

COMMUNICATION PROCESS IN UNIVERSITIES AND PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEES – A STUDY

Dr. M.A. Quddus

Section Officer (UGC-Human Resource Development Centre)

Maulana Azad National Urdu University

Gachibowli, Hyderabad – 500 032

Telangana – INDIA

Voice: +91-8125453920

e-mail : quddus_maq@hotmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The Universities comprise mainly of students, teaching and non-teaching staff. Teachers play a pivotal role in the teaching and learning process. They make a great difference on students' achievement, especially, nowadays, when the importance of education for knowledge and information societies has been acknowledged worldwide. The non-teaching staff form an integral part of the university system. They are valuable partners in working with teaching staff and with the university authorities. It is imperative that the non-teaching staff is satisfied with their jobs and that they derive work motivation there-from. Hence, this study attempts to study the same.

DEFINITIONS

“Work motivation is a set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior and to determine its behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration.” Pinder (1998).

“Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job; an affective reaction to one's job; and an attitude towards one's job”. Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviours. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Pinder (1998) described work motivation as the set of internal and external forces that initiate work-related behavior, and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration. Pinder (1998) contended that an essential feature of this definition is that work motivation is an invisible, internal and hypothetical construct, and that researchers, therefore, have to rely on established theories to guide them in the measurement of observable manifestations of work motivation. Du Toit (1990) added that three groups of variables influence work motivation, namely individual characteristics, such as people's own interests, values and needs, work characteristics, such as task variety and responsibility, and organizational characteristics, such as its policies, procedures and customs. Van Niekerk (1987) saw work motivation as the creation of work circumstances that influence workers to perform a certain activity or task of their own free will, in order to reach the goals of the organization, and simultaneously satisfy

their own needs.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Higher education is an “enterprise of human beings” (Liebmann, 1986) where technology and service delivery are primarily driven by human resources (Jensen, 2006). Thus, an innovative organizational climate that maximizes the potential of its members may be a viable option for an enhanced work environment where employees feel empowered to experiment with new ideas (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978) and, ultimately, may become important to the long-term survival of colleges and universities in today’s increasingly competitive environment (Jensen, 2006; Scott & Bruce, 1994).

Non-academic professional employees are key components in today’s higher education. They are responsible for the day-to-day operations of a university (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). Non-academic professional employees in colleges and universities are staffs who are employed for the primary purpose of providing academic support, student services, and institutional support. These assignments require post-secondary credentials or a substantial record of comparable background (Knapp et al., 2009). Scholars have argued that non-academic professional employees are important to all academic departments and colleges and universities could not function without the assistance of these support staff members who oversee the day-to-day operations (Knight & Trowler, 2001). As such, in brief it can be described that:

In a University system the Teaching staff makes University excel in all its academic endeavours. The Non-Teaching staff renders their service to implement the plans needed for advancement of a University. The contribution of Non-Teaching staff is also very important in carrying out the activities of the University. The Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction form important aspects of efficient and effective management system. Hence, need is felt to undertake a research study on the work motivation and job satisfaction among the Non-Teaching staff working in Central and State Universities located in Hyderabad (INDIA). Communication is considered as a factor to study the work motivation and job satisfaction among the non-teaching staff. For the purpose, two Central and two State universities (Central Universities: Maulana Azad National Urdu University and University of Hyderabad – State Universities: Osmania University and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University) have been selected for study. Each university has carved a niche in the academic and research domains. The contributions of these universities have been widely acknowledged by the government and all sections of society.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- ❖ To find the perception of Non-Teaching Employees regarding work motivation and job satisfaction with special reference to Communication.

HYPOTHESIS

- ❖ Ho1: There is no significant difference among the Group ‘A B & C’ Non-Teaching staff of the Universities in study with respect to the level of work motivation and job satisfaction.

SCOPE & LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study is meant to find the factors of work motivation and job satisfaction in the non-teaching staff of the Universities in study (Maulana Azad National Urdu University, University of Hyderabad, Osmania University and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University). The present study confine to Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction with special reference to Communication. The authenticity and accuracy of the data depend upon the responses given by the respondents. The inferences cannot be generalised.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

SOURCES OF DATA:

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. **Primary Source:** Non-Teaching staff of the Central and State Universities in study. **Secondary Source:** Annual Reports, Act & Statutes of Universities in study, Profiles, Websites of the Universities in study, Journals, Books and other published material available. Primary Data has been collected from the Non-Teaching staff of the Universities in Study by administering a structured questionnaire.

Five Point Likert Rating Scale has been used where the number represents as: (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Uncertain (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree

SAMPLE DESIGN

Sample Method: Stratified Random sampling technique has been adopted to select samples from the Universities in Study. **Population:** Non-Teaching staff of the cadres – Group 'A' (Deputy Registrars and Assistant Registrars) Group 'B' (Section Officers/Superintendents and Assistants/Senior Assistants) Group 'C' (Upper Division Clerks/Office Assistants and Lower Division Clerks/Junior Assistants).

SAMPLE SIZE

A sample size equivalent to 25% of the total designated non-teaching staff strength of Universities in study is selected for study which equals to 270 as per the following break-up:-

Group	Central Universities	State Universities	Total
A	10	15	25
B	22	88	110
C	53	82	135
Grand Total	85	185	270

DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

The responses obtained from the respondents through questionnaire has been analysed by using statistical techniques viz., Descriptive Statistics like mean, standard deviation and z-test. SPSS software has been used for analysis.

Responses of Group 'A' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Communication'

Table – 1

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	Communication and information flow is excellent	Central	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	0	10 (100%)
		State	5 (33%)	10 (67%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
2	There is ample scope of communication gap between the Section Heads and the Subordinates	Central	1 (10%)	2 (40%)	5 (50%)	0	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
		State	0	0	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	15 (100%)
3	Communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction	Central	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	10 (100%)
		State	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	6 (40%)	5 (33%)	15 (100%)
4	My Section Head shares his experiences with me	Central	3 (30%)	6 (60%)	0	1 (10%)	0	10 (100%)
		State	2 (13%)	13 (87%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
5	Communication is the key factor of our working relationships	Central	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	2 (13%)	13 (87%)	0	0	0	15 (100%)
6	The Section Heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses	Central	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	1 (10%)	0	0	10 (100%)
		State	2 (13%)	11 (74%)	2 (13%)	0	0	15 (100%)
7	Flow of information on matters relating to University / Departmental activities is fast	Central	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	0	10 (100%)
		State	0	11 (74%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	0	15 (100%)

From the table above, it is revealed that 100% respondents of the Central Universities agree that communication is the key factor of their working relationships. Further, 80% of the respondents have agreed that the section heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses. Conversely, 40% of the respondents have disagreed to the statement that the communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction.

Further, 100% respondents of the State Universities strongly agree that communication and information flow is excellent and their section heads share their experiences with them. Further, 87% of the respondents have agreed that the section heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses. Conversely, 73% of the respondents have disagreed to the statement that the communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction.

Responses of Group 'B' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Communication'

Table – 2

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	Communication and information flow is excellent	Central	2 (9%)	12 (55%)	5 (23%)	3 (13%)	0	22 (100%)
		State	31 (35%)	42 (48%)	15 (17%)	0	0	88 (100%)
2	There is ample scope of communication gap between the Section Heads and the Subordinates	Central	1 (4%)	9 (41%)	6 (27%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	22 (100%)
		State	9 (10%)	53 (60%)	11 (13%)	8 (9%)	7 (8%)	88 (100%)
3	Communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction	Central	2 (9%)	4 (19%)	4 (18%)	6 (27%)	6 (27%)	22 (100%)
		State	10 (12%)	9 (10%)	22 (25%)	22 (25%)	25 (28%)	88 (100%)
4	My Section Head shares his experiences with me	Central	5 (22%)	13 (60%)	3 (14%)	0	1 (4%)	22 (100%)
		State	21 (24%)	46 (52%)	16 (18%)	0	5 (6%)	88 (100%)
5	Communication is the key factor of our working relationships	Central	7 (31%)	13 (59%)	1 (5%)	0	1 (5%)	22 (100%)
		State	25 (28%)	51 (58%)	11 (13%)	0	1 (1%)	88 (100%)
6	The Section Heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses	Central	3 (13%)	12 (55%)	7 (32%)	0	0	22 (100%)
		State	29 (33%)	39 (45%)	17 (19%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	88 (100%)
7	Flow of information on matters relating to University / Departmental activities is fast	Central	2 (9%)	12 (55%)	5 (23%)	3 (13%)	0	22 (100%)
		State	4 (4%)	56 (64%)	28 (32%)	0	0	88 (100%)

From the table above it is revealed that 90% respondents of the Central Universities agree that communication is the key factor of their working relationships. Further, 82% have responded that their section heads share their experiences with them. Conversely, 54% of the respondents have disagreed to the statement that the communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction. Further, 86% respondents of the State Universities agree that communication is the key factor of our working relationships. Further, 83% of the respondents agree that communication and information flow is excellent. Conversely, 53% of the respondents have disagreed to the statement that the communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction.

Responses of Group 'C' Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities regarding 'Communication'

Table – 3

Sl. No.	Statement	Universities	Percentage of Response					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1	Communication and information flow is excellent	Central	27 (51%)	24 (45%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	53 (100%)
		State	28 (35%)	48 (58%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	0	82 (100%)
2	There is ample scope of communication gap between the Section Heads and the Subordinates	Central	6 (11%)	20 (38%)	5 (9%)	14 (27%)	8 (15%)	53 (100%)
		State	7 (9%)	35 (43%)	17 (20%)	15 (18%)	8 (10%)	82 (100%)
3	Communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction	Central	1 (2%)	4 (8%)	6 (11%)	24 (45%)	18 (34%)	53 (100%)
		State	0	5 (6%)	11 (13%)	35 (43%)	31 (38%)	82 (100%)
4	My Section Head shares his experiences with me	Central	15 (29%)	28 (52%)	6 (11%)	4 (8%)	0	53 (100%)
		State	15 (18%)	52 (63%)	7 (9%)	8 (10%)	0	82 (100%)
5	Communication is the key factor of our working relationships	Central	17 (32%)	27 (51%)	5 (9%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	53 (100%)
		State	0	5 (6%)	11 (13%)	35 (43%)	31 (38%)	82 (100%)
6	The Section Heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses	Central	9 (17%)	35 (66%)	5 (9%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	53 (100%)
		State	27 (33%)	48 (59%)	7 (8%)	0	0	82 (100%)
7	Flow of information on matters relating to University / Departmental activities is fast	Central	20 (37%)	29 (55%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	53 (100%)
		State	26 (32%)	49 (60%)	7 (8%)	0	0	82 (100%)

From the table above it is revealed that 96% of the respondents of Central Universities agree that communication and information flow is excellent. Further, 92% have agreed that flow of

information on matters relating to university / departmental activities is fast. 83% have responded that communication is the key factor of our working relationships. Conversely, 79% of the respondents have disagreed to the statement that the communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction. Further, 93% respondents of State Universities have agreed to the statement that communication and information flow is excellent and 92% agreed that the Section Heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses. Similarly, 92% have responded that flow of information on matters relating to university / departmental activities is fast. Conversely, 81% have disagreed to the statement that communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction.

Group Statistics and Hypothesis Testing:

To examine the significance of the perception of Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities z-test was conducted with the following hypothesis and the results are depicted in table No. 4

H₀: There is no significant difference in the perception of Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff of two Central and State Universities with regard to ‘Communication’.

Group Statistics and Hypothesis Testing of Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff regarding ‘Communication’

Table – 4

Factor	Universities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	z-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
Communication - Group A CUs and SUs	CUs	70	3.77	1.10	1.566	173	.119	NS
	SUs	105	3.50	1.10				
Communication - Group B CUs and SUs	CUs	154	3.53	1.07	1.977	768	.048	NS
	SUs	616	3.72	1.05				
Communication - Group C CUs and SUs	CUs	371	3.67	1.21	.665	943	.506	NS
	SUs	574	3.72	1.14				

The result of the Hypothesis Testing reveals that there is no significant difference in the perception of Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff of the Central and State Universities with regard to ‘Communication’.

CONCLUSION

From this study it is revealed that all the Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff have agreed that communication and information flow is excellent and flow of information on matters relating to university / departmental activities is fast. Majority of them have also agreed that the section heads communicate to their subordinates the understanding of their strength and weaknesses. Commonality exists to the disagreement that communication gap is one of the causes of job satisfaction. The result of the Hypothesis Testing reveals that there is no significant difference in the perception of Group ‘A, B & C’ Non-Teaching staff of the Central and State Universities with regard to ‘Communication’. The overall response of the staff members have been very positive with regard to the kind of Communication they have

in their respective universities. Maintenance of such Communication may be helpful for the staff in discharging their duties more efficiently and effectively.

REFERENCES

1. Du Toit, M.A. (1990). Motivering (Motivation). In J. Kroon (Ed.), *Algemene bestuur* (General management) (2nd ed.) (pp.83 – 92). Pretoria : HAUM.
2. Jensen, J. A. (2006). Support for innovation in schools: Effects of trust, empowerment, and work environment variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.
3. Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., Ginder, S. A., & National Center for Education, S. (2009). Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2008, and salaries of fulltime instructional staff, 2008-09. First look. Washington, DC.: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
4. Knight, P., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Departmental leadership in higher education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press/SRHE.
5. Liebmann, J. D. (1986, June). Non-academic employees in higher education: A historical overview. Paper presented at the 1986 Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Orlando, FL.
6. Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
7. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
8. Siegel, S. M., & Kaemmerer, W. F. (1978). Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 553-562.
9. Smerek, R., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250.
10. Van Niekerk, W.P. (1987). *Eietydse bestuur* (Contemporary management). Durban: Butterworth.
11. Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 173-194
12. www.academic.csuohio.edu
13. www.arp.sagepub.com
14. www.braou.ac.in
15. www.education.nic.in
16. www.eprints.hec.gov.pk
17. www.etd.uum.edu.my
18. www.etd.uwc.ac.za
19. www.manuu.ac.in
20. www.osmania.ac.in
21. www.ugc.ac.in
22. www.uohyd.ac.in
23. www.usca.edu/essay
24. www.wikipedia.org