levels of performance. On the other hand, Bart et al. (2001) investigated the relationship between mission rationales and content and argued that the purpose of a mission statement is driven by its content. The researchers defined two motives leading to the creation of mission statements. First, there is no reason for mission creation; it simply results from a need. Second, mission creation is anchored to clear motives. However, the study findings supported the second view and stated that how clear managers are about their motives in creating a mission statement ultimately determines the statement's final composition (i.e., the ends and means specified in the mission).

Bartkus and Glassman (2008) questioned the notion of practicing what is declared in companies' mission statement regarding various stakeholders. Commenting on this, Verma (2010) revealed the importance of the theory of reasoned action (TRA). With this theory in mind, he proposed rational thinking when writing a mission statement because mission statement ingredients are essential in influencing employee behavior.

METHODOLOGY

The sample was drawn from 45 firms listed in the Muscat Securities Market (MSM) and was categorized on the basis of industry type. Using publicly quoted corporations facilitated access to detailed corporate information, which was important for this research.

The model applied in this research tested how mission statements are crafted and communicated. The contents of such statements were reviewed and ranked using Pearce and David's (1987) model that employs nine components in assessing a mission statement. To record the overall score of components in each group, three scores were independently placed to examine each document and assign values where 0 means the statement does not include the component, 1 means the statement includes the component in vague terms, and 2 means the component is clearly expressed in the statement text. Weighted average score was used to compare a company's mission statement with that of its peers in the same industry.

In contrast, the communication analysis focused on measuring connotative meaning of selected mission statements as part of the content analysis for developing such statements. Therefore, the Fog index was used to measure the readability level of each mission statement for companies in each sector individually; then the average score was taken per group communication analysis with applied denotative and connotative meanings. The Fog index is commonly used to confirm that text can be read easily by the intended audience (Liu, 2013; Bargate, 2012; Hatcher & Colter, 2007).

Corporate websites were the core instrument employed for data collection in this study. Selected companies were categorized into seven groups based on industry type, as described below:

- Financial service (including banking and purely finance companies)
- Food and beverages
- Industrial manufacturing
- General investments
- Mining, metal, oil and gas (non-renewable natural resources)
- Utilities (power, telecom, billing services)
- Infrastructure and human services (education, healthcare, transport)

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Table-2 (Appendix) summarizes the results of all the 45 companies. As indicated by the assigned three ratings, financial service companies scored higher than the other six industries on four of the nine recommended components of the mission statement. Financial service firms had a higher overall average score on coverage of components than the other six industry types, and they were more likely than other industries to include the four components of *customers*, *philosophy*, *public image*, and *employees*.

However, note that the average score of the highest rated industry is a mere 0.9841. While a 1 average would denote minimal (vague) inclusion of the respective component, financial service firms scored less than 0.5555 on one component only. This suggests that the mission statement of the majority of the firms operating in the financial service sector includes eight of the nine components. Overall, even though their statements were the best compared to the other six industry groups, financial service firms have not done a good job in specifying the geographic boundaries of their operations. They scored the lowest among the seven groups tested on this particular component and this is consistent with the average score on the component of *customer* representing vague terms. Targeting customers without clear, implemented segmentation strategies results in financial service firms in Oman neglecting the importance of providing specific descriptions to their target customers and considering geographic factors to segment any niche customer groups when crafting their mission statements.

Food and beverage firms, with an average of 0.9505, ranked next to financial service firms but had the highest score for the *geographic markets* component among the eight industry groups. They also scored 1.8888 on the philosophy component, which means an extraordinary consideration of their values, ethics, and beliefs. However, they were not maintaining a good track record on *technology* and *concern*

for growth/survival, with scores of 0.3333 and 0.4444, respectively. This finding raises question marks on research and development (R&D) strategies in this industry that is quite mature.

The general investment industry group maintained a score of 1.4 on four components, of which three had the highest scores in the seven tested groups. Those three components were *product/service*, *distinctive competence*, and *concern for survival/growth*. It should not be unusual for the sample companies in this particular group to achieve a remarkable score on the component *concern for growth/survival* as the nature of this industry is based on market expectations and projected return on invested resources. However, these companies did not include the *technology* and *employees* components in their statements. Note that the average value scores among investment firms were all above 0.5555 in all but two components, which indicates that mission statements of firms belonging to that group are satisfactory overall.

With an overall average value score of 0.8666, natural resources firms did slightly worse than general investment firms. *Customers* and *geographic market* components rest at the bottom of the ranked scores for this group with values of 0.4 and 0.6, respectively. In contrast, the group had the highest score among all the groups in the *technology* component. Furthermore, seven of the nine components in their mission statements scored not less than 0.8, meaning that the sample firms in that group occupy a median position among the other six groups.

Firms operating in the industrial manufacturing sector scored well in three components: *product/service*, *philosophy*, and *public image*. In contrast, the other six components received scores less than 0.716, which is the group's overall average score value, revealing a relatively poor inclusion of the nine components in mission statements for the sample firms in that group. Firms grouped in healthcare, education, and transport industries had a slightly lower overall average score than those in the industrial manufacturing group. It is important to point out that statements of firms in this sector had the highest score for the *inclusion of employees* among the seven groups. On the other hand, firms in the above group were not doing well at all in considering *technology* or *concern for growth/survival*.

Utilities, scoring just 0.5555 overall, had the fewest comprehensive mission statements among the seven industry groups sampled in this study. They scored less than 0.5555 in five components out of the nine recommended, suggesting that mission statements of most of the sample utilities firms did not include the following components: *technology*, *customers*, *product/service*, *geographic market*, and *distinctive competence*. However, the average value scores among all utilities firms ranged from 0.8 to 1.2 on the other four components, which indicates that utilities mission statements are weak overall.

The second part of the analysis discusses the outcome of the Fog index used to measure the readability level for mission statements of the sample companies in the seven industry groups. Table 4 (Appendix) summarizes the Fog index for sample firms in each industry group and provides the average value for that index per group.

The Fog index scores for the sample firms in the financial service group lie outside the ideal score of 7 to 8. Four companies scored below 7 while the other two scored above 12, suggesting that the level of readability for mission statements in this group is either very low or very difficult. However, the overall average value of the Fog index for financial service firms is 8.435, which represents a good readability level.

Firms operating in the food and beverage sectors had an ideal score on the Fog index on average and 10.4 as the maximum score recorded for sample firms in this group. This requires an education level of 7.4 years, on average, for a specific reader to fully understand the language used to craft mission statements for food and beverage companies. The utilities industry group and the metal, mining, and oil and gas group fell in the same category as the food and beverage group, with average Fog index values of 7.7 and 8.6 each.

Only one firm in the investment industry group scored near the ideal range on the Fog index, while others deviated up and down that range. However, the overall average value for all firms in that sample fit slightly above the ideal range, with a score of 8.96, revealing a good readability level on average for the mission statements. In contrast, the overall average score on the Fog index for companies in both the industrial manufacturing group and the group containing firms operating in the healthcare, education, and

transport sectors were 10.5 and 11, respectively. This reflects that mission statements for companies in these two groups are hard for most people to understand, thus implying a need to edit those statements.

CONCLUSION

A properly designed mission statement that comprises all the components discussed in this study has the potential to become one of the most important strategic tools for a firm in achieving its goals. This study investigated components of mission statements of 45 companies in Oman and measured their readability level. The sample firms in our study generally did not include needed components in their mission statements.

The one component the sample firms most often included was *philosophy*. This finding is positive as it suggests that companies use their mission statements to express their values, beliefs, and business ethics to stakeholders. However, the analysis revealed that the component of *product/service* is the only other component included, which means that the companies studied basically did not include the other seven components: *technology*, *geographic market*, *employees*, *distinctive competence*, *concerns for growth/survival*, *public image*, and *customers*. Actually, this is a disturbing finding since constituencies or stakeholders gain no insight into the firms from reading their mission statements. The study found that the component of *technology* received the lowest rating of all components, as indicated by the 0.3888 average rating. This finding shed light on the importance of assessing levels of technology employment in the strategic planning of key industries forming the backbone of the Omani private sector.

A medium readability index was recorded for mission statements of companies working in the financial service, food and beverage, general investment, utilities, and natural resources sectors. Their average readership ranged from 7.5 to 9, indicating a clear and concise writing style. On the other hand, mission statements for sample companies in industrial manufacturing, healthcare, education, and transport had an exceptionally high readability index exceeding 10.5. This high score implies the need to review and rewrite the mission statements by reducing sentence length and the use of multiple-syllable words.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The results discussed in this paper offer practitioners insightful guidance for drafting mission statements. To begin with, rational mission statements must contain components that address the interests of both internal and external stakeholders. The overall lack of completeness in mission statements reported among the sample firms in this research may serve to alert and caution planners in those business sectors to improve their documents. The modification process implies forming a facilitator team or special committee that is fully aware of the organization's business model, strategic objectives, the market structure, and all other general aspects affecting the business environment. Such a process is expected to enhance the effectiveness of communication and commitment among employees' at all organizational levels. Finally, regarding the readability of the mission statement, which is obtained through the Fog index, the mission statement committee should involve managers in evaluating mission statements so that words that describe the feelings of management can be incorporated in the statements.

Sample firms studied in this research were grouped using a broad definition of industries where wide gray areas may exist between firms gathered in single sectors for the sake of having groups of logical sizes. It is still not clear-cut that a group of five sample firms from indirectly related industries can provide consistent indicators applicable to all industries forming a particular business cluster. Therefore, additional evidence on the industry classification developed in this study is required to further substantiate these results.

Moreover, mission statements of the sample firms were quoted directly from corporate websites without being edited; as a result, the study may also include documents such as vision statements. Additionally, the number of words in the mission statements of the sample companies is far below the 100 words used on average to test the readability level with the Fog index. We encourage further research

that fills identified gaps in this research that will also include new components that may be needed in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Abell, D. F. (1980). *Defining the Business: The Starting Point of Strategic Planning*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Atril, P., Omran, M., & Pointon, J. (2005). Company mission statements and financial performance, *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 2, (3), 28-35.
- Bailey, J. A. (1996). Measuring your mission. *Management Accounting*, 44, (3), 44-47.
- Bargate, K. (2012). The readability of Managerial Accounting and Financial Management textbooks. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 20, (1), 4-20.
- Bart, C., & Baetz, M. (1998). The Relationship Between Mission Statements and Firm Performance: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36, (6), 823-853.
- Bart, C., & Bontis, N. (2003). Distinguishing between the board and management in company mission: Implications for corporate governance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 4, (3), 361-81.
- Bart, C. K., Bontis, N., & Taggar, S. (2001). A model of the impact of mission statements on firm performance. *Management Decision*, 39, (1), 19-35.
- Bartkus, B. R., & Glassman, M. (2008). Do Firms Practice What They Preach? The Relationship Between Mission Statements and Stakeholder Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83, (2), 207-216.
- Campbell, A., & Yeung, S. (1991). Creating a Sense of Mission, *Long Range Planning*, 24, (4), 10-20.
- Cochran, D. S., David, F. R., & Gibson, C. K. (2008). A Framework for Developing an Effective Mission Statement. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 25, (2), 27-29.
- Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1996). Building Your Company's Vision, *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 131-143.
- David, F. R. (2005). *Strategic Management*, 10th edition. USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- David, F. R., & David, F. R. (2003). It's time to redraft your mission statement. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 24, (1), 11-14.
- Drucker, 1974. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, and Practices*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Freeman, R. E., & Gilbert, D. (1988). *Corporate Strategy and the Search for Ethics*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall.
- Green Jr, K. W., & Medlin, B. (2003). The strategic planning process: the link between mission statement and organizational performance. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 2, (1), 23-32.
- Gregson, K. (1992). Establishing a productivity mission. *Work Study*, 41, (6), 19-23.

Hatcher, T., & Colton, S. (2007). Using the internet to improve HRD research: The case of the web-based Delphi research technique to achieve content validity of an HRD-oriented measurement. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 31, (7), 570-587.

Hill, C. W. L., & Jones, G.R. 2002. *Strategic Management: AN Integrated Approach*, Means Business, New York.

Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A., (1992). Mission Statements: Importance, challenge and Recommendations for Development, *Business Horizons*, 35, (5), 34-42.

King, W. R. & Cleland D. I. 1979. *Strategic Planning and Policy*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Publishing.

Klemm, M., Sanderson, S., & Luffman, G., (1991). Mission Statements: Selling Corporate Values to Employees, *Long range Planning*, 24, (3), 73-78.

Liu, C.Z., & Rowe, B.J. (2013). Effect of Audit Quality on the Readability of Auditor Preferability Letters: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Management*, 30, (1), 160-167.

Matejka, K., Kurke, L. B., & Gregory, B. (1993). Mission impossible? Designing a great mission statement to ignite your plans. *Management Decision*, 31, (4), 34-37.

McGinnis, V. (1981). The Mission Statement: A Key Step in Strategic Planning, *Business*, 31(6), Nov-Dec, 39-43.

Miller, A., & Dess, G. G., (1996). *Strategic Management*, 2nd ed., New York: McGraw Hill.

Mullane, J. V. (2002). The mission statement is a strategic tool: When used properly. *Management Decision*, 40, (5), 448-455.

O'Gorman, C., & Doran, R. (1999). Mission statements in small and medium-sized businesses. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 37, (4), 59-66.

Pearce II, J. A. (1982). The Company Mission As a Strategic Tool. *Sloan Management Review*, 23, (3), 15-24.

Pearce, J. A., & David, F. R. (1987). Corporate Mission statements: the Bottom Line, *Academy of Management executive*, 1, (2), 109-116.

Peyrefitte, J., & David, F. R. (2006). A content analysis of the mission statements of United States firms in four industries. *International Journal of Management*, 23, (2), 296-301.

Piercy, N. & Morgon, N. (1994). Mission analysis: An operational approach, *Journal of General Management*, 19, (3), 1-19.

Rarick, C.A., & Vitton, J. (1995). Mission Statements Market Cents, *Journal of Business Strategy*, 16, (1), 11-12.

Steiner, G. 1979. *Strategic Planning: What Every Manager Must Know*. New York: The Free Press.

Stone, R. A. (1996). Mission statements revisited. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 61, (1), 31-38.

Sufi, T., & Lyons, H. (2003). Mission statements exposed. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15, (5), 255-262.

Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. 2003. *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Vandijck, D., Desmidt, S., & Buelens M. (2007). Relevance of mission statements in Flemish not-for-profit healthcare organizations. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 15, (2), 131-41.

Verma, H. V. (2010). Mission statements-a study of intent and influence. *Journal of Services Research*, 9, (2), 153-172.

Waddock, S. A., & Graves, S. B. (1997). The Corporate Social Performance – Financial Performance Link, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, (4), 303 - 319.

Want, J. H. (1986). Corporate Mission, *Management Review*, August, 75, (1), 46-50.

Wickham, P. A. (1997). Developing a mission for an entrepreneurial venture. *Management Decision*, 35, (5), 373 – 381.

Wilson, I. (1992). Realizing the Power of Strategic Vision, *Long Range Planning*, 25, (5), 18-28.

APPENDIX

**Table-2. Content Analysis of Mission Statements - Sector wise
Financial Services Sector**

Nine Components of Mission Statement	Company Name						Average Score
	BANK MUSCAT	OMAN INTL. BANK	NATIONAL BANK OF OMAN	UNITED FINANCE	NATIONAL FINANCE	MUSCAT FINANCE	
1 Customers	1	1	1	2	1	0	1
2 Product/ Services	0	2	1	2	0	2	1.1666
3 Geographic Market	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.1666
4 Technology	0	1	2	0	0	2	0.8333
5 Philosophy	1	2	2	2	2	1	1.6666
6 Public Image	0	2	2	0	2	1	1.1666
7 Employees	0	0	2	2	2	0	1
8 Distinctive Competence	0	2	2	1	1	0	1
9 Concern for Growth/ Survival	1	0	0	2	2	0	0.8333
Total Score	3	11	12	11	10	6	

Food & Beverage Sector

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name									AVERAGE SCORE
		ASAFFA FOOD	DHOFAR BEVERAGE & FOOD STUFF	GULF MUSHROOM PRODUCTS	DHOFAR CATTLE FEED	OMAN INTL. FOODS	NATL BISCUIT IND.	OMAN FISHERIES	OMAN REFRESHMENT	SALALAH MILLS	
1	Customers	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0.8888
2	Product/ Services	1	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	1.1111
3	Geographic Market	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0.8888
4	Technology	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0.3333
5	Philosophy	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1.8888
6	Public Image	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	1.1111
7	Employees	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	0.7777
8	Distinctive Competence	1	1	1	2	0	2	1	1	1	1.1111
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4444
Total Score		11	13	7	14	1	11	5	9	6	

Industrial Manufacturing Sector

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name								Average Score	
		OMAN CABLES IND.	OMAN FIBER OPTICS	OMAN CEMENT	GULF PLASTIC IND.	RAYSUT CEMENT	GULF INT. CHEMICALS	AL JAZEERA STEEL PRODUCT COMPANY	VOLTAMP ENERGY		ALHASSAN ENG.
1	Customers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.4444
2	Product/ Services	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	1.333
3	Geographic Market	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0.5555
4	Technology	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0.5555
5	Philosophy	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	1.3333
6	Public Image	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0.8888
7	Employees	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.5555
8	Distinctive Competence	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0.6666
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1111
Total Score		3	9	11	3	7	6	4	6	7	

Power & Utilities, Telecom, and Related sectors

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name					Average Score
		ACWA POWER BARKA	SOHAR POWER	AL KAMIL POWER	OIFC	NAWRAS	
1	Customers	0	0	0	1	0	0.2000
2	Product/ Services	2	2	0	0	1	1.0000
3	Geographic Market	0	0	2	0	0	0.4000
4	Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.0000
5	Philosophy	0	2	0	2	2	1.2000
6	Public Image	0	2	2	0	0	0.8000
7	Employees	0	0	0	1	0	0.2000
8	Distinctive Competence	0	0	0	1	0	0.2000
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	1	0	2	2	0	1.0000
Total Score		3	6	6	7	3	

Investment Sector Metal, Mining, Oil & Gas

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name					Average Score
		NAT. ALUMINIUM PRODUCTS	OMAN CHROMITE	OMAN OIL MARKETING	NATIONAL GAS	AI MAHA PETROLEUM PRODUCTS MARKETING	
1	Customers	0	0	1	0	1	0.4000
2	Product/ Services	0	2	0	1	2	1.0000
3	Geographic Market	0	1	0	0	2	0.6000
4	Technology	0	0	1	2	2	1.0000
5	Philosophy	0	0	2	2	2	1.2000
6	Public Image	0	0	2	2	2	1.2000
7	Employees	0	0	0	2	2	0.8000
8	Distinctive Competence	1	0	1	1	1	0.8000
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	2	0	1	0	1	0.8000
Total Score		3	3	8	10	15	

Investment Sector

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name					Average Score
		AL ANWAR HOLDING	AL BATINAH DEV. & INV. HOLDING	AL SHARQIA INV. HOLDING	OHI	OMINVEST	
1	Customers	1	1	0	1	1	0.8000
2	Product/ Services	2	2	1	0	2	1.4000
3	Geographic Market	0	0	2	0	2	0.8000
4	Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0.0000
5	Philosophy	2	2	1	2	0	1.4000
6	Public Image	0	0	2	2	0	0.8000
7	Employees	0	0	0	1	0	0.2000
8	Distinctive Competence	2	2	0	0	2	1.4000
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	2	2	0	0	2	1.4000
Total Score		9	9	6	6	9	

Education, Healthcare, and Transport Sectors

Nine Components of Mission Statement		Company Name						Average Score
		DHOFAR UNIVERSITY	MAJAN COLLEGE	OMAN EDUCATION & TRAINING INV.	NAT. PHARMACEUTICAL IND	PORT SER. CORP	SALALAH PORT SERVICES	
1	Customers	0	2	2	0	0	0	0.6666
2	Product/ Services	2	2	2	1	0	0	1.1666
3	Geographic Market	0	0	2	2	0	0	0.6666
4	Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0000
5	Philosophy	2	2	2	0	0	2	1.3333
6	Public Image	0	2	2	0	2	2	0.6666
7	Employees	0	2	0	0	2	2	1.0000
8	Distinctive Competence	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.6666
9	Concern for Growth/ Survival	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0000
Total Score		5	11	12	3	4	6	

Table-3. Mission statement content analysis across seven industries

Component	Financial services (n=6)	Food & Beverages (n=9)	Industrial Manufacturing (n= 9)	General Investments (n= 5)	Mining, Metal, Oil & Gas (n= 5)	Utilities (n= 5)	Healthcare, Education & Transport (n= 6)	Average (n= 45)
Customers	1.0000	0.8888	0.4444	0.8000	0.4000	0.2000	0.6666	0.6190
Product/ Services	1.1666	1.1111	1.3333	1.4000	1.0000	1.0000	1.1666	1.1682
Geographic Market	0.1666	0.8888	0.5555	0.8000	0.6000	0.4000	0.6666	0.5825
Technology	0.8333	0.3333	0.5555	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.3888
Philosophy	1.6666	1.8888	1.3333	1.4000	1.2000	1.2000	1.3333	1.4317
Public Image	1.1666	1.1111	0.8888	0.8000	1.2000	0.8000	0.6666	0.9475
Employees	1.0000	0.7777	0.5555	0.2000	0.8000	0.2000	1.0000	0.6476
Distinctive Competence	1.0000	1.1111	0.6666	1.4000	0.8000	0.2000	0.6666	0.8349
Concern for Growth/ Survival	0.8333	0.4444	0.1111	1.4000	0.8000	1.0000	0.0000	0.6555
AVERAGE	0.9814	0.9505	0.7160	0.9111	0.8666	0.5555	0.6851	

Note: Scale is

- 0 = statement does not include the component
- 1 = statement include the component in vague terms
- 2 = statement includes the component in specific terms

The table give average values for each component within each group (industry)
Values in bold are the highest for each component and firm type

Table-4. Determining Mission Statement's Readability Level

**Measuring Fog Index
Financial Services Sector**

Readability Level	Bank Muscat	Oman International Bank	National Bank of Oman	United Finance	National Finance	Muscat Finance
▪ Number of Words	13	50	58	35	69	29
▪ Number of Sentences	1	1	2	5	7	3
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	13	50	29	7	9.85	9.66
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	0	1	1	0	1
▪ Percent of Hard Words	0	0	1.72	2.85	0	3.44
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	13	50	30.72	9.85	9.85	13.1
Fog Index	5.2	20	12.28	3.94	3.94	5.24

Food and Beverage Sector

Readability Level	Asaffa Foods	Dhofar Beverage & Food Stuff	Gulf Mushroom Products	Dhofar Cattle Feed	Oman Intl. Food	National Biscuit Industries	Oman Fisheries	Oman Refreshments	Salalah Mills
▪ Number of Words	85	106	34	125	10	9	26	44	35
▪ Number of Sentences	5	4	2	6	1	1	1	2	2
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	17	26.5	17	20.83	10	9	26	22	17.5
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
▪ Hard Words Percent	0	0.94	0	0	0	0	0	2.27	2.85
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	17	24.91	17	20.83	10	9	26	24.27	20.35
Fog Index	6.8	9.96	6.8	8.33	4	3.6	10.4	9.7	8.14

Industrial Manufacturing Sector

Readability Level	Oman Cables Industry	Oman Fiber Optics	Oman Cement	Gulf Plastic Industries	Raysut Cement	Gulf Int. Chemicals	Al Jazeera Steel Product Company	Voltamp Energy	Al Hassan Engineering
▪ Number of Words	27	22	39	19	92	157	42	37	48
▪ Number of Sentences	1	1	8	1	6	8	1	1	1
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	27	22	4.87	19	15.33	19.62	42	37	48
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
▪ Hard Words Percent	0	0	0	0	0	3.18	0	0	0
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	27	22	4.87	19	15.33	22.80	42	37	48
Fog Index	10.8	8.8	1.94	7.6	6.13	9.12	16.8	14.8	19.2

Utilities & Power, Telecom, and relevant Sector

Readability Level	ACWA Power Barka	Sohar Power	Al Kamil Power	OIFC	NAWRAS
▪ Number of Words	19	14	26	30	21
▪ Number of Sentences	1	1	2	1	1
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	19	14	13	30	21
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	1	1	0	0
▪ Hard Word Percent	0	7.14	3.84	0	0
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	19	21.14	16.84	30	21
Fog Index	7.6	8.45	6.73	12	8.4

Investment Sector

Readability Level	Al Anwar Holding	Al Batinah Dev. & Inv. Holding	Al Sharqia Inv. Holding	OHI	OMINVEST
▪ Number of Words	42	48	22	18	27
▪ Number of Sentences	4	1	1	4	1
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	10.5	48	22	4.5	27
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	0	0	0	0
▪ Hard Word Percent	0	0	0	0	0
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	10.5	48	22	4.5	27
Fog Index	4.2	19.2	8.8	1.8	10.8

Metal, Mining, Oil & Gas Sector

Readability Level	National Aluminum Products	Oman Chromite	Oman Oil Marketing	National Gas	Al Maha Petroleum Products Marketing
▪ Number of Words	80	7	31	84	114
▪ Number of Sentences	3	1	1	5	8
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	26.66	7	31	16.8	14.25
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	0	1	0	0
▪ Hard Words Percent	0	0	3.22	0	0
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	26.66	7	34.22	16.8	12.25
Fog Index	10.66	2.8	13.68	6.72	4.9

Education, Healthcare, & Transport Sectors

Readability Level	Dhofar University	Majan College	Oman Education & Training Inv.	National Pharmaceutical Ind.	Port Services Co.	Salalah Port Services
▪ Number of Words	30	75	49	20	37	56
▪ Number of Sentences	1	6	1	1	1	6
▪ Average Number of Words per Sentences	30	12.5	49	20	37	9.33
▪ Number of Hard Words	0	0	0	1	1	0
▪ Hard Words Percent	0	0	0	5	2.7	0
▪ Sum of Word Average and Hard Words Percent	30	12.5	49	25	39.7	9.33
Fog Index	12	5	19.6	10	15.8	3.7

Table-5. Fog Index levels for sample firms in seven industry groups

Industry Group	Financial Services	Food & Beverages	General Investment	Industrial Manufacturing	Metal, Mining, Oil & Gas	Utilities	Healthcare, Education, & Transport
Fog Index							
1	3.94	3.6	1.8	1.94	2.8	6.73	3.7
2	3.94	4	4.2	6.13	4.9	7.6	5
3	5.2	6.8	8.8	7.6	6.72	8.4	10
4	5.24	6.8	10.8	8.8	10.66	8.45	12
5	12.28	8.14	19.2	9.12	13.68	12	15.8
6	20	8.33		10.8			19.6
7		9.7		14.8			
8		9.96		16.8			
9		10.4		19.2			
Average Value	8.435	7.5255	8.96	10.5766	7.752	8.636	11.016