

Communication Satisfaction of SUC's Faculty Members

SUSAN R. BUTAC, PhD

Associate Professor
College of Arts and Sciences
San Beda University, Manila
susan_butac@yahoo.com

Abstract: The research examines the communication satisfaction of permanent faculty members in the National Capital Region's State Universities and Colleges in terms of Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, and Organizational Communication. Its goal was to address the question, "What is the degree of communication satisfaction of SUC faculty members in terms of: Interpersonal communication context, Group communication context, and Organizational communication context?" The study used a quantitative research design. Since the study focused on quantitative data, the descriptive method, specifically the descriptive survey, was used because the study focused on the levels of Communication Satisfaction of 377 regular faculty members of SUCs at the NCR in terms of Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, and Organizational Communication. Downs and Hazen's modified communication satisfaction survey form was used to collect the required quantitative data (1977). Findings would show that, SUC faculty members were Significantly Satisfied in terms of communication satisfaction across all aspects. Communication Satisfaction is Satisfied among SUC faculty members at the NCR. Their satisfaction with their current communication system in terms of Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, and Organizational Communication has proved to be extremely important in performing their work. It may also be deduced that Communication Satisfaction improves Job Satisfaction and Productivity in certain situations. In selecting these characteristics, communication satisfaction is a changeable choice.

Keywords: communication satisfaction, interpersonal communication, group communication, organizational communication

I. INTRODUCTION

During the Covid-19 pandemic, communication remains an essential tool in connecting with our loved ones, learners, clientele, and even remote audience. In fact, many companies and organizations adopt different modes of communication to get connected with their employees and customers despite the restrictions of the pandemic. The same thing goes with teachers who have started to embrace the call of remote learning and flexible learning. They utilize digital platforms such as Zoom, Google meet, MS teams, and the like just to reach out with their students. Also, they collaborate with their colleagues with the goal of training their students to become problem solvers. The challenge of online communication that we have is linked to the idea of Communication 2.0 that the transmission of information is made possible through electronic channels. For the same point, Kemp (2018) claims that there are no excuses for teachers not to collaborate with others since we get more connected. The presence of technology brings connectivity into reality. This is indeed the trademark of the 21st century, However, this technologically-oriented world challenges the teachers to advance on the usage of technology in order to communicate effectively with others and eventually get satisfied with their

communication system. Their being technologically savvy enables them to establish and promote critical thinking and learning styles among their students which serve as a guiding tool and a catalyst in helping them learn.

Furthermore, communication now is considered as an intangible soft skill for careers. It facilitates human connections. As a matter of consideration, Kathy Robinson, founder of Boston career-coaching firm Turning Point considers it as one of the keys to building relationships, gaining visibility, and creating more opportunities for advancement. Communication if it's an effective one really helps administrators and education leaders to be more focused in attending and providing the needs of their members and colleagues, in making the existing system efficient for better financial outcome, and in promoting a more productive working vicinity.

Communication satisfaction is the level of satisfaction of employees in an organization experience during interactions between themselves and their superiors and between themselves and their fellow employees (Wagner, 2013). It aims the common success of a group because it sets the tone for the interaction of organization members. Besides, it is a social process whose ultimate purpose is a common understanding- a unity within the social group or team (Hennings, 2013). But the challenge now remains debatable in the Philippine context. The deficiency of local studies investigating on the level of communication satisfaction particularly during this time of Covid-19 pandemic remains apparent. There is still least attention given to the usage of upward form of communication where employees can express their concerns to the authorities. But the chance to rectify the communication system in order to attain communication satisfaction remains achievable.

Taking the case of State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) at the National Capital Region (NCR) is no excuse. It is assumed that the interaction between the administrators and the subordinates is driven by Downward Communication. Since these schools are funded by the government, the financial allocation and procurement of facilities, faculty development, education and scholarship grants, and other work-related transactions come from the government itself. Messages are received in the form of memoranda, school publication, performance assessment, job instructions, school orientation, and training for the job. However, the usage of Upward Communication should be given consideration to generate more open flow of communication within the system. Also, the SUCs' faculty members are expected to take part in the communication process and in the operation of their schools. They, themselves, should have an understanding of the communication process and be knowledgeable enough of the existing issues that hamper it. Believed by Bangayan- Manera (2020) Teachers' awareness of the existing communication problems helps the administration in solving the issues that obstruct communication satisfaction and eventually job satisfaction and productivity. This idea is supported by Writing (2016) when he claims that organizations should address such problem because poor communication strains the productivity of the organization.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study used the Quantitative design of research. Also, Descriptive method particularly the Descriptive Survey as the most appropriated one was employed since it focused on the quantitative data which are the levels of Communication Satisfaction of 377 regular faculty members of SUCs at the NCR in terms of Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication and Organizational Communication. Formplus Blog (2021) describes

Descriptive survey research as a process that uses surveys to gather data and to know the extent to which conditions can be obtained from varying topics. The needed Quantitative data were obtained using the modified communication satisfaction survey questionnaire of Downs and Hazen (1977).

Twenty five percent (25%) was taken from the total population of Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP) main campus only, Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology (EARIST), Rizal Technological University (RTU), Technological University of the Philippines (TUP), Philippine Normal University (PNU), Philippine State College of Aeronautics (PhilSCA) and Marikina Polytechnic College (MPC). The said sample became the participants of this study. However, the sample from PNU was not included since permission to gather data was not given to the researcher. The sample size which was 25% was proportional to the overall population of each school. It turned to be feasible after the computation. Simple Random Sampling was employed in identifying the respondents.

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaires (CSQ) by Downs and Hazen (1977) was adopted and modified by the researcher. It underwent Expert Validity. Then, Reliability test was completed. The modified CSQ, with the calculated **Cronbach’s Alpha reliability value** of 0.98 was used in this study. Lastly, the weighted Mean of each item was computed to determine the levels of communication satisfaction of the SUC’s faculty members.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study yielded the following results on the Communication Satisfaction levels of the SUC’s faculty members in terms of Interpersonal, Group, and Organizational levels.

Table 1

Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Interpersonal Communication

Communication Satisfaction in terms of Interpersonal Communication	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q4. Information about your progress in your job.	3.71	Moderately Satisfied
Q8. Information about how you are being performance managed.	3.50	Satisfied
Q9. Recognition of your efforts.	3.47	Satisfied
Q18. Extent to which your manager/supervisors understand the problems faced by staff.	3.60	Moderately Satisfied
Q20. Extent to which your supervisor listens and pays attention to you.	3.43	Satisfied

Q22. Extent to which your supervisor offers guidance for solving job-related problems.	3.47	Satisfied
Q25. Extent to which your supervisor trusts you.	3.62	Moderately Satisfied
Q29. Extent to which your supervisor is open to ideas.	3.55	Moderately Satisfied
Q33. Extent to which the amount of supervision given to you is about right.	3.48	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.54	Moderately Satisfied

Note: 4.51-5.00 – “Highly Satisfied”, 3.51-4.50 – “Moderately Satisfied”, 2.51-3.50 – “Satisfied”, 1.51-2.50 – “Fairly Satisfied”, 1.00-1.50 – “Highly Unsatisfied”

The Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s faculty members in terms of Interpersonal Communication is presented here. Table 2 shows that the Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s faculty members in terms of Interpersonal Communication has “Moderately Satisfied” response. Overall, the mean score for level of communication satisfaction in terms of Interpersonal Communication which was 3.54 with moderately satisfied descriptor is presented. Five items (Q8, Q9, Q20, Q22, Q33) got a “Satisfied” response while Four (Q4, Q18, Q25, Q29) obtained a “Moderately Satisfied” response. It appeared that SUCs faculty members are “Moderately Satisfied” with the score of 3.71 regarding their Information about the progress in their job. It is however, found to have their least communication satisfaction with the Extent to which their supervisor listens and pays attention to them with 3.43 score. Nevertheless, four faculty members’ responses reveal that the level of SUCs communication satisfaction in terms of Interpersonal Communication was to a “Moderately Satisfied.”

The yielded result correlates with the claim of Jooste (2010) that information on what to do and a clear focus on what to be achieved is significant. Also, in order for the faculty members to be highly satisfied, it is important for both supervisors and subordinates to understand each other. This kind of atmosphere promotes efficiency among the members of a group. Effectiveness in doing one’s job is also observed if there is an established respect and open communication among the members of an organization. As a result of such practice, a school or an organization will have its machinery to fulfill its goals.

Table 2
Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Group Communication

Communication Satisfaction in terms of Group Communication	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q5. News regarding personnel.	3.40	Satisfied
Q7. Information about how your job performance compares with other.	3.45	Satisfied

Q10. Information about departmental policies and goals.	3.52	Moderately Satisfied
Q11. Information about the requirements of the job.	3.65	Moderately Satisfied
Q26. Extent to which you receive the information required to do your job in time.	3.44	Satisfied
Q27. Extent to which conflicts are handled appropriately through proper communication channels.	3.43	Satisfied
Q28. Extent to which the informal communications network (grapevine) is active in your school.	3.47	Satisfied
Q30. Extent to which communication with other employees at your level is accurate and free flowing.	3.38	Satisfied
Q31. Extent to which your work group is compatible.	3.51	Satisfied
Q36. Extent to which informal communication is active and accurate.	3.50	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.48	Satisfied

Note: 4.51-5.00 – “Highly Satisfied”, 3.51-4.50 – “Moderately Satisfied”, 2.51-3.50 – “Satisfied”, 1.51-2.50 – “Fairly Satisfied”, 1.00-1.50 – “Highly Unsatisfied”

The Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Group Communication is shown on this table. Table 3 shows that the Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Group Communication is “Satisfied.” Overall, the mean value of 3.48 for Group Communication is projected. Eight factors (Q5, Q7, Q26, Q27, Q28, Q30, Q31, and Q36) obtained a “Satisfied” response while two factors (Q10, Q11) got the “Moderately Satisfied” response. It showed that SUCs faculty members are “Moderately Satisfied” with the value of 3.65 when it comes to the information about the requirement of their job. It is however, found to have their least communication satisfaction level in terms of extent to which communication with other employees at their level is accurate and free flowing. The yielded score of 3.38 calls for an attention from administration to improve group communication since faculty members are just satisfied. Thus, highly satisfied is needed for them to be contented with their job.

It is important for the faculty members to get satisfied or even highly satisfied in order for appreciate the value of group communication. They must be well informed about the well-being of their colleagues because this promotes belongingness in an organization. Downs & Hazen (1977) support this claim that the information conveyed to employees about their fellow

workers has large impact on their level of psychological belonging. Communicating with colleagues empowers the Horizontal mode of communication which is evident in this kind of occurrence.

Table 3

Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC's Faculty Members in terms of Organizational Communication

Communication Satisfaction in terms of Organizational Communication	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q6. Information about policies and goals.	3.45	Satisfied
Q12. Information about government regulations affecting your school.	3.45	Satisfied
Q13. Information about changes in your school.	3.37	Satisfied
Q14. Reports on how problems in your job are being handled.	3.36	Satisfied
Q15. Information about employee benefits and pay.	3.44	Satisfied
Q16. Information about profits and/or financial standing of the school.	3.29	Satisfied
Q17. Information about achievement and/or failures of your school.	3.38	Satisfied
Q19. Extent to which your school's communication motivates you to meet its goals.	3.45	Satisfied
Q21. Extent to which school employees have communication abilities.	3.43	Satisfied
Q23. Extent to which communication in your school make you identify with it or feel a vital part of it.	3.42	Satisfied
Q24. Extent to which your school communications are interesting and helpful.	3.41	Satisfied
Q32. Extent to which your meetings are well organized.	3.45	Satisfied
Q34. Extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise.	3.49	Satisfied
Q35. Extent to which the attitudes towards communication at your school are basically healthy.	3.40	Satisfied



Q37. Extent to which the amount of communication at your school is about right.	3.44	Satisfied
Grand Mean	3.41	Satisfied

Note: 4.51-5.00 – “Highly Satisfied”, 3.51-4.50 – “Moderately Satisfied”, 2.51-3.50 – “Satisfied”, 1.51-2.50 – “Fairly Satisfied”, 1.00-1.50 – “Highly Unsatisfied”

The Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Organizational Communication is shown on this table. Table 4 shows that the Level of Communication Satisfaction of SUC’s Faculty Members in terms of Organizational Communication is “Satisfied.” Overall, the mean value of 3.41 for Organizational Communication is presented. Fifteen factors (Q6, Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q19, Q21, Q23, Q24, Q32, Q34, Q35, and Q37) uniformly yielded a satisfied response. It showed that SUCs faculty members are Satisfied with the score of 3.49 when it comes to the extent to which written directives and reports are clear and concise. It is however, found to have their least communication satisfaction level with respect to information about profits and/or financial standing of the school. It obtained the score of 3.29. Nonetheless, this response, categorized that the level of communication satisfaction was to a “Satisfied.” This instills that the faculty members who are just satisfied need to feel highly satisfied in the process of their Organizational Communication in order to give their best in working.

With this result, correct media of communication should be utilized for communication satisfaction promotion. Downs & Adrian (1977) support the usage of formal media such as meetings, written directives, reports and the like for formal and official communication. However, the results call for the practice of transparency as to the expenditures of the school and its related financial standing in order for the teachers to feel involved and be able to contribute to the needed solution for any financial constraint experienced by an organization.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Communication Satisfaction level of SUC’s faculty members at the NCR is Satisfied. Their feeling of being contented with their existing communication system in terms of Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication and Organizational Communication is proven very significant in doing their job.

This result instills that, it is essential for them to feel satisfied in order to be efficient in discharging their duties as teachers since teaching is considered to be the prime source of their bread and butter, their substantial source of living.

It can be inferred also that Communication Satisfaction promotes Job Satisfaction and productivity in some areas. Communication satisfaction is a variable option in determining these aspects.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn in the study, the following are favorable recommendations:

- 1) Regular supervision and supportive face to face communication must be provided in order for the SUCs faculty member to have highly satisfied level of communication satisfaction. This practice should be done in a communication-friendly space. Also, Administration should create a rewarding team to recognize achievements and contributions of teachers.
- 2) There must be a creation of a culture with respect.
- 3) Schools should adopt appropriate media of communication and utilize appropriate platforms for better and accurate transmission and dissemination of information to all the concerned members of the organization.
- 4) The administration should fix poor obstructive policies and regulations since such ambiguities compromise trust and commitment to one's job.

References

- [1] Bangayan- Manera, A. (2020) Doodle: Towards a Hermeneutical Appreciations of Jacques Derrida's Deconstruction. *The Asian EFL Journal*. 24(4.2) 191-204
- [2] Bortz, D. (2021). *Soft skills to help your career hit the big time*. <https://www.monster.com/career-advice/article/soft-skills-you-need>
- [3] Downs, CW & Adrian, AD. (2004). *Assessing organizational communication: Strategic communication audits*. The Guilford Press.
- [4] Down C.W. & Hazen M.D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14 (3), 63-73.
- [5] Formplus Blog. (2021). *Descriptive research designs: Types, examples & methods*. <https://www.formpl.us/blog/descriptive-research>
- [6] Hennings, D. (2013) *Communication in action: Teaching literature –Based Language Arts: 7th Edition*
- [7] Jooste, K. (2010). *The principles and practice of nursing and health care*. Pretoria.
- [8] Kemp (2018). *Top 5 skills teachers need to continue to flourish in the fourth-industrial-revolution*. Retrived May 30, 2019 from <https://www.ge.com/reports/ethical-underbelly-fourth-indstrial-revolution>
- [9] Wagner J.D. (2013). *Communication satisfaction of professional nurses working in selected public health care services in the city of Johannesburg*. <http://uir.unisa.ac.za/handle/10500/11959>
- [10] Whittlesey, A. (2020). *Communication during a pandemic*. <https://www.raps.org/news-and-articles/news-articles/2020/4/communication-during-a-pandemic>

