ROLE OF HEADS OF TEACHING DEPARTMENTS
IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION
AT POSTGRADUATE LEVEL

By
RAHMAT ULLAH SHAH

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION & RESEARCH
GOMAL UNIVERSITY, DERA ISMAIL KHAN
SEPTEMBER, 2011
ROLE OF HEADS OF TEACHING DEPARTMENTS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION AT POSTGRADUATE LEVEL

By

RAHMAT ULLAH SHAH

Supervised by: Prof. Dr. Umar Ali Khan

A dissertation submitted to the Institute of Education & Research

Gomal University in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education

SEPTEMBER, 2011
IN THE NAME OF ALLAH
THE MOST BENEFICIENT
THE MOST MERCIFUL
DEDICATION

Dedicated to my great parents
Whose kindness and encouragement
Provided the strongest foundation
For my education
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Umar Ali Khan, my Ph.D research supervisor, for his continued support, advice and words of wisdom and his encouragement throughout the development and writing of this thesis. He has been a role model, great motivator and mentor for me. Thank you Dr. Khan!

I extend thanks to my study respondents: Universities and postgraduate colleges’ heads and teachers for their cooperation in providing data and moral support. Without their cooperation I was unable to undertake this study.

I am also grateful to my sponsor: Higher Education Commission of Pakistan for its financial support throughout my study.

I present my sincere thanks to my professors and staff in the Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University, and all my friends. Thank you!

RAHMAT ULLAH SHAH
ABSTRACT

Communication plays a very important role in the management of an educational institution. It is the soul of an organization. An institution cannot be run without proper communication. The purpose of the study was to investigate the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level. The population of the study consisted of all heads and teachers in universities and postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. For this purpose, eight universities and eight postgraduate colleges were randomly selected by the researcher as a sample. The sample consisted of 441 (148 heads and 293 teachers) respondents. A questionnaire consisted of 27 items was utilized for data collection. Mean, t-test, and One-Way ANOVA were used for data analysis. The role of heads of teaching departments was positive in all aspects of communication. Type of institute of the heads did not differentiate the two groups of heads in their opinions about their role in the promotion of communication. Insignificant difference was found between the views of heads of natural and social sciences departments about their role in the promotion of communication. A significant difference was found between heads and teachers’ views regarding the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Insignificant difference was observed between the views of universities and postgraduate colleges’ teachers, teachers from natural and social sciences departments, and between male and female teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Insignificant difference was found among the views of heads by age, qualification, experience as a chairperson, and total length of service in the present department regarding their role in the promotion of communication. Teachers were not differentiated by qualification, designation, age and experience in their views. It
is concluded that heads of teaching departments play positive role in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level. Demographic characteristics of the heads, i.e., age, qualification, total length of service in the present department, experience as a chairperson, type of institute and nature of department do not affect their role in the promotion of communication. This is also evident from the views of teachers that heads promote communication in their respective institutions. To make heads more effective in the process of communication, a course of communication skills may be arranged for newly inducted as well as for those heads who are already working as heads of teaching departments. For this purpose communication training institute may be established in every university. For the development of language proficiency of the heads and teachers, a language laboratory may be established in every institution of higher education.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Broadly speaking, nobody can ignore the fact that communication plays a very important role not only in the management of an educational institution, but also in the management of every organization. These organizations range from a small home to a multinational company. For the smooth running of an educational institution, particularly a university, sharing of a great deal of information among superordinates, subordinates and peers is necessary. Cooperation between heads and teachers is essential for proper management of an educational institution. This cooperation may be acquired through proper sharing of information between heads and teachers within a university or postgraduate college. For the coordination of various activities of an institute, effective communication is necessary between superordinates and subordinates. To get work done by employees, their job satisfaction should be increased. Effective communication enhances job satisfaction of employees. As Alexander (1996) indicates that strong relationship, exist between communication climate and job satisfaction of academic department chairs, and the communication climate activities are characterized by mutual influence, openness and free flow of information.
For effective sharing of information, a competent person must be made in charge for the management of information on the campus. The appointment of a competent person as a communicator may be helpful in the accomplishment of organizational goals. As Zorn & Violant (1996) indicated that positive and significant association existed between communication abilities and attainment of organizational rewards.

As heads and teachers exchange information with each other, but how to make this sharing an effective one, is an important matter. Effective communication between heads and teachers may result in organizational commitment. However, lack of communication between heads and teachers negatively affects organizational commitment. As Gorden & Infante (1991) revealed that, less perceived freedom of speech in the workplace resulted in less employees’ organizational commitment and satisfaction with their work and supervisor. They further stated that employees wished more freedom of speech in the workplace than they had. The head of teaching department as a communicator communicates in three directions, i-e, downward, upward, and horizontal. These directions of communication affect level of commitment of employees within the institution. Strong relationship exists between vertical communication and the levels of commitment at both organizational and unit level as compare to horizontal communication (Postmes, 2001).

The perceptions of employees also affect credibility of information within an organization. As Unzicker et al (2000) revealed that positive relationship existed between effective internal communication and perceptions of employees in the firm. Effective
communication among employees increases not only their commitment, but also may enhance the output of an organization. As Clampitt & Downs (1993) indicated:

“Communication was perceived to have impact on productivity that varied both in kind and magnitude. Moreover, a number of intriguing differences emerged between these two companies. The findings suggest that the link between communication and productivity is more complex than previously assumed.”

Sometimes barriers may emerge which halt the process of communication. These barriers may negatively affect the output of an organization. For the avoidance or elimination of these barriers, trust among employees is essential. Transparency in information sharing is necessary for the development of trust among employees. An atmosphere of trust can eliminate or minimize communication barriers, i-e, context-related barriers and content-related barriers within an organization (Phelps & Dufrene, 1989). Athanassiades (1973) found dynamic relationships and interactions between downward and upward distortions, and the organizational climate. Effective communication not only develops trust but may also be helpful in the incorporation of innovations. As world has become a global village, innovations are taking place very rapidly in every organization, especially in the institutions of higher education. A university not only transmits knowledge, but also generates it. These innovations may take place in academic structure, i-e, admission procedure, curriculum development, methods of teaching, system of examination and management structure, i-e, planning, organizing, staffing, directing, reporting and budgeting, of an educational institution. Proper exchange of information between heads
and teachers may be helpful in incorporation of these innovations. Monge et al (1992) indicated that communication variables, i-e, level of information and group communication were the causes of organizational innovation. Johnson et al (2001) revealed that communication variables: quality of communication, interpersonal communication and mediated communication had both direct and indirect effects on perceived innovativeness. They further stated that mediated channels could play a critical role in the implementation of management-initiated innovations.

Effective communication is helpful not only in the incorporation of innovations, but also may develop identification of all stakeholders with their institution. Smidts et al (2001) revealed that employees’ communication supplemented perceived external prestige and explanation of organizational identification. They further stated that communication climate played a central role in arbitrating the impact on organizational identification of the content of communication.

As nobody can deny the contributions of communication in the management of an institution of higher education, but the lack of communication among stakeholders may results in so many problems. such as lack of coordination, lack of cooperation, lack of self-confidence, lack of identification with the institution, mistrust, inefficiency, decrease in output and misunderstanding. These contributions of communication led the researcher to explore the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level.
Managerial Duties of a Head of Academic Department, which influence his/her Communication or Interpersonal interactions

The head plays a very important role in the management of a teaching department. The head is an essential link between the faculty and administration. He plays his role as a manager as well as a faculty member. The head spends most of his time in managerial duties. Smith (2002) pointed out that majority of heads work more than 50 hours per week, and that dealing with under-performing staff is the most difficult issue as indicated by the heads in both chartered and statutory universities. Hancock (2007) states:

“Across seven categories of chair duties, 71.3 percent of time demands, more than 3.5 of five days in a typical week, involves general managerial tasks that require no discipline-specific academic credentials”.

The academic head is busy in most of the time in managerial tasks, does many works at a time, interact with many people at a time, and as a result he becomes stressed. As Gmelch & Burns (1993) reported that chairs felt much stressed because of heavy workload, and the stressors included time pressures, confrontation with colleagues, organizational constraints and their faculty duties. They (chairs) are in paradoxical situation: experiencing double pressures as an effective leader and as a productive faculty member. They (1994) pointed out that chairs felt high stressed in both areas of faculty and administration.
Postgraduate level Institutions in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Postgraduate level institutions are those where education beyond bachelor degree program is imparted. In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, postgraduate level institutions are postgraduate colleges and universities. Postgraduate colleges impart education at Master level. Provincial government of KPK exclusively finances PGCs. The Directorate of Colleges formulates rules and regulations for these colleges. The principal is the head of a postgraduate college. The director of colleges appoints the principal of a postgraduate college. The principal appoints a head of teaching department for the period of three years. Eligibility criteria for the appointment of a head of teaching department are experience and qualification. However, there are no strict rules and regulations considering experience and qualification as requirements for the appointment of the head of department. As the Directorate of Colleges makes rules and regulations for postgraduate colleges, while universities are autonomous in formulating rules and regulations. The statutory bodies of a university formulate rules and regulations for it. Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) gives only guidelines to the universities. These guidelines reflect the policy of the Government of Pakistan about higher education. The university makes rules and regulations in the light of these guidelines. Public as well as private sector universities are engaged in transmitting and generating knowledge. The federal government of Pakistan exclusively finances universities in public sector. Private sector universities generate fund from their own resources. The chancellor appoints a vice-chancellor for the period of two or four years.
Vice-chancellor is the head of a university. In center, the president of Pakistan is the chancellor of a university, while in provinces governor is the chancellor of a university.

The vice-chancellor appoints a head of teaching department for the period of three years. The vice-chancellor may give extension to the head of teaching department because of good performance. The head of a university usually appoints a senior and well-qualified teacher as a head of teaching department. However, no strict rules exist regarding experience and qualification as a requirement for the appointment of a head of teaching department. The vice-chancellor has the authority to appoint a head of teaching unit.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Teaching department is the teaching as well as administrative unit of an institution of higher learning. The head of teaching department is called chairperson. He/she is the executive head of the department. For the effective management of the department, proper sharing of information is essential between the head and teachers. The head communicates not only with subordinates but also with superordinates and peers on the campus. For this purpose, he/she uses various channels of communication. The utilization of various channels may ensure effective communication between the head and teachers.

Effective communication may enhance commitment and job satisfaction of the head as well as of the teachers. Communication may develop trust between the head and teachers. No single study has explored the role of heads of teaching departments as communicator anywhere in general and Pakistan in particular.
This phenomenon led the researcher to investigate the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges. This study determined the influence of the eight demographic variables i.e., gender, age, qualification, designation, type of institute, nature of discipline, total length of service in the present department and experience as chairperson on the role of heads in the promotion of communication.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Following were the objectives of the study:

1. To know the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level.

2. To explore difference between the opinions of heads and teachers regarding the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication.

3. To find out difference between the opinions of university and postgraduate college heads, heads of natural and social sciences’ departments about their role in the promotion of communication.

4. To explore difference between the opinions of university and postgraduate college teachers, teachers of natural and social sciences’ departments, male and female teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication.

5. To investigate difference among views of heads by age, qualification, experience as a chairperson and total length of service about their role in the promotion of communication.
6. To highlight difference among views of teachers by designation, age, experience and qualification about the role of heads in the promotion of communication.

1.4 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses tested the problem of the study:

H (1): The overall role of the heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication.

H (2): There is no significant difference between the opinions of heads and teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level.

H (3): There is no significant difference between the views of university and postgraduate college’ heads, heads from natural and social sciences’ departments about their role in the promotion of communication.

H (4): There is no significant difference between the opinions of university and postgraduate college’ teachers, teachers from natural and social sciences’ departments, male and female teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication.

H (5): There is no significant difference among the opinions of heads by age, qualification, experience as a chairperson and total length of service regarding their role in the promotion of communication.
H (6): There is no significant difference among the views of teachers by designation, age, qualification and total length of service about the role of heads in the promotion of communication.

1.5 Overview of the Procedure

It was a descriptive study. The population of the study consisted of all heads and teachers of teaching departments at postgraduate level in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The researcher randomly selected eight universities and eight postgraduate colleges as a sample. The researcher selected a head and two teachers as respondents from every teaching department. The researcher developed a 27 items questionnaire for data collection. The researcher consulted his Ph.D supervisor and experts in social sciences for the validation of the scale (see Appendix C). For the purpose of reliability, the researcher randomly selected a sample of 60 (20 heads and 40 teachers) respondents from the population. The researcher excluded this number from the final sample. Cronbach's coefficient alpha formula was used in estimating internal consistency of the scale. Cronbach’s Alpha was achieved as high as 0.937 for the scale. The researcher personally administered the questionnaire. The researcher utilized Mean, t-test and One-Way ANOVA as statistical techniques for data analysis.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Communication is the soul of an organization. Proper sharing of information is essential for the management of an organization. Communication is used to assign task, build cooperation, maximize performance and satisfaction, avoiding and solving problems.
Therefore, nobody can deny the importance of communication in an organization. Communication is essential for the management of an educational institution. An institution cannot be managed without proper sharing of information. The chairperson is the executive head of a teaching department. The head’s communicative role is very important for the management of the department. The head of department communicates not only with subordinates, but also with superordinates and peers on the campus. The head and teachers share information with each other within the department. They exchange views and ideas with each other regarding different matters of the department. Sometimes misunderstandings may occur between the head and teachers due to lack of communication. Teachers complain that the heads do not convey relevant messages to them. On the other hand, heads blame teachers for not giving feedback to them. In such a situation, lack of communication between heads and teachers may give birth to so many problems, which may negatively affect the output of the department.

Keeping in view the present scenario, the researcher decided to explore the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication.

This study can be justified on the following grounds:

i. This is the first study which explores the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication. This study will contribute useful information for the effective management of a postgraduate level institution.
ii. The primary beneficiaries of this research will be heads and teachers of universities and postgraduate colleges. However, this study may provide useful information for the effective management of other organizations.

iii. The head shares job-related information not only with subordinates but also with superordinates and peers on the campus through various channels of communication. This study will explore the effects of demographic variables such as age, gender, qualification and experience on the communicative role of heads.

iv. The head of a department does a multi-faceted job. He/she plays his/her role as an office manager, evaluator, students’ guide, selector of teachers and materials. Proper sharing of information is necessary for the management of all these activities. This study will investigate the extent to which the heads play their role as communicator.

v. This study may provide educational administrators and researchers with useful information about communication practices in universities and postgraduate colleges.

vi. This document may present useful information to policy makers in the institutions of higher education in Pakistan.

vii. This study will open new areas of interest for researchers in education discipline.

1.7 Definitions of Terms/Abbreviations

Role: The role is constituted by communicative behaviors of the heads of teaching departments.

Teaching Department: The teaching department is a teaching as well as an administrative unit of a postgraduate college or a university.
KPK: KPK stands for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Its old name was N.W.F.P. It consists of 24 districts.

PGC Postgraduate College

HOD Head of Department

HEC Higher Education Commission

GSS Group Support System

CMC Computer-Mediated Communication

E-mail Electronic Mail

1.8 Overview of the Thesis

Chapter 1 contains the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, hypotheses, overview of the procedure, significance of the study and definitions of terms/abbreviations. A review of the related-literature is found in Chapter 2. The methodology of the study is presented in Chapter 3. Analysis of the data are given in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 contains the findings, discussion, conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

For understanding the problem of the study, it is necessary to review relevant literature. Keeping in view the importance of the review of literature, an attempt has been made in this chapter to study the related documents on various aspects of the problem and record observations. For the sake of convenience, the materials so thrashed out, are presented in various sections. The description of which is given below:

2.1 Communication Concepts

2.2 The Importance of Communication

2.3 Communication Process

2.4 Forms of Communication

2.4.1 Formal Communication

2.4.1.1 Downward Communication

2.4.1.2 Upward Communication

2.4.1.3 Horizontal Communication

2.4.2 Informal Communication

2.5 Channels of Communication
2.5.1 Face-to-Face Communication

2.5.2 Electronic Mail

2.5.3 Telephone

2.5.4 Written Communication

2.5.5 Meetings

2.6 Listening

2.7 Computer-Mediated Communication

2.8 Related Research Studies

2.9 Research Literature in Pakistani Context

2.1 Communication Concepts

Communication is the exchange of information between a sender and a receiver. Communication is flow of information within an organization. Communication is a mean of processing meaning. Brown (1959) defines communication as "The process of transmitting ideas or thoughts from one person to another, or within a single person, for the purpose of creating understanding in the thinking of the person receiving the information".

Wilson (1986) defines communication as
“An evolutionary culturally dependent process of sharing information and creating relationship in environments designed for manageable, cooperative, goal oriented behavior”.

“Organizational communication is the process of creating and exchanging messages within a network of interdependent relationships to cope with environmental uncertainty” (Goldhaber, 1993).

Tortoriello et al (1978) defined organizational communication as “The flow and impact of messages within a network of interactional relationships”.

Communication is central to the exercise of authority within an organization. Communication is an ongoing process within an organization. It does not reflect reality which comes from reality (Deetz, 1982). In the words of Ordway (1951)

“Communication is the touching of mind by mind, of person with person whether it would be one man to a thousand. It can include conversation, interview, dialogue, visual technique, carefully used”.

Communication is the process of exchanging and sharing messages, ideas and feelings (Porter & Robert, 1976, Meaning, 1992). By the use of face-to-face or technological media, individuals interact and influence each other through communication (Craig, 1999). Johnson (1992) states that the construct of organizational communication consists of five main dimensions. These dimensions include relationships, entities, contexts, configuration and temporal stability. Pettit et al (1997) described six dimensions of
communication, i.e., accuracy of information, desire for interaction, information load, 
trust in superior, influence of superior, and satisfaction with communication as predictors 
of job satisfaction with the greatest support.

Communication is vital for all members in an organization. The functions of 
communication in an organization as stated by Baskin & Aronoff (1984) include (a) to 
co-ordinate actions of the members in an organization (b) information sharing, and (c) 
expression of feelings and emotions. Staton-Spicer & Spicer (1987) described four 
functions of communication in an organization. These functions include informative, 
integrative, regulative and innovative. Wiemann (2006) proposed five components model 
of communication competence: interaction management, empathy, affiliation/support, 
behavioral flexibility and social interaction. He reported strong, positive, linear 
relationship between interaction management and communicative competency. Positive 
correlation existed between competence and other components of the model.

Communication is the socializing matrix. “Communication is a social process in which 
two or more parties exchange information and sharing meanings” (Charles et al, 1979). 
Ruesch & Bateson (1951) described four dimensions of communication in social matrix, 
i.e., (1) Intrapersonal communication (2) interpersonal communication (3) group-
Individual communication, and (4) group-to-group communication.

2.2 Importance of Communication

Communication is the life blood of every organization. Katz & Kahn (1978) state: 
"Communication is the essence of an organization". Communication is utilitarian within
an organization. That’s why; managers employ communication primarily to accomplish organizational goals. Barnard (1938) asserted:

"Communication occupies a central place in an organization because the structure, extensiveness and scope of organization are almost entirely determined by communication techniques”

Chester (1938) stated that communication held a central place in an organization. Executives, managers, employees and all organizational members needed to understand and improve their communication abilities. Communication is one of the most dominant and important activities in an organization (Harris & Nelson, 2008).

Communication is helpful in socialization of employees, decision making, problem solving, and change management process in an organization. Communication is the interpersonal foundation upon which all organizational life is built. Communication may develop trust and motivation in employees. Organizations which had employed and obligated employees were 50 % more productive than those organizations where employees were not employed (Izzo & Withers, 2000).

McKinney et al (1997) found significant positive associations between concern-for-other and concern-for-issue conflict styles and communicative adaptability scale dimensions: social confirmation, social experience and appropriate disclosure. Negative relationship was found between a self-oriented conflict style and the communicative adaptability scale dimensions: social composure, articulation, and social experience. Sharma & Patterson (1999) state that effective communication is a key driver of antecedents’ variables, i.e
technical quality, functional quality and trust, and the signal most powerful determinant of relationship commitment. Elvins (1985) pointed out that participation in quality circle had positive effects on perceived individual influence/power, communication with superiors, subordinates, and to some extent, with peers.

Although communication plays a very important role in the accomplishment of institutional goals, however barriers may emerge which interfere with communication process. These barriers include status difference, information overload, structure, filtering and semantics. To improve communication process within an educational institution, one must understand potentials problems that can affect the process. Source may intentionally withhold or filter information on the assumption that the receiver is in no need of it. Boyd (1984) stated that the communicator’ selection might cause a breakdown in communication that could not be repaired even with good follow-up communication. Credibility/background and hostility/conflict problems are considered to be the most serious barriers. Personality differences, know-it-all attitude, either-or-thinking, resistance to change, and jumping to conclusions are considered the most frequent barriers to effective communication (Golen et al, 2007). Some of these communication barriers can be overcome by using communication skills. These skills include repetition, empathy, understanding, feedback and listening.

The head of teaching department does multi-faceted jobs, which include setting objectives, organizing tasks, reviewing results, making decisions and motivating employees. Without effective communication, all these jobs of the head of teaching
department cannot be completed on the campus. The centrality of communication to the overall job of an educational manager is evident from the time which he spends in sharing of information.

Effective communication is necessary not only for the managers of postgraduate level institutions, but also necessary for school managers. The school principal spends a great of deal of time in communication. As Lunenburg & Irby (1994) state:

"Elementary schools principals, high schools principals and school superintendents spend 70 to 80 % of their time in communication".

Mintzberg (1997) indicate: "Administrators spend 80 % of their time in communication".

Leadership styles of an educational manager may affect communication within an institution. Supervisor task and relational leadership style are strongly related to supervisor’ communication competence (Paul, 2008). Snyder & Morris (1984) found strong correlation among perceived communication variables, i.e., the quality of supervisory communication and information exchange within peer work groups, and critical revenue and workload measures of overall organization performance.

By communication, an individual expresses emotions, shares hopes and remember accomplishments. Organizational capabilities are developed and performed through intensively social and communication process (Jones et al, 2004). Communication is essential for the administration of an institution. As Gronn (1983) elaborates:
“Not only do administrators spend much of their time talking and that this talk accomplishes administration, but that talk is used to do the work of tightening and loosening administrative control”.

Communication is essential for the business of an institution. An institution cannot be managed without proper communication. Open communication makes the work of an educational manager more effective within a school. Arshad (2003) states that open communication make the school more effective, while poor communication results in ineffective control, poor coordination and inevitable management failure.

For the implementation of an information system, it is necessary that the right people must communicate the right information, at the right time and through the right media (Bakehouse & Doyle, 2007). The various dimensions of communication affect job satisfaction of employees in an organization. As Ticehurt & Downs (1998) state that personal feedback and organizational integration are the predictors of job satisfaction in an organization. Communication satisfaction is one of the facets of job satisfaction of employees in an organization. Communication satisfaction with co-workers, supervisors, and upper management has significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (Ehlers, 2003). Varona (1996) found explicit positive relationship between communication satisfaction and employees’ organizational commitment.

Olaniran (1996) identified three variables of the predictors of members’ communication satisfaction. These variables include easy use of communication medium, participation and decision confidence.
Communication is related not only to job satisfaction, but also with job performance of employees. As Bednar (1982) reported significant association between communication style and different levels of managerial performance, while Rodwell et al (1999) identified negative correlation between communication and performance of employees. Rice (1994) pointed out that negative correlation existed between forms of communication and performance ratings.

Paulraj et al (2008) state that interorganizational communication is a relational competency which enhances buyers’ and suppliers’ performance.

Managers’ communication styles are not discriminated by gender. Birdsall (1980) compared communication styles of male and female managers during staff meetings. Gender did not prove to be a strong variable in producing changes in communication styles of managers. Senemoglu (2007) pointed out that women administrators perceived that they did not experience apparent gender discrimination in communicating with superiors, subordinates, and with individuals of other institutions. While MacLeod et al (1992) found significant differences among lower, middle, and upper level, and between male and female managers, regarding their oral communication styles.

Steckler & Rosenthal (1985) report:

“Females’ voices were rated as sounding more competent both verbally and nonverbally when they were speaking to their bosses, whereas males’ voices were rated as more competent when they were speaking to their peers”.
Penley et al (1991) indicated that female managers reported low self-reports of communication skills than their male counterparts.

2.3 The Communication Process

Communication is a social process in which two or more than two parties share information and meanings. The process is social because it engages two or more persons. Communication is a two-way process, occurs over time rather than instantaneously. The understanding of organizational structure is central to the communication process.

Communication is mediated by the message, the language in which the message is encoded in, and the medium through which the message is transmitted (Foulger, 2005). Communication is a two-way street involving both sending and receiving messages. Communication is usually more rich, varied and subtle than it is considered. Communication process may provide individuals with an opportunity to become more productive in every aspect of their profession. Communication process involves a sequence of steps: Source, encoding, transmission, receiving, decoding and feedback. These steps are explained below:

**Source:** Source is the origin of communication, may be an individual, group, or organization, involves in communicating something to another party. The individual in a group or in an organization may send a message on behalf of this group or organization.

**Encoding:** Encoding characterizes the idea which the sender wishes to transmit. Symbols are designed for conveying messages. Meanings cannot be transmitted because it lies in
the significance that the encoder gives to it. The receiver of the message also gives meanings to the symbols.

**Transmission:** Messages are transmitted by sender using several channels such as memoranda, telephone, closed-circuit television, computers and face-to-face communication.

**Receiving:** The encoded message is received by the receiver in two forms, either in oral or in written form. In case of oral form, the receiver must be an active listener, while in case of written form; the receiver must be attentive to its stated and implied meaning.

**Decoding:** Decoding is the process by which the receiver gets a message and interprets its meaning. The receiver uses his/her knowledge and experiences to interpret the symbols of the message. Decoding is the translation of a received message into a perceived meaning. Chamber et al (1998) elaborate that the words which are exchanged, do not have meanings, the receiver controls the meanings. Meaning cannot be transmitted or received. The receiver gets the transmitted messages and gives meanings to them.

**Feedback:** Feedback is the receiver’s response to the message. Feedback verifies the message by telling the source whether he/she got the message and understood it.

The receiver should give feedback to the sender by telling him/her that the message was received and understood. Johnson et al (1959) stated: "Communication is a system involving a sender and a receiver with implications of feedback control".
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C. Merton (1952) described five factors in the process of administrative communication viz:

(1) Act: The communication act requires the use of symbols. Language symbols usually serve the purpose.

(2) The Scene: The scene determines what is said, what symbols are used and often the meaning of what is said.

(3) Agent: Individuals who are engaged in a communication process. Relationship is considered to be the agent of communication process.

(4) Agency: The medium of communication constitutes the agency.

(5) Purpose: The purpose of communication refers to the objectives sought by an individual or group or organization, engaged in the communication process.

2.4 Forms of Communication

2.4.1 Formal Communication

Formal communication flows through officially designated channels of communication within an institution. Departmental meetings, conferences, news bulletins, special interviews and special purpose publications are the various forms of formal communication within an institution of higher education. Formal communication follows hierarchical chart within an organization. The hierarchies may be correlated with the
styles of management within an organization. Botero & Dye (2009) report in study one and study two respectively:

“LMX was positively related to voice, power distance was negatively related to voice, and power distance made more of a difference in voice when LMX was high”.

“LMX and power distance were both related to voice but did not interact”.

The purpose of communication here is to provide the means for transmitting information fundamental to goal achievement. Hall (2002) emphatically states that the very establishment of an organizational structure is a sign that communication is supposed to follow a particular path. Formal communication channels follow hierarchal order within an organization. Different channels of communication are adopted by different organizations, and employees in these organizations, transmit messages through these channels. But the most used and most preferred channels of communication are telephone and face-to-face communication (Devi, 1994). Barnard (1938) named these formal networks as the communication system. He (1938) stated that some factors must be considered for the development and utilization of formal communication. These factors included (a) the channels of communication must link every member of the organization (b) the lines of communication must be direct and short as possible (c) the complete network of communication should be specially used (d) every message must be ratified as being from the correct person holding the position and authority to produce it. To make sure that the message goes through proper channels and follow the chain of
command, are the two common behaviors that reflect a demand for control and structure of communication within an organization (Harris, 1993).

Formal system of communication within an organization may be affected by some characteristics of its bureaucracy. Three characteristics of a university bureaucracy may be crucial to formal system of communication. These characteristics of a university bureaucracy are: centralization in the hierarchy, the organization’s shape and the level of information technology used. Porter & Rober (1976) stated that centralization was important to the effectiveness of a communication system. The shape may affect communication process within an organization. The shape of an organization means the number of hierarchal levels through which a message travels. The number of hierarchal levels can be considered the distance through which the message must be transmitted. With the increase of distance, the chance for message distortion increases, and the satisfaction with quantity and quality of communication decreases (Clampitt, 1993, Zahn, 1991). Hage et al (1971) indicated that structural characteristics of an organization (complexity, formalization and centralization) affect both schedule and unscheduled interdepartmental communication. Communication is affected by not only the structural characteristics of an organization, but also the quality of relationship between superiors and subordinates. As Abu Bakar & Muhammad (2001) revealed that the quality of relationship between superiors and subordinates affect communication regardless of the country context and cultural background. Gupta & Kumar (2009) found that communication with superior had strong impact on interactional Justice. They (Gupta & Kumar, 2009) found strong correlation between communication relationship satisfaction
and justice perception. Team communication is affected by the willingness of team members to participate in team decision-making activities. Strong connection exists between communication form and team development (Douglas et al, 2003). Harison (2006) indicated that strong association existed between the participation of subordinates in decision-making and the quantity and quality of communication they experienced with superiors. Communication flow in an organization is also influenced by organizational and social issues. As Al-Rawas & Easterbrook (1996) indicated that flow of communication within an organization was negatively affected by organizational and social issues.

Communication within an institution is affected by some contextual factors such as degree of communication, knowledge and skills of the communicator and the communicatee. Charvatova (2006) pointed out that positive relationship existed between communication effectiveness and the degree of communication among units of an organization. This study also concluded that the knowledge and skills required for the use of communication tools, enhanced communication within an organization, and had positive effect on the result. Poor quality of communication is usually complained by members in an organization. As Harcourt et al (1991) reported that the quality of communication was poor in organizations of U.S.A. They further reported that middle managers preferred grapevine over formal communication within an organization.
The head of teaching department communicates in three directions, i.e., downward, upward and horizontal. These directions of communication may affect job satisfaction and performance of subordinates within an organization. As Vaught et al (2000) state:

“Downward communication received some statistical support as both moderator and predictor of job performance and job satisfaction in low individual-job congruence situation. Upward and lateral communication had some support as predictors but lacked as moderators of job performance and job satisfaction in high individual-job congruence situation”.

Hunt et al (2000) pointed out that educational managers communicate upward 48%, downward 26% and lateral 26% in work place. These directions of communication are discussed in detail below:

2.4.1.1 Downward Communication

Downward communication follows hierarchal chart, transmit messages from upper to lower levels in an organization. Downward communication directs the activities of employees. Downward communication educate employees in proper behaviors and working methods, convince them to adopt certain ideas and attitudes, evaluate their performance on the job, seek upward communication and provide movement, within an organization. Some examples of downward communication include notices, circulars, instructions, orders, letters, memos, bulletins, handbooks, annual reports and group meetings in an institution of higher education, Pakistan. The vice chancellor, the head of a university, generates a message. This message is transmitted from vice chancellor office
to director’s office (academics’ director, finance director, administration director, sports
director etc.). The message is transmitted from director’s office to deans of faculties.
From dean’s office, the message is transmitted to the heads of teaching departments. The
HOD receives the message and shares it with teachers and clerical staff within the
department.

Downward communication is the most dominant form of formal communication within
an organization. As Bukely et al (1996) stated that downward flow of information was a
dominant feature of Irish organizations. Employees’ job performance and job satisfaction
are affected by downward communication. As Goris et al (2000) states that downward
communication occasionally affects job performance more than job satisfaction when
high individual job-congruence exists. Johike & Duhan (2000) found association between
frequency of superior service employees’ communication and lower level employees’ job
satisfaction. Anderson & Level (1980) comment:

“The importance of downward communication to job performance can be strengthened
or weakened by environmental factors (factors within the organization, factors within the
task, and factors within the employee)”.

2.4.1.2 Upward Communication

Upward communication follows hierarchical chart and transmits messages from lower to
upper levels in an organization. Examples of upward communication includes
employees’ comments about themselves, their reactions about others, their reactions to
organizational practices and policies, and their views about work. As Katz & Kahn (1978) state that upward communication usually assumes one of the following forms:

- Employees’ comments about themselves, their performance, and their problems.
- Employees’ reactions and ideas about others’ behaviors and problems.
- Employees’ reactions to organizational practices and polices.
- Employees’ thoughts about what needs to be done and how it be done.

An organization uses various channels for upward communication. These channels include face-to-face communication, telephone, meetings, conferences, social affairs, grapevine, counseling, reports, personal letters, memos, suggestions box system, attitudes and information surveys, and union publications (Koehler et at, 1981). Downs & Conrad (1982) concluded these most important 11 communicative behaviors for subordinates: (1) encode clear messages (2) provide feedback (3) communicate in timely manner (4) brief and concise (5) listen (6) be factual and through (7) ask questions (8) check perceptions (9) anticipate superiors’ needs (10) volunteer input, and (11) follow instructions.

What is communicated upward is different from what is communicated downward in an organization. The reasons for this difference may be that at lower levels employees have lower rank and status than those at upper levels. It is usually observed that pleasant information is more likely to be communicated upward than unpleasant ones. Achievements are more likely to be communicated upward as compared to information regarding errors or difficulties come across at lower levels. Subordinates may be reluctant to communicate negative feedback or share information that reveals deficiencies of their
performance. David & Harvey (1977) found the presence of filtering of important and unfavorable information in air force organization of U.S.A.

An organization uses upward communication for different purposes. An organization uses it for enhancement of quality and efficiency, where as employees use it for advancement of their careers (Saund & Leck, 1993).

Organizational culture also affects communication practices within it. National culture affects subordinates’ communication truthfulness with superiors. As U.S.A nationals misrepresent private information more than their Chinese counterparts in the absence of face-to-face communication with superiors (Chow et al, 1998). In upward communication, the head of academic department transmits messages such as performance on the job, job related problems, problems of fellow employees, subordinates’ perceptions on organizational policies and practices, tasks and procedures, to high-ups in an educational institution. The superior facilitates more upward and open communication with all subordinates irrespective of their relationship quality and cultural background (Abu Bakar et al, 2003).

2.4.1.3 Horizontal Communication

Horizontal communication takes place among employees at same hierarchal level in an organization. Horizontal communication is basically peers’ communication. It is often overlooked and underused. Integration and coordination among units of an organization are created by horizontal communication. Besides providing task coordination, horizontal communication furnishes emotional and social support among peers. It serves as a
socializing process for an organization. Koehler et al (1981) describes six functions of horizontal communication: (1) let coordination among departments in order to increase output of the institution (2) ensure problem-solving at the very beginning, which result in increased morale and confidence of the individuals engaged in problem-solving (3) it permits sharing of information among departments which result in task effectiveness (4) useful in solution of intradepartmental and interdepartmental conflicts (5) information sharing is permitted among peers which give social and emotional support to the employees (6) serve as a substitute of vertical communication.

Horizontal communication is usually less formal than vertical communication. Horizontal communication is usually realized through cross functional committees or council meetings, telephonic conversation, task forces, social events, memos and notes.

Simpson (1959) found that first-line foremen communicate horizontally among themselves. The research findings reject the assumption hold by traditional theory that communication in an organization move vertically throughout the lines of hierarchy and it does not cross the lines of hierarchy. In the present technological age, changes are taking place very rapidly in every organization. These technological changes may affect communication system within an organization. Randolph & Finch (1977) revealed that direct relationship existed between technological certainty and the proportion of organization members’ horizontal communication.

2.4.2 Informal Communication
By informal communication, people carry on social and nonprogrammed activities within the formal boundaries of the system. Informal communication does not follow any organizational chart. It coexists with formal communication within an organization. Informal communication arises from friendship, personal interest and physical proximity of employees within an organization. Informal communication channels are often called grapevine. Grapevine is the fact of life in all organizations. Informal communication usually takes place in the form of oral communication within an organization. Most of information is shared through grapevine within an organization. As Deal & Kennedy (1982) state that 90% of organizational information is shared through informal communication channels.

The information received through grapevine is not credited by individuals within an organization. As Newstrom et al (1974) found:

“The majority of the survey respondents have negative feelings about grapevine. Many of the respondents (two out of five) perceived the grapevine to be quite influential (pervasive and dominant) in their organizations”.

As mentioned above that a great deal of information is shared through informal communication channels within an organization. And such type of information is not credited by members within an organization. It is usually assumed that information transmitted through informal channels is not correct. But Davis (1973) and Hellweg (1987) rejected this assumption. They stated that 78 to 90 % of information received through informal communication channels is accurate. David (1973) suggests:
“If properly guided, grapevine can build teamwork, company loyalty, and the kind of motivation that makes people want to do their best”.

Informal communication may be useful in the generation and maintenance of social relationships within a group or an organization. Kraut et al (1990) elaborate that informal communication is distance sensitive, and occurs among members who are close to each other. Level of integration negatively influences effects of collaborative communication on outcome of an organization. As Mohr et al (1995) found negative relationship between level of integration and the effects of collaborative communication on outcomes of the organization.

2.5 Channels of Communication

2.5.1 Face-to-Face Communication

The primary methods of communication in an organization are oral and written. Often these methods are jointly used in an organization. Oral communication is frequently used for sharing of information within an organization. Oral communication usually takes place in the form of informal conversation in the process of doing work, group meetings and task forces, formal speeches and presentations. Verbal communication can be improved by adopting some communication skills. These skills include (a) talk to them in their language (b) be prepared to meet and talk face-to-face with those peers (c) get to understand their culture (d) know your audience, and (e) keep smiling (Hopkins, 2006)
Face-to-face communication occurs when negotiators interact in physical proximity with each other. Face-to-face communication is either one to one or one to many. It is true form of communication. In face-to-face situation, employees have an opportunity to share opinions, thoughts, and feelings in two-way process. They share not only information, but have an opportunity to observe nonverbal cues such as facial expression, tone of voice, posture and body language. Storper & Venables (2004) described the following four features of face-to-face communication:

“It is an efficient communication technology, it can help solve incentive problems, it can facilitate socialization and learning, and it provides psychological motivation.”

In informal interaction, information is transmitted through various channels. Most of this information is transmitted through face-to-face communication. A large amount of informal messages are transmitted through face-to-face channel because of opportunistic encounters (Favela et al, 2007). Daft et al (1987) described that executives spend a large amount of time in communicating through face-to-face channel and group discussion. They prefer face-to-face communication media over sophisticated communication media such as teleconferencing, computer conferencing and electronic mail. Haythronthwaite & Wellman study contradict the findings of Daft et al (1987) study. They (1998) reveal that face-to-face communication is used in workplace where work ties among employees are weak. When ties are strong, face-to-face communication is supplemented by electronic mail. Dewhirst (1971) found usage of interpersonal channel of communication more productive than written channel within an organization. Dewhirst further stated that
individuals’ perceptions about norms of organizational information-sharing affected the use of channels both within and outside the organization. Langel & Daft (1989) suggested a rich medium of communication like face-to-face for unusual and difficult-to-understand messages. They found a relationship between sensitiveness to media richness and executive job performance. Purdy & Nye (2000) state:

“Results suggest that media richness affects required bargaining time, outcome satisfaction and the desire for future negotiation interaction”.

An educational administrator spends much of time in communicating with subordinates, superordinates and counterparts. Gronn (1983) report:

“Not only do administrators spend much of their time in talking and that this talk accomplishes administration, but that talk is used to do the work of tightening and loosening administrative control”.

Face-to-face communication enhances co-operation among employees of an organization. Bicchieri & Lev-On (2007) indicated that face-to-face communication positively affected cooperation in social dilemmas. Like face-to-face communication, computer-mediated communication also positively affected cooperation, but it was difficult to establish and maintain that cooperation.

2.5.2 Electronic Mail

Electronic mail is fast, text-based and inexpensive medium of communication. E-mail can be stored, modified and printed. This modern communication tool can be used to
speed-up the traditional pen pal process. The usage of electronic mail has become increasingly commonplace and important in corporate and institutional environment.

E-mail is not only a fast, but also a rich medium of communication. The richness of this medium of communication is determined by different factors. Schmitz & Fulk (1991) study found:

“(a) Perceived electronic mail richness (1) varied across individuals and (2) co-varied with relational social influences and with media experience factors; (b) perceived electronic mail richness predicted individuals' electronic mail assessments and usage; (c) social influences of colleagues had pervasive effects on others' media assessments”.

The richness of electronic mail is also determined through organizational context in which it is used. As Lee (1994) says:

“Richness or leanness is not an inherent property of the electronic-mail medium, but an emergent property of the interaction of the electronic-mail medium with its organizational context, where the interaction is described in terms of distanciation, autonomization, social construction, appropriation, and enactment”.

E-mail is used for exchange of different kinds of information for different purposes. As Haythronthwaite & Wellman (1998) state that e-mail is used for effective, sociable interaction, as well as for instrumental and work exchange.

Users may prefer electronic mail over voice mail within an organization. Media richness theory hypothesizes that voice mail is preferred over electronic mail. While El-
Shinnaway & Markus’ study rejects this hypothesis. They (1998) state that users generally prefer electronic mail over voice mail. Electronic mail can be sent to a group of people as conveniently as to one person. Electronic group mail may affect group behavior within an organization. Finholt & Sproull (1990) commented as: “The electronic group at work is a new social phenomenon that may contribute importantly to organizational behavior”.

Various channels of communication are used for transmission of messages within an organization. The usage of electronic mail may be more effective than other channels of communication within an organization. As Singarella et al (1993) indicate:

“A significant positive impact of e-mail was found relative to other forms of communication (e.g., paper, phone) with regard to e-mail messaging, response rates, influence, value, formality, perceptions, errors in communication, cost-effectiveness, communication style, and other factors”.

But Sarbaugh-Thompson & Feldman’ study did not support these findings. They (1998) indicated that overall organizational communication decreased with the frequent use of electronic mail.

The frequency of electronic mail usage also affects attitude of members within an organization. Hacker et al (1998) identified strong differences among attitudes of electronic mail users based on their job position. Those who used electronic mail more frequently had more positive attitude than those who less used it. As electronic mail usage is a new trend in an organization. Therefore, young employees use electronic mail
more frequently than old ones. Young faculty members, who have greater familiarity with computer, use electronic mail more frequently than old ones (Mitra et al, 1999).

Both male and female employees use e-mail within an institution. Unlike age, gender of the employees does not affect the usage of electronic mail within an institution. Men and women do not differ in the use of e-mail, but they differ in their perceptions (Gefer & Straub, 1999). Female employees consider electronic mail as a medium of communication to be easier, more efficient and more effective than their male peers. Female employees perceive electronic mail usage more appropriate for transmitting certain types of messages than their male counterparts (Allen, 1995). Every organization has its social norms. These social norms also affect the usage of electronic mail. Sproull & Kiesler (1986) revealed that with the decline of social context cues, deregulation effects of communication increase in an organization. They further stated that much of the information transmitted through e-mail would not have been transmitted easily through other medium of communication. Laura & Barry (1993) extensively reviewed literature on electronic mail. They state that electronic mail provides users with opportunities to have access to new information, and electronic mail reduces spatial, temporal and status barriers. A group of electronic mail users is capable of producing diverse opinions and making better decisions.

2.5.3 Telephone

As mentioned above, information is shared among employees through different channels within an organization. Telephone is one of these channels which are used for sharing of
information among employees both within and outside the organization. As Hinds & Kiesler (1995) found that all lateral communication among employees takes place by phone, and 59% of communication among employees is extra departmental. Dimmick et al. (2000) elaborate: “A wider spectrum of needs is being served by the telephone, where as e-mail provides greater gratification opportunities”.

Telephone and voice mail are the most vital communication technologies in an organization. These are the most frequently used technologies of communication in an organization (Scott & Timmerman, 1999). Through telephone, information of both public and private nature is shared within an organization. Social relations are developed and maintained among peers through the use of telephone. Ling (2000) elaborates: “The adoption of mobile telephone indeed leads to the rationalization and streamlining of the institution”.

Both males and females use phone as a communication channel, but the latter makes more usage of phone than the first ones. As Cray et al. (2004) indicated that 63% of telephone users were females, and 37% were males of Cochlear implant recipients.

2.5.4 Written Communication

Typically an organization produces a great deal of written communication of many kinds in day-to-day business. Letter is one of formal means of communication used for correspondence with an individual, generally someone outside the organization. Office memorandum is the most common form of written communication within an organization. A memorandum addresses to a person or group inside the organization and
deals with a single topic. Other common forms of written communication are manuals, reports and forms.

The head of teaching department communicates not only vertically, but also horizontally within an institution of higher education. The head uses two methods of communication for transmission of messages, i.e., written and oral. Most of the heads’ time is spent in writing. They are usually busy in writing reports, letters, memos and manuals. They receive feedback from subordinates on sent messages. Therefore, they prefer writing skills over other communication skills. Department chairs consider writing skills to be more important for business courses than other communication skills such as speaking, interpersonal communication, listening, technology-mediated communication, team/group communication, and cultural literacy skills (Wardrope, 2002). Al-Shanbari & Meadow (1995) indicated that handling of communication and information through traditional channels is subject to significantly greater limitations in Saudi universities as compare to universities in UK. And increasing use of information technology may lessen some of the informational problems currently exist in the academic world of Saudi Arabia. Seventy percent of supervisors spend 8 to 14 hours per week in writing (Mabrito, 1997).

As mentioned earlier that HODs are usually busy in producing written work, and they feel overloaded by the constant demand for production of writing. As a result, they become stressed. Mabrito (1997) reported:
“Many supervisors felt overwhelmed by the constant demand to produce writing and frequently were unable to produce in accordance with deadlines all the writing required of them”.

The academic head does multi-faceted jobs at a time. Therefore, he assigns duties to his colleagues including writing work. Casady (1994) reports that major writing responsibilities are assigned to colleagues within different departments of international companies and most of the written documents are produced at the keyboard or in the longhand.

Males and females are not differentiated by writing styles in an organization. As Sterkel (1988) reported that no significant difference existed between males and females regarding writing styles in business communication.

Rubin & Greene (1992) report:

“The writing of men and women is far more similar one to the other than different. Differences due to mode of discourse were more wide spread than differences due to gender”.

2.5.5 Meetings

A meeting takes place between two or more than two persons, with predetermined objectives, in formal settings. The meeting is an important vehicle for personal contact within an organization. Meetings are considered to be an integral part of organizational life. A manager spends a great deal of time in meetings. Meetings are an important part of
one’s working life. Managers and knowledge workers spend 25-80 % of their time in meetings. (Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). Thirty percent of executives’ time is spent in meetings (Croston & Goulding, 1966).

Some meetings are held only once, while others are called regularly. Some meetings address one specific problem, while others deal with a variety of issues. Whatever the purpose or nature of the meetings may be, bear 10 characteristics. These characteristics include (1) participants (2) purpose (3) special logistics (4) time frame (5) advance preparation (6) program and agenda (7) start, middle, finish (8) follow-up (9) atmosphere (10) cost (Gibson & Hodgetts, 1986). Bormann et al (1982) identified six steps in the planning of a meeting: (1) make sure that the meeting is completely essential (2) be sure that the meeting gets done its objective (3) establish the objective of the meeting (4) plan the meeting to get the purpose (5) do homework (6) evaluate result and follow-up.

For convening a meeting, time, duration, agenda, participants, venue and set-up should be considered in advance (Raman & Sharma, 2004). Agenda is a written list of individual items which need to be discussed. Agenda ensures the fulfillment of stated objectives. These guidelines should be kept in mind while developing an agenda for a meeting: (1) the number of items should be limited (2) it should reflect the future orientation (3) the agenda should be upbeat (4) critical items should be focused (5) sufficient time should be allotted for agenda (6) enough detail should be included (7) right participants (8) venue and setting (Raman & Sharma, 2004).

Volkema & Niederman (1996) indicate:
“The strongest relationships were found between the use of agendas, minutes, and support documents and the timing of meetings (duration, delays). Traditional media (for example, flip charts, chalk boards, transparencies) and higher-level technologies (for example, computers, VCRs) were largely absent from meetings”. For the success of a meeting, good relations among employees are necessary. Seaman & Basili (1998) reported that past and present working relationships between inspections participants and physical proximity affected the length of meeting time. The advantages of a meeting cannot be denied, but the excess of meetings may negatively affect employees’ well-being. Luong & Rogelburg (2005) identified positive relationship between the abundance of meetings and increased feelings of fatigue, and work load of employees. They further stated that meetings load could negatively affect employees’ well-being. The quality of a meeting is largely determined by its procedure. The chair plays a very important in the process of a meeting. The chair plays his/her role as a leader, facilitator and participant. Raman & Sharma (2004) described the following responsibilities of a chair:

1. Ensures good start of the meeting
2. Converts silence of the participants into discussion
3. Encourages equal participation
4. Participates himself/herself in the discussion
5. Deals with the emotions of participants
6. Deals with the latecomers
7. Resolves conflicts
8. Makes humor
Closes the meeting with a positive note.

Niederman & Volkema (1999) found positive correlation between facilitator’s characteristics (amount of experience/training, amount of facilitation external to versus within one’s organization, and use of group support systems) and multiple aspects of pre-meeting planning and agenda use items. Anson et al (1995) state:

“The quality of facilitators and the restrictiveness of different GSS tools moderated their impacts on appropriation processes and group outcomes”.

Nixon & Littlepage (1992) indicated that open communication, focus on tasks, exploration of options, analysis of decision consequences, action planning, temporal integrity and leader impartiality resulted in effective meetings. Majias (2007) pointed out that process’ losses negatively affected outcome satisfaction and process satisfaction dimensions of meeting satisfaction within identified computer-mediated communication environment. On the contrary, process gains positively affected both outcome satisfaction and process satisfaction irrespective of anonymity level.

The use of information technology to support meetings is increasing day by day on the campus. To support meetings electronically, some systems have been developed in universities. Dennis et al (1988) stated that PLEXSYS systems had been operational in university of Arizona since 1985. Burdett (2000) reveals:

“Electronic meeting system has the potential to overcome many barriers to women’s equal participation, effectiveness and satisfaction with the meeting process when men and women are present”. 
2.6 Listening

Listening is an important management activity. Listening is a very important management skill (Brownell, 1990). Communication, the leadership skill, is a two-way process develops through listening, enables every member to learn where he or she can fit into a team (Yeung, 2000). Studies of communication in organizational settings view listening as a key management competence (Brownell, 1991, DiSalvo, Lasen et al, 1976, Harris & Thomlison, 1983). Listening is more important than speaking and writing (Goby & Lewis, 2000).

Gibson & Hodgetts (1986) described five types of effective listening. These types are directing, judgmental, probing, smoothing and empathic. They suggested three techniques for the development of this worthwhile skill including (1) listen for total meaning (2) respond to feelings (3) note all nonverbal expressions. Raman &Sharma (2004) described four types of listening, i-e, appreciative, comprehensive, empathetic, and critical. They suggested the following traits of a good listener:

- Being non-evaluative
- Paraphrasing
- Reflecting implications
- Reflecting hidden feelings
- Inviting further contributions
- Responding nonverbally
Listening is a desirable skill in organizational settings. Listening in organizational environment is interrelated set of concepts including attentiveness, verbal behaviors, nonverbal behaviors, attitudes, memory and behavioral responses. Cooper (1997) developed a model of listening competency that does apply directly to the workplace. The model emphasizes two effective behaviors: accuracy and support. Accuracy is the confirmation of the message sent and support is the affirmation of the relationship between the speaker and the listener. Johnson et al (2003) elaborate:

“The act of self-imposed silence greatly improves awareness of one's listening effectiveness and the value of developing beneficial listening skills”.

There are barriers which negatively affect listening. As Hulbert (1989) classified barriers to listening under these headings viz: content, speaker, medium, distractions, mindset, languages, listening speed, and feedback.

Alexander et al (1992) pointed out that listening, nonverbal sensitivity and reading were related to managerial effectiveness in a bank environment. Significant positive relationships exists between listening, communication related abilities, employees level in an insurance company and upward mobility (Syphor et al, 1989).

2.7 Computer-Mediated Communication

World has become a global village. Technological changes are occurring very rapidly in every organization. Modern communication system is taking place in every organization.
Technology provides new channels of communication which basically affect how work is done, how decisions are made and how organizations are designed. An organization uses technology for facilitation of communication. Effective communication results in co-ordination of people, resources and work. With the use of technology, the firm becomes efficient, effective and better able to survive in a rapidly changing environment. Freedman (1992) proposed four immediate applications for organizations:

(1) Video conferencing  (2) multimedia  (3) collaborative computing  (4) local area network to local area network communication (cited in Andrews & Richard, 1998).

CMC generates basic changes in understanding of communication, teamwork and decision making. Computer-mediated asynchronous communication increases organizational communication, team collaboration and decision making (Berry, 2006). To reach consensus, CMC takes more time than face-to-face channel of communication. Computer-mediated communication groups take more time to reach consensus than face-to-face communication groups (Olaniran, 1994). Face-to-face participants are more influential and satisfied with decision making process than their computer-mediated counterparts, irrespective of what decision making technique is used (Thompson et al, 2002).

Status differences exist among employees irrespective of what communication channels are used in an organization. Status differences exist in CMC and face-to-face communication groups regarding participation and influence equality in mixed-status groups (Weisban et al, 1994). CMC reduces status effects to some extent in an
organization. As Tan et al (1998) reported that CMC decreased status influences during group communication in both cultures of Singapore and United States. Conflicts are unavoidable part of organizational life. Conflicts happen as an organization changes and its members endeavor to cope with their mutual interdependency in a changing organizational environment. Hobman et al (2002) reveal that no differences exist between CMC and face-to-face groups regarding the amount of task conflict express on any day. Participants who solve their problems through computer conferencing are more satisfied with the process and quality of problem-solving (Jonassen & Kwon, 2001).

Although the use of CMC is much beneficial to an organization, but its demerits cannot be ignored. CMC decreases group performance, increases the amount of time required for the completion of a task and decreases job satisfaction as compared to face-to-face group (Baltes et al, 2001).

2.8 Related Research Studies

While reviewing literature on the research topic, the researcher could not find any relevant study conducted in Pakistan. However, some studies have been conducted at world level.

Schnake et al (1990) investigated the effects of difference in perceptions of superiors and subordinates about communication practices of superiors. They found significant difference between the perceptions of superiors and subordinates regarding communication practices of superiors. They indicated that perceptual incongruence between the managers and subordinates could negatively affect intrinsic job satisfaction,
perceptions of intergroup and intra group conflict, and subordinate perceptions of the openness and supportiveness of the organizational climate.

Shatshat (1980) compared the present and ideal roles of communication directors on 19 items scale in selected business organizations. He indicated that majority of the roles (14 of 19) were perceived differently by the respondents according to the frequency and importance of the present roles and ideal roles. In each of the 14 mentioned roles, the ideal role was rated more frequently than the present role which reflected that ideals roles should be attended more frequently by the communication directors than they presently attended. Again in each of the 14 mentioned roles, the ideal role was rated higher than the present role in terms of the degree of importance assigned by the respondents.

Lack of communication skills influences communication process as pointed out by Hunt et al (2000). They reveal:

“The major findings include persistent communication problems between managers and staff, the organization of meetings, the transmission of information and the use of appropriate communication channels. The data suggest that there is a need for improved communication to facilitate the more effective management of education organizations, and to improve relationships between education managers and their staff. Greater communication skills’ training for managers is therefore recommended.”

Kocabas (2009) revealed that high-context communication tendencies of teachers were found to be more dominant than their low-context communication tendencies. He further indicated that demographic variables, i.e., marital status, education level, income level,
age, and employment period cause differences in communication tendencies. Zenger & Lawrence (1989) found relationship of age and tenure distributions with frequency of technical communication.

2.9 Related Research Literature in Pakistani Context

While reviewing literature on the research topic, the researcher could not find any relevant study carried out in Pakistan. However, two far related studies have been cited here.

Javed et al (2004) found that working environment, quality work, performance appraisals and clarity of information provided by project managers to team members were the factors which positively contributed to job satisfaction in software industry.

Ismail & Ali (1995) found negative correlation between team size and team effectiveness, while positive correlation was found of team effectiveness with the need for achievement and level of communication.
CHAPTER III

METHODS OF THE STUDY

This chapter mainly consists of the problem of the study, population and sample, data collection procedure, analysis of data, assumptions, delimitation and limitations of the study.

3.1 The Problem of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication as perceived by heads themselves and teachers in universities and postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

3.2 Population and Sample

3.2.1 Population

The population of this study consisted of all heads and teachers of teaching departments of universities and postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

3.2.2 Sample

The sample of the study consisted of heads and teachers of eight universities and eight postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. All heads of the teaching departments of the selected universities and postgraduate colleges were included as respondents of the study, while two teachers were randomly selected from each teaching department. The questionnaire was filled by a head and two teachers from each teaching department of the selected universities
and postgraduate colleges. To get the questionnaire filled, the selection of teachers was done randomly. The sample consisted of 441 (148 heads and 293 teachers) respondents.

The researcher estimated the sample size to be based on the suggestions of Stevens (1996), who recommended 15 research participants per variable. Cohen (1988) suggested a minimum of 60 research subjects per group to get approximate power of 80 with a medium effect size.

The Composition of the Sample:

The following table shows the composition of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>University college</th>
<th>Postgraduate college</th>
<th>Natural science</th>
<th>Social science</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of 60 participants (20 heads and 40 teachers) were randomly selected for the pilot study. The subjects selected for the pilot study, were not included in the final study.

3.3 Data Collection Instrument

A two-part questionnaire was administered by the researcher to the subjects (heads and teachers). Part-1 of the questionnaire consisted of eight independent variables as demographic characteristics viz: Type of institute, nature of department, designation, age, gender, qualification, total length of service in the present department and experience as chairperson.
Part- II of the questionnaire consisted of 27 Likert-type items, responded on a 5 point scale from "Always to Never", carrying a value of 5 to 1 respectively. Items designated positively are scored by 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. Items designated negatively are scored in the reverse manner. Omitted or invalid responses are given a score of 3.

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher himself. Twenty-seven items of the questionnaire were the communicative behaviors of a head of teaching department which make his/her role as a communicator. The questionnaire was personally administered by the researcher to measure the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level. The scale reflects amount of involvement of heads in the process of communication.

For the purpose of reliability of the scale, a random sample of 60 (20 heads and 40 teachers) was selected for the pilot study. This number was excluded from the final sample. Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha formula was used in estimating the internal consistency of the scale. Obtained Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.937 for the scale (scale mean if item deleted, scale variance if item deleted, corrected item-total correlation, Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted are given as an appendix A ). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient usually ranges between 0 and 1. There is no really lower limit to the coefficient. The nearer the reliability coefficient is to 1.0, the better the internal consistency of the item in the scale. In general the reliabilities less than 0.6 are considered to be poor, those in the 0.70 range are acceptable, and those over 0.8 are considered good (Sekaran, 1999: 311). George & Mallery (2003) gave these rules of thumb: “≥.9 =Excellent, ≥ .8 = Good, ≥ .7 = Acceptable, ≥.6 = Questionable, ≥ .5 = Poor, and ≤ .5 = Unacceptable” (cited in Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The scale was developed by the researcher himself, so its Cronbach’s Alpha could not be compared to any other scale in the literature.
The content validity of the scale was checked by the researcher’ Ph.D research supervisor and experts in social sciences (the list of experts is given as an appendix C).

3.4 Analytical Procedure

3.4.1 Operational Definitions of Independent Variables

1. **Type of institute**: Type of institute was treated as a dichotomous variable to be either postgraduate college or university.

2. **Nature of department**: This dichotomous variable was treated to be natural science or social science.

3. **Gender**: This true dichotomous variable was categorized as male or female.

4. **Designation**: This variable carried four values of a professor, associate professor, assistant professor and lecturer.

5. **Age**: Age was classified into three categories viz: (1) 30 or less than 30 years (2) 31-50 years (3) More than 50 years.

6. **Qualification**: There are three levels of education viz: Ph.D, M.Phil, and Master

7. **Total length of service in the present department**: This continuous variable was measured by asking respondents to indicate the number of years they had spent as a teacher and as a head of department in the present department.

8. **Experience as a chairperson**: This continuous variable was measured by asking chairperson to indicate the number of years he/she had spent in the present department as a chairperson.
3.4.2 **Operational Definition of a Dependent Variable**

**Promotion of communication**: This variable was measured by 27 Likert-type items asking the respondents to indicate the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level. They had to mark on the appropriate place on one of the five categories ranging from "Always" to "Never", carrying the scores of 5 to 1 respectively, as described by the item.

3.5 **Data Analysis**

The coded data were analyzed by utilizing statistical techniques Mean, Independent-Samples t-test and One-Way ANOVA. For the measurement of overall role of the heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication, Mean scores were placed into three categories viz:

1. 0--2.49 = Below Average
2. 2.50--3.49 = Average
3. 3.50--5.00 = Above Average

Enueme & Egwunyenga (2008) categorized Mean scores into four categories in order to know principals’ instructional leadership roles. These categories are as under:

1. 3.50 – 4.00 = Very High Extent
2. 2.50 – 3.49 = High Extent
3. 1.50 – 2.49 = Low Extent
4. 0.00 – 1.49 = Very Low Extent
Anyakoha, Uzuegbunam & Ezeike (1999) categorized Mean scores for the purpose of knowing the extent to which the channels of communication meet information needs of academics and administrators in Nigerian Universities. Mean scores were placed into the following three categories:

< 2.00 = Never meets information needs

2.00 – 2.49 = Meets information needs

2.50 – 3.00 = Always meets information needs

For the purpose of knowing the extent of attitude of different communities towards reproductive health education, Aziz (2009) placed Mean scores into the following three categories:

1 – 1.69 = Negative Attitude

1.70 – 2.39 = Moderate Attitude

2.40 – 3.00 = Positive Attitude (Aziz, 2009).

To find out Means difference between the views of heads and teachers, university heads and postgraduate college heads, natural and social sciences departments’ heads, male and female heads, university and postgraduate college teachers, natural and social sciences departments teachers, male and female teachers, t-test was employed.

The use of t-test enables one to test whether there is or not significant difference between the samples Means. Typical value for the significance level set for testing null hypothesis was 0.05. Alpha level of statistical significance is placed at .05 for all types of research studies in social sciences (Stevens, 1996).
Two types of t-test may be performed:

1. Independent Samples: Cases are classified into two groups and a test of Mean difference is performed for specified variables.

2. Paired Samples: For paired observations arranged case wise, a test of treatment effects is performed. For example the same (similar) individual is measured before and after treatment.

Typical values which are chosen for the significance level for testing null hypothesis are .05 and .01. Means of independent samples are compared through t-test.

One-Way ANOVA is employed for doing comparison of means of more than two variables. One-Way ANOVA was utilized to find out Means difference among opinions of heads by experience as a chairperson, age, qualification and total length of service in the present department. One-Way ANOVA was used to explore Means difference among views of teachers by designation, age, total length of service in the present department and qualification.

The SPSS statistical software package, version 11.0, was used to analyze the quantitative data.

3.6 Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. Heads and teachers' responses on the questionnaire are sincere.

2. Items of the questionnaire measure the overall role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication.

3. Respondents are cooperative with the researcher.
4. A proper survey was made to collect data in order to accomplish the true worth of the study.

3.7 Delimitation and Limitations of the Study

3.7.1 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to eight public sector universities and eight public sector postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The researcher randomly selected eight universities out of 10 and eight postgraduate colleges out of 14 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

3.7.2 Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited only to eight selected independent variables viz: type of institute, nature of department, designation, qualification, age, gender, total length of service in the present department, experience as a chairperson.

2. Only the questionnaire was used as a research instrument for data collection.

3. Universities and postgraduate colleges of private sector were not included as a part of this study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication. This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data. For data analysis descriptive and inferential statistics are used. Table 1 describes the demographic profile of the respondents. In order to test the hypotheses, formulated in chapter I, Mean, t-test and One-Way ANOVA are employed. This chapter consists of 17 tables. The interpretation of these tables reflects the overall role of HODS in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
### TABLE 4.1

**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF HEADS AND TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>P2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate college</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of department</td>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30 or less than 30 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 to 50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total length of</td>
<td>10 or less than 10 yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service in the present department</td>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a</td>
<td>5 or less than 5 yrs</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** N1 = 148 for heads and N2 = 293 for teachers

P1= percentage for heads and P2 = percentage for teachers

The above table shows descriptive analysis of the respondents. The researcher collected data from a total sample of 441 (148 heads and 293 teachers) respondents. Eighty-Three percent (123) heads were from university teaching departments, while 16% (25) heads
were from postgraduate colleges. Among teachers 83% (244) were from universities and 16% (49) teachers from postgraduate colleges. Sixty-Two percent (93) heads were from natural and 37% (55) from social sciences’ departments. Fifty-Nine percent (173) teachers were from natural and 41% (120) represented social sciences teaching departments.

Among heads 98% (145) were male and 2% (3) were female. Seventy-Five percent (222) teachers were male and 24% (71) were female teachers. The heads’ ages ranged from 25 to 65, with an average age of 49 years. Majority of heads (54%) were in the age category of “More than 50’ years, while the second largest age group was “31 to 50’ years (37%).

The teachers’ ages ranged from 22 to 62, with an average age of 36 years. Majority of teachers (38%) were in the age category of “30 or less than 30” years. The second largest group of teachers’ age was “31 to 50” years.

Among heads 60% possessed Doctoral degree, while others 22% had Master degree, and 11% had M.Phil degree. Majority of teachers (59%) had earned Master degree, while others had completed M.Phil degree (17%) and Doctoral degree (15%). The total length of service of the heads averaged 22 years with a maximum of 38 years. Majority of the heads were in the experience category of “more than 20 years” (23%), followed by a second largest group (18%) who were in the experience category of “11 to 20” years, and the third group (12%) were in the category of “10 or less than 10” years of experience. The total length of service of the teachers averaged 9 years with a maximum of 34 years. Among teachers 61% were in the experience category of “10 or less than 10” years,
whereas the 2nd and 3rd group of “11 to 20” years and “More than 20” years had equal length of service, i-e, 19%.

Heads’ experiences as chairperson ranged from 1 to 21 years, with an average experience of 4 years. Most of the heads (83%) had “5 or less than 5” years of experience as a chairperson, while second and third experience groups of “6 to 10” years and “More than 10” years had equal length of experience (8%). Majority of teachers (61%) had designation of lecturer, followed by assistant professor (27%), professors (6%), and associate professors (4%).
TABLE 4.2
HEADS’ VIEWS REGARDING THEIR ROLE IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequentl y</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.371</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.567</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.614</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.554</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.540</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.608</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.432</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.473</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.817</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.540</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.831</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.939</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.317</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.452</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.668</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.527</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.756</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.831</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.689</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.763</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Mean of total items= 4.596

Categorization of Mean

1. 0--2.49 =Below Average
2. 2.50--3.49 = Average
3. 3.50--5.00 = Above average

Table 4.2 illustrates that Mean scores on all the items of the scale fall in the above average Mean category (3.50—5.00), showing that the role of the heads of teaching departments is positive in all aspects of communication.
## Table 4.3

**Teachers’ Views About the Role of Heads of Teaching Departments in the Promotion of Communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Always %</th>
<th>Frequently %</th>
<th>Occasionally %</th>
<th>Seldom %</th>
<th>Never %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Mean of total items= 4.023

Categorization of Mean

1. 0--2.49 = Below Average
2. 2.50--3.49 = Average
3. 3.50--5.00 = Above average

Table 4.3 indicates that the Mean scores on all the items of the scale fall in the above average Mean category (3.50—5.00), which reflects that the role of heads is positive in all aspects of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
TABLE 4.4

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE VIEWS OF HEADS AND TEACHERS ABOUT THE ROLE OF HEADS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>124.101</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>437.436</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>108.935</td>
<td>18.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The result is significant if probability of occurrence (p-value) is equal to or less than 0.05 level.

The above table shows the testing of significant difference between the opinions of heads and teachers about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication. Since \( p = 0.00 < \alpha = 0.05 \), means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of heads and teachers about the communicative role of heads is rejected. This is concluded that teachers are not satisfied with the communicative role of heads of teaching departments on the campus. The communicative role of heads is not according to the expectations of the teachers.
Table 4.5 shows the testing of significant difference between the opinions of universities and postgraduate colleges teaching departments heads at .05 about their role in the promotion of communication. Since \( p\text{-value} \ 0.97 > \alpha = 0.05 \), clearly indicates that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of universities and postgraduate colleges teaching departments heads regarding their role in the promotion of communication is accepted. This insignificant difference reflects that heads of both universities and postgraduate colleges possess similar views about their role in the promotion of communication on the campus. This is concluded that heads of teaching departments play positive role in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
TABLE 4.6
COMPARISON BETWEEN THE VIEWS OF NATURAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES TEACHING DEPARTMENTS HEADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>123.957</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>124.345</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table illustrates the testing of significant difference between the views of heads of natural and social sciences departments about their communicative role. Since p-value = 0.793 > α= 0.05, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of heads of natural and social sciences’ departments regarding their role in the promotion of communication is accepted. Heads of both natural and social sciences departments hold similar views about their role in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges. This insignificant difference between the opinions of heads of natural and social sciences departments reflects that their role is positive in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level institutes.
### TABLE 4.7

**COMPARISON BETWEEN THE OPINIONS OF UNIVERSITY AND POSTGRADUATE COLLEGE TEACHERS ON THE ROLE OF HEADS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>108.077</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>-1.795</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Postgraduate college</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>113.204</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>-1.795</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates the testing of significant difference at .05 between the views of teachers of university and postgraduate college about the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Since $p=0.074 > \alpha=0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the opinions of university and postgraduate college teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges is accepted. The teachers of both universities and postgraduate colleges think that their heads promote communication in their respective departments. This is concluded that the role of heads is positive in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
Table 4.8 shows the testing of significant difference between the opinions of teachers of natural and social sciences about the communicative role of heads. Since p = 0.795 > α =0.05, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the views of teachers of natural and social sciences about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level is accepted. Teachers from both natural and social sciences departments have similar opinions regarding the communicative role of heads on the campus. This means that heads of teaching departments promote communication in their respective departments.
TABLE 4.9
COMPARISON BETWEEN THE VIEWS OF MALE AND FEMALE TEACHERS ABOUT THE ROLE OF HEADS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>109.270</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>107.882</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals the testing of significant difference between the opinions of male and female teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Since the $p = 0.58 > \alpha = 0.05$, indicates that null hypothesis of no significant difference between the views of male and female teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges is accepted. Male and female teachers have similar views about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication. Gender does not affect the opinions of teachers regarding the communicative role of heads in universities and postgraduate colleges.
TABLE 4.10

COMPARISON AMONG VIEWS OF HEADS BY EXPERIENCE AS CHAIRPERSON ABOUT THEIR COMMUNICATIVE ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>639.264</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>319.632</td>
<td>4.4711</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>10386.216</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>71.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The result is significant if probability of occurrence (p-value) is equal or less than 0.05

The above table shows that $F(2,145) = 4.471$, $p= 0.13$, since $p= 0.13 > \alpha= 0.05$, reveals that null hypothesis of no significant difference among views of heads by experiences as chairperson regarding their role in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level is accepted. The chairpersons having various experiences hold similar views about their role as a communicator. This is implied that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
Table 4.11 illustrates that $F(2,145) = 0.501$, $p = 0.601$, since $p = 0.601 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference among opinions of heads by age about their role in the promotion of communication is accepted. This means that heads of different ages have similar views regarding their role in the promotion of communication in their respective teaching departments. This insignificant difference among the views of heads reflects that they promote communication on the campus. They effectively communicate not only with subordinates but also with superordinates and counterparts on the campus.
### TABLE 4.12

COMPARISON AMONG VIEWS OF HEADS BY QUALIFICATION ABOUT THEIR ROLE IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>410.462</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205.231</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>10595.016</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>73.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that $F (2,145) = 2.809$, $p= 0.064$, since $p= 0.064 > \alpha= 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference among views of heads at 0.05 by qualifications about their role in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges is accepted. The acceptance of null hypothesis reflects that heads of teaching departments with different qualifications hold similar opinions regarding their role in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges. This means that heads of teaching departments play positive role in the promotion of communication on the campus.
TABLE 4.13

COMPARISON AMONG VIEWS OF HEADS BY TOTAL LENGTH OF SERVICE IN THE PRESENT DEPARTMENT ABOUT THEIR ROLE IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>50.699</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.349</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>10954.781</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 indicates that $F (2, 145) = 0.336$, $p= 0.716$, since $p= 0.716 > \alpha= 0.05$, reflects that null hypothesis of no significant difference among opinions of heads by total length of service in the present department about their role in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level is accepted. This means that heads of teaching departments having different length of service hold similar views regarding their role in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges. This is concluded that heads play positive role in the promotion of communication on the campus.
TABLE 4.14

COMPARISON AMONG TEACHERS’ VIEWS BY DESIGNATION ABOUT THE ROLE OF HEADS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1378.613</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>459.538</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>96485.155</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>333.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that $F(3, 289) = 1.376$, $p= 0.256$, since $p= 0.256 > \alpha= 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference among opinions of teachers by designation about the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges is accepted. The acceptance of null hypothesis indicates that teachers of different designations possess similar views regarding the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication. This means that the role of heads of teaching department is positive in the promotion of communication on the campus.
TABLE 4.15

COMPARISON AMONG OPINIONS OF TEACHERS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1110.432</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>555.216</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>9670.432</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>333.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 illustrates that $F (2, 290) = 1.664$, $p = 0.191$, since $p = 0.191 > \alpha = 0.05$, means that null hypothesis of no significant difference among teachers’ opinions by age about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in the institutions of higher learning is accepted. Teachers of different ages have similar views about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in the institutions of higher education in KPK, Pakistan. This is concluded that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication on the campus.
TABLE 4.16
COMPARISON AMONG OPINIONS OF TEACHERS BY EXPERIENCE ABOUT THE ROLE OF HEADS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1812.695</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>906.348</td>
<td>2.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>96051.073</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>331.211</td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that F (2, 289) = 2.736, p= 0.066, since p=0.066 > α= 0.05, denotes that null hypothesis of no significant difference among teachers’ opinions by experience regarding the role of heads in the promotion of communication is accepted. This insignificant difference among the views of teachers by experience about the role of heads in the promotion of communication reflects that heads play positive role in this regard. The heads of teaching departments effectively communicate not only teachers but also with other heads of academic departments and superordinates on the campus.
Table 4.17 shows that $F(2, 290) = 0.515$, $p= 0. 598$, since $p = 0.598 > \alpha= 0.05$, illustrates that null hypothesis of no significant difference among views of teachers by qualifications regarding the role of heads in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level is accepted. Teachers of different qualifications hold similar opinions about the communicative role of heads of teaching departments in the institutions of higher education. This means that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.

**Note:** Male and female heads were not compared in their views about their communicative role because of unequal sample. The strength of males was 145 and females’ strength was only three.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND SUMMARY

This chapter deals with the findings, discussion, conclusions, recommendations, suggestions for further research and summary of the study.

5.1 FINDINGS

Following were the findings of the study:

1. The Mean scores of heads’ opinions about all the items on the scale fell in the Above Average Mean Category (3.50—5.00) which showed that the role of the heads of teaching departments was positive on all aspects of communication (see table 4.2).

2. The Mean scores of teachers’ opinions about all the items on the scale fell in the Above Average Mean Category (3.50—5.00) which implied that the role of the heads of teaching departments was positive on all dimensions of communication at postgraduate level (see table 4.3).

3. Significant difference was found between the views of heads and teachers regarding the communicative role of heads in universities and postgraduate colleges (see table 4.4).
4. Type of institute did not prove to be a strong variable in producing significant
difference between the opinions of heads of teaching departments of universities
and postgraduate colleges in the promotion of communication (see table 4.5).

5. Nature of department did not differentiate the heads of natural and social
sciences’ departments in their views about their role in the promotion of
communication (see table 4.6).

6. No significant difference was found between the opinions of teachers from
universities and postgraduate colleges about the role of heads of teaching
departments in the promotion of communication (see table 4.7).

7. Nature of department did not make significant difference between the opinions
of teachers of natural and social sciences regarding the role of heads of teaching
departments in the promotion of communication (see table 4.8).

8. No significant difference was found between the views of male and female
teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication (see table
4.9).

9. Experience as chairperson of the heads did not differentiate the three groups in
their views about their role in the promotion of communication (see table 4.10).

10. The three groups of heads based upon age did not differ significantly in their
views about their role in the promotion of communication on the campus (see
table 4.11).
11. Qualification did not differentiate the three groups of heads in their views about their role in the promotion of communication. Qualification wise heads were placed into three categories, i.e. Ph.D, M.Phil and Master (see table 4.12).

12. Total experience in the present department did not prove to be a strong variable in producing significant difference among the opinions of three groups of heads about their role in the promotion of communication (see table 4.13).

13. The four groups of teachers based upon their designation did not differ significantly in their views about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in the institutions of higher education (see table 4.14).

14. Age did not differentiate the three groups of teachers in their views about the role of heads in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level (see table 4.15).

15. No significant difference was found among the opinions of teachers by experience regarding the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges (see table 4.16).

16. Qualification did not make significant difference among the opinions of three groups of teachers about the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges (see table 4.17).
5.2 DISCUSSION

The role of heads of teaching department is positive on all aspects of communication (see table 4.2). The table 4.2 indicates that Mean scores of all the 27 items of the questionnaire fall in Above Average Mean Category (3.50-5.00), showing that heads fully promote communication in universities and postgraduate colleges. The Mean score (4.277) of item one falls in the above average Mean category (3.50-5.00), reflects that heads call meetings of teachers when needed. HODs call meetings of teachers in order to discuss various issues with teachers such as students’ admissions, allocation and distribution of courses, exams, developmental projects etc. Similarly, the Mean score (4.277) of item two reflects that HODs distribute agenda of the meeting in advance. When agenda is distributed in advance among participants, then they do homework for the meeting. As a result the meeting becomes more productive. The Mean score of item three is 4.783 implies that heads make efforts to provide favorable environment for faculty meeting. Favorable environment may increase teachers’ participation in meetings. The Mean score (4.675) of item four reflects that heads share information with colleagues about rules and regulations of service in staff meetings. This implies that heads convey messages to teachers about rules and regulations of service. The Mean score (4.371) of item five falls in the above average Mean category (3.50-5.00) which mean that heads notify what is related to teachers. They keep teachers informed about all concerned official matters. By sharing official information with teachers by heads, job satisfaction of teachers may be increased. In this way, the output of a teaching department may be
increased. In the same way, the Mean score of item six illustrates that HODs share information with teachers about the decisions made in the meetings. These meetings may be about schedule of classes, exams, university leaves, students’ discipline, scholarships and teachers’ professional development programs etc. By sharing information with teachers about such matters, their job performance may be increased.

The Mean score (4.5) of item seven indicates that HODs also share those information with teachers received from the high-ups. A head usually receives information from high-ups in the form of decisions of syndicate, chairmen council, board of advanced studies and research etc. Sometimes the head of department holds one-to-one meeting with vice-chancellor. They discuss matters of mutual interest with each other. As it is already mentioned in chapter one that postgraduate colleges work under the control of director of colleges, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, PGCs follow directives of the Director of Colleges, KPk. In postgraduate colleges, the head of department receives all these directives through principal office, and then convey these directives to teachers. The head also holds one-to-one meeting with the principal and discusses various matters of the department with each other.

The Mean scores of items eight (4.614), nine (4.55) and ten (4.54) fall in the above average Mean category (3.5-5.00), which implies that HODs are honest in providing opportunity and discussing various issues with teachers. HODs seek opinions of teachers on different issues. HODs encourage colleagues to discuss their problems with them. As already has been mentioned that the head of department discusses various issues with teachers including students’ admission program, allocation and distribution of courses,
classes’ schedule, exams etc. The chairperson makes decisions in the light of those consultations given by teachers.

The Mean scores of items 11 (4.60), 12 (4.43), 13 (4.47) and 14 (4.81) show that HODs encourage teachers to communicate with them. A teacher can share information with the head of teaching department about various matters such as students’ academic achievement, students’ discipline, exams, schedule of classes etc. HODs not only encourage teachers to communicate with them, but also keep channels of communication open for them on the campus. The heads transmit messages vertically and horizontally through different channels. These channels include face-to-face communication, electronic mail, telephone and written communication. They establish effective channels of communication with all concerned. They use both formal and informal ways of communication. Formal ways of communication may be notifications, office orders and formal meetings. The informal ways of communication include face-to-face communication and telephone.

The Mean scores of items 15 (4.54), 16 (4.43), 17 (4.87), 18 (4.83), 19 (4.93) and 20 (4.31) reveal that HODs listen to their colleagues when they have something to discuss with them. Teachers usually discuss two types of matters with heads: (1) matters related to students (2) matters related to teachers themselves. Matters related to students include admission procedure, classes’ schedule, timetable, students’ academic achievement, discipline, exams and co-curricular activities. Matters related to teachers may be teachers’ professional development programs, promotion, transfers, annual confidential reports, leaves etc. The heads not only share information with teachers but also seek their
feedback. They take initiative in dialogue with faculty members, encouraging them to discuss their problems with them. The heads listen to faculty members while discussing their problems with them. Participation of staff members in framing institutional plans are invited by HODs.

The high Mean scores 4.45, 4.66, 4.52 of items 21, 22, 23 respectively reflect that HODs convey suggestions of colleagues to high-ups on various issues. Teachers may give suggestions to heads on various issues such as admission criteria, students’ discipline, exams, teachers’ professional development programs. HODs convey not only suggestions of teachers to high-ups, but also update them on teachers’ job performance. Teachers’ job performance is considered one of the important elements for promotion. Teachers are given promotion keeping in view their qualification, teaching experience and job performance. The heads exchange views with peers about the promotion of various educational activities on the campus. These activities include both curricular and co-curricular activities. Co-curricular activities supplement curricular activities on the campus.

The Mean scores of items 24 (4.15), 25 (4.14), 26 (4.32), 27 (4.19) imply that HODs allow their colleagues to seek information from every available source. They do not confine teachers to any specific source of information. They believe in free and frank discussion on every matter related to educational enterprise. They welcome colleagues to discuss their problems with them. They keep channels of communication. When there is group discussion, HODs provide equal participation chance to every faculty member. They believe in equal participation in group discussion.
Table 4.3 shows the views of teachers about the communicative role of heads. The Mean scores of all the 27 items of the table fall in the above average Mean category, indicates that the heads promote communication on its all aspects. Farmer et al (1998) found strong relationship between shared vision and communication of the leader. Sturo (2006) pointed out that information of job performance assisted in decision-making regarding promotion, demotion and transfer. Trust and commitment are developed among teachers through effective communication of heads. Team work, organizational communication and organizational trust are positively associated with effective commitment (Boon et al, 2006).

Type of institute of the heads did not differentiate the heads in their views about their role in the promotion of communication. Similarly, type of institute of the teachers did not prove to be a strong variable in producing significant difference between the opinions of the two groups of teachers, i-e, university teachers and postgraduate college teachers. The findings of this study are not in line with the findings of the study of Smeltzer & Fann (1989). They reported significant differences between managerial communication patterns of small organizations and large organizations. Dedmon (2006) found that the quality of formal communication in contemporary higher education is very low, but the quality of informal communication in many situations is very significant. There are two separate set-ups of teaching departments: postgraduate college and university teaching departments in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Heads and teachers of postgraduate colleges are appointed by the Director of Colleges in KPK. These colleges are exclusively financed by provincial government of KPK. While universities are autonomous bodies, independent in making rules and regulations. Only guidelines are
provided by HEC to the universities. The universities have their own appointment procedure and BPS structure. Teachers and heads are appointed by the vice-chancellor. The heads of both institutions have similar responsibilities. They usually fulfill the following responsibilities:

1. Academic leadership
2. Department governance
3. Staff guidance and management of performance
4. Finance and infrastructure management

Designation of the heads did not make difference in their views about their role as a communicator. Similarly, insignificant difference was found among teachers’ views by designation. The head of a teaching department is called chairperson. The head is appointed for the period of three years by the vice-chancellor in a university, and by the principal in a postgraduate college. The tenure of a head of department may be extended on the basis of good performance. By designation, there are four categories of teachers in the institutions of higher education. These categories of designation are lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor.

Like designation, gender of the teachers did not distinguish the two groups in their views about the role of heads in the promotion of communication. The findings of this study are in line with the study of Pool et al (1998). They stated that both male and female managers and professionals consider interpersonal communication skills as an important competency. But the findings of the study do not confirm the findings of the study of Amason & Allen (2008). They stated that males developed positive co-worker
communication relationship, but females did not. Penley et al (1980) reported difference between male and female subordinates’ observations about organizational communication. However, Algren & Eichhorn (2007) pointed out that gender wise no significant difference existed among public relations practitioners and technicians regarding levels of cognitive communication competence.

Nature of department of the heads did not prove to be a strong variable in producing significant difference between the opinions of the two groups of heads about their role in the promotion of communication. Likewise, no significant difference was reported between the views of teachers of natural and social sciences about the communicative role of heads. The reasons of this insignificance difference may be:

1. The roles and responsibilities of the heads of both the natural and social sciences departments are the same.
2. The official channels of communication are the same for the heads of both departments.
3. The appointment and promotion criteria are the same for the heads and teachers, of both the sciences in the institutions of higher education.
4. Equal professional development opportunities are available for the heads and teachers, of both the sciences.
5. The performance appraisal and evaluation procedure are the same for the heads, and teachers, of both the sciences.

Heads and teachers were different in their views about the communicative role of heads. This study is in line with the findings of Verona (1996). Verona found that
supervisors were more satisfied with communication practices than their subordinates in a organization. The reasons of this significant difference may be:

1. Heads and teachers are differentiated by their designation.
2. Teachers may not be provided with desired information by the heads.
3. Teachers may not be consulted on important issues by the heads at department level.
4. Teachers may not be allowed by the authority of concerned institution to use all channels of communication.
5. Teachers may not be provided with a chance of equal participation in decision making.

Age of the heads did not differentiate them in their views about their role as a communicator. In the same way, the age of the teachers did not make difference in their views about communicative role of heads. The findings of this study contradict findings of the study of Zenger & Lawrence (1989). They revealed that age and tenure distribution had relationship with frequency of technical communication. McCann & Giles (2007) revealed that young workers experienced more difficulty in communication with old workers as compare to their same age workers. People of different ages communicate differently (McCann et al, 2005). This means that age determines the patterns of communication. Minimum age is 18 years for the appointment of a government servant, and 60 years for retirement of an employee, in Pakistan. The same rule of age is applied to both heads and teachers. After retirement, a Ph.D degree holder can serve for the period of five years on contract basis in a university.
Qualification of the heads did not differentiate the three groups of heads in their opinions about their role in the promotion of communication. Qualification wise heads were placed into three categories, i.e, Ph.D, M.Phil and Master. Similarly, qualification of the teachers also did not prove to be a strong variable in producing change in the views of the three groups of teachers about the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Minimum qualification for the appointment of a teacher is Master Degree. They get promotion on the basis of experience, qualification and performance. Similar official channels of communication are available for all heads irrespective of their qualification. Teachers are also provided with equal communication opportunities irrespective of their qualification.

Experience of the heads did not make difference in their views about their role in the promotion of communication. In the same way, experience of the teachers did not differentiate them in their opinions about the communicative role of heads. Experience is much counted in the appointment of a head of teaching department. Usually an experienced teacher is appointed as a head of academic department.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn on the basis of findings of the study:

1. On the whole, the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in all aspects of communication at postgraduate level.

2. The variables type of institute and nature of department of the heads do not make difference in their views regarding their role in the promotion of communication.
These two variables do not affect the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.

3. The variables age, qualification and experience of the heads do not make difference in their views regarding their role in the promotion of communication on the campus. These variables do not impact the communicative role of heads.

4. The variables type of institute and nature of department of the teachers do not differentiate them in their opinions about the communicative role of heads of teaching departments in universities and postgraduate colleges.

5. The variables age, designation, qualification and experiences of the teachers do not make difference in their views about the communicative role of heads. The teachers think that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication on the campus.

6. Gender of the teachers does not prove to be a strong variable in producing change in the opinions of the two groups about the communicative role of heads. This means that both male and female teachers consider the role of heads positive in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Following recommendations were made on the basis of the conclusions:

1. To make a head of teaching department an effective communicator, training in communication skills may be given to him/her. For this purpose, a communication training institute may be established where heads of both university and postgraduate college may be trained.
2. The head of teaching department plays his/her role as a leader, manager and administrator. For the performance of this multi-faceted job, it is essential for the head of teaching department to be a good communicator. For this purpose, a reorientation course of communication skills may be recommended for the newly inducted heads.

3. A teacher in a postgraduate level institute performs not only his/her teaching duty, but is also involved in various administrative activities. A head of department assigns various teaching and administrative responsibilities to the teachers. The teacher shares information with the head as well as with the students simultaneously. For the fulfillment of this important responsibility, the teachers are in need of up-to-date information. For the purpose of providing teachers with up-to-date information, a committee of teachers may be constituted which work for the promotion of communication at departmental level.

4. Language, the basic tool of communication, is used for the transmission of both verbal and written messages within an organization. Urdu is the national and English is the official language of Pakistan. These languages are also used as a medium of instruction in educational institutions. As English is an official language of Pakistan, therefore, all official correspondence is done in English. For the improvement of language proficiency of the heads and teachers, a language laboratory may be established in every postgraduate level institution.

5. Teaching department is a teaching as well as an administrative unit of a university or postgraduate college. Various educational activities take place
within a department daily. For the better projection of these activities, every teaching department may publish its own newsletter on monthly basis.

6. Internet is the fast and cheap mode of communication today. The users of Internet are increasing day by day in Pakistan. Every university or postgraduate college has developed its own website. All relevant information about the institute is available on its website. This is usually observed that website is overloaded with information. Sometimes very important information does not find place in the website. For the better accommodation of relevant information, every teaching department may develop its own website. The website may be updated regularly.

7. Students are considered the investment of a nation. When a student completes Master degree, then he/she is inducted as an employee in an organization. As an employee he/she will be a communicator whether in the position of a superordinate, subordinate or counterpart. To prepare students for professional life, organizational communication course may be included in the curriculum of postgraduate level program. Fifty percent engineering schools of USA and 80% engineering schools of Canada are in need of a course of technical communication (Reave, 2004).

5.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The conclusions drawn from the study indicate that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level, in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. There are other areas which can be studied for further findings:
1. To generalize these results across Pakistan, this study may be replicated in other provinces viz; Punjab, Sindh and Baluchistan.

2. Keeping in view the importance of communication in the management of educational institutions, the communicative role of secondary schools’ heads may be investigated.

3. This study should be supplemented with inclusion of other variables including teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction. The communicative role of heads and its relationship with teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction may be explored. Other demographic variables such as marital status, socio-economic status, monthly salary and the number of children may be included in the study.

4. This study may be replicated by using other instruments for data collection such as interview.

5. This study explored communicative role of heads of teaching departments in universities and postgraduate colleges. It may be replicated by exploring communicative role of principals of Degree colleges, Commerce colleges and Technical colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

5.6 SUMMARY

This study dealt with the investigation of the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level. The effects of demographic variables: type of institute, nature of department, designation, qualification, age, gender and
experience were explored on the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.

The population of the study consisted of all heads and teachers of teaching departments of universities and postgraduate colleges in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The study was delimited to eight universities and eight postgraduate colleges of public sector in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The researcher randomly selected eight universities out of 10 and eight postgraduate colleges out of 14 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The sample consisted of 441 respondents, with ratio of 148 heads and 293 teachers. A questionnaire consisted of 27 items was utilized for data collection. Mean, t-test and One-Way ANOVA were used as statistical techniques for data analysis.

The role of heads of teaching departments was positive in all aspects of communication. The difference between the opinions of heads of postgraduate colleges and universities was not significant about their role as a communicator. The nature of department of the heads did not prove to be a strong variable in producing a change in their views about their communicative role. Significant difference was found between the views of heads and teachers on the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Insignificant difference was found between the views of teachers of universities and postgraduate colleges, teachers from natural and social sciences’ departments, male and female, regarding the role of heads in the promotion of communication. Insignificant difference was found among heads’ views by age, qualification, experience as a chairperson and total length of service in the present department, regarding their role in the promotion of
communication. Similarly, insignificant difference was observed among views of teachers by age, experience, designation and qualification.

It is concluded that the role of heads of teaching departments is positive in all aspects of communication. The demographic variables do not affect the role of heads in the promotion of communication in universities and postgraduate colleges.
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APPENDIX A

ITEM MEAN, VARIANCE, CORRECTED ITEM TOTAL CORRELATION AND CRONBACH'S ALPHA FOR THE WHOLE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.3443</td>
<td>403.796</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>136.7869</td>
<td>402.437</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.5082</td>
<td>404.121</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>136.7705</td>
<td>399.013</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>137.1148</td>
<td>395.670</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>137.2623</td>
<td>390.497</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>137.9344</td>
<td>396.929</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>136.9016</td>
<td>391.923</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>137.1475</td>
<td>388.895</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>137.2623</td>
<td>394.330</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>138.3443</td>
<td>395.130</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>136.7213</td>
<td>391.238</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>136.7705</td>
<td>389.046</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>138.8852</td>
<td>396.370</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>136.5246</td>
<td>398.387</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>137.1475</td>
<td>398.928</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>137.1803</td>
<td>400.384</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>136.5902</td>
<td>394.479</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>137.4918</td>
<td>383.821</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>136.9508</td>
<td>402.814</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>136.7049</td>
<td>399.145</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>136.6393</td>
<td>391.734</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>137.0820</td>
<td>400.677</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>137.3443</td>
<td>395.230</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>137.3279</td>
<td>386.157</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>136.9016</td>
<td>392.457</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>136.9016</td>
<td>398.723</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>136.8852</td>
<td>391.403</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>136.6166</td>
<td>394.043</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>136.5902</td>
<td>406.579</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>136.9836</td>
<td>394.983</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>136.8525</td>
<td>400.861</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>138.8033</td>
<td>431.227</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>136.6721</td>
<td>408.324</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>136.8525</td>
<td>404.695</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Alpha = .9373, Mean = 141.082, Variance = 420.50
# APPENDIX B

## ITEM MEAN, VARIANCE, CORRECTED ITEM TOTAL CORRELATION AND CRONBACH’S ALPHA FOR THE SELECTED ITEMS OF SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>137.3443</td>
<td>403.796</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>136.7869</td>
<td>402.437</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.5082</td>
<td>404.121</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>136.7705</td>
<td>399.013</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>137.1148</td>
<td>395.670</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>137.2623</td>
<td>390.497</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>136.901</td>
<td>391.923</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>137.1475</td>
<td>388.895</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>137.2623</td>
<td>394.330</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>138.3443</td>
<td>395.130</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>136.7213</td>
<td>391.238</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>136.7705</td>
<td>389.046</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>136.8852</td>
<td>396.370</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>136.5246</td>
<td>398.387</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>136.5902</td>
<td>394.479</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>137.4918</td>
<td>383.821</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>136.7049</td>
<td>399.145</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>136.6393</td>
<td>391.734</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>137.0820</td>
<td>400.677</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>137.3443</td>
<td>395.230</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>137.3279</td>
<td>386.157</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>136.9016</td>
<td>392.457</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>136.9016</td>
<td>398.723</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>136.8852</td>
<td>391.403</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>136.6066</td>
<td>394.043</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>136.9836</td>
<td>394.983</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>136.8525</td>
<td>400.861</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

Alpha = .9373  
Mean = 141.082  
Variance = 420.50
APPENDIX C

LIST OF EXPERTS FOR VALIDATION OF SCALE

1. Prof. Dr. Umar Ali Khan, Director of Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University
2. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Shah, Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University
3. Prof. Dr. Abdur Rehman, Department of Education, Hazara University
4. Prof. Dr. Nasir Urdin, Institute of Education & Research, Punjab University
5. Prof. Dr. Aysha, Institute of Education & Research, Gomal University
6. Prof. Dr. Saeed Awar, Department of Education, Hazara University
7. Prof. Dr. Bahadur Shah, Dean of Management Sciences, Hazara University
8. Prof. Dr. Rashid Ur Rehman, Department of Business Administration, Gomal University.
9. Dr. Salahuddin, Chairman of Department of Sports & Physical Sciences, Gomal University.
10. Prof. Dr. Taj Muharram, Chairman of Department of Political Science, University of Peshawar.
11. Prof. Dr. Adnan, Chairman of Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar.
12. Prof. Dr. Rasheed, Chairman of Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar.
13. Prof. Dr. Shadiullah, Dean of Social Sciences, Gomal University
14. Dr. Afzal Khan, Department of Economics, Gomal University
15. Dr. Saeed Khan, Department of Education, Hazara University
16. Prof. Dr. Khair-Uz-Zaman, Dean of Sciences, Gomal University

17. Habir-Ur-Rehman, Assistant Professor of English Department, Government Postgraduate College, Bannu

18. Dr. Muhammad Naseer-Ud-Din, Institute of Education & Research, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat

19. Prof. Syed Munawar Ali Shah, English Department, Government Postgraduate College, Kohat

20. Abdul Jalil, Assistant Professor of English, Government Postgraduate College, Kohat

21. Dr. Gohar Zaman, Department of Public Administration, Gomal University

22. Dr. Waseem, Department of Mass Communication, Gomal University

23. Hakim Zad Khan, Assistant Professor of English Department, Government Postgraduate College, Bannu.

24. Biaz Khan, Chairman of Department of Commerce, Gomal University

25. Dr. Khalid Zaman, Chairman, Department of Social Work, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire No---------------------

Date-----------------------

Institute of Education & Research
Gomal University, Dera Ismail Khan

Dear Respondent,

This survey is being conducted in the partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Ph.D on the “Role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication at postgraduate level”. To know the role of heads of teaching departments in the promotion of communication, I have developed a questionnaire. Kindly fill up the questionnaire as directed. Your impartial opinions can help me in getting authentic and credible data. All the details and views will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. I shall be grateful to you for your assistance and earlier response.

Thank you!

Sincerely Yours

Rahmat Ullah Shah
Ph.D Scholar
Institute of Education & Research
Gomal University
D.I.Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
Cell No. +92-331-9176783
E-Mail: rahmatullahshah@gmail.com
E-Mail: rs_bannu@yahoo.com
APPENDIX E

ROLE OF HEADS OF TEACHING DEPARTMENTS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION AT POSTGRADUATE LEVEL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HEADS

Name of the college/university__________.

Name of the department__________.

Designation: Professor_____ Associate Prof._____ Assistant Prof._____ Lecturer_____.

Qualification: Ph.D_____ M.Phil_____ Master_____.

Age__________.(In Years)

Gender: Male_____.Female_____.

Total length of service in the present department__________(In Years).

Experience as a chairperson__________(In Years).

Note: “A” stands for Always, “F” for Frequently, “O” for Occasionally, “S” for Seldom, “N” for Never. Please (✓) tick the most appropriate answer,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I call meetings of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like to distribute agenda of the meeting in advance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I make every effort to provide favorable environment for faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I provide information regarding rules and regulations governing service of the employees in staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I notify whatever is related to the faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I keep aware my colleagues about the decisions taken in the meetings of the heads of teaching departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I share information received from the high-ups with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I provide opportunity to discuss various issues with my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I seek views of the teachers on different issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do not call teachers to discuss any particular issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I encourage teachers to communicate whatever they want to communicate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I do not keep channels of communication open.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I use both formal and informal ways of communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I favor establishing effective channels of communication with all concerned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I listen to my colleagues whenever they have something to discuss it to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I invite all concerned to give me feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I allow faculty members to meet and discuss their problems with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I hesitate to initiate dialogues with my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I conceal information from my fellows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Participation of staff members in framing institutional plans is invited by me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I convey suggestions of my colleagues to high ups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I keep authorities informed of my colleagues’ performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I do not exchange views with my counterparts about the promotion of educational activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I let my colleagues to seek information from every source.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I believe in free and frank discussions on every matter related to educational enterprise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I mind when someone is communicating something to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I believe in providing fair chance of participation to every member in group discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX F**

**ROLE OF HEADS OF TEACHING DEPARTMENTS IN THE PROMOTION OF COMMUNICATION AT POSTGRADUATE LEVEL**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS**

Name of the college/university__________.  
Name of the department__________.  
Designation: Professor_____Associate Prof._____Assistant Prof._____ Lecturer_____.  
Qualification: Ph.D_____ M.Phil _____ Master_____.  
Age__________. (In Years)  
Gender: Male_____.Female_____.  
Total length of service in the present department__________ (In Years).  

Note: “A” stands for Always, “F” for Frequently, “O” for Occasionally, “S” for Seldom, “N” for Never. Please (√) tick the most appropriate answer,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He/she calls meetings of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>He/she likes to distribute agenda of the meeting in advance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He/she makes every effort to provide favorable environment for faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>He/she provides information regarding rules and regulations governing service of the employees in staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>He/she notifies whatever is related to the faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He/she keeps aware his/her colleagues about the decisions taken in the meetings of the heads of teaching departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>He/she shares information received from the high-ups with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>He/she provides opportunity to discuss various issues with his/her colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>He/she seeks views of the teachers on different issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>He/she does not call teachers to discuss any particular issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with him/her.

11 He/she encourages teachers to communicate whatever they want to communicate.

12 He/she does not keep channels of communication open.

13 He/she uses both formal and informal ways of communication.

14 He/she favors establishing effective channels of communication with all concerned.

15 He/she listens to his/her colleagues whenever they have something to discuss it with him/her.

16 He/she invites all concerned to give him/her feedback.

17 He/she allows faculty members to meet and discuss their problems with him/her.

18 He/she hesitates to initiate dialogues with his/her colleagues.

19 He/she conceals information from his/her fellows.

20 Participation of staff members in framing institutional plans is invited by him/her.

21 He/she conveys suggestions of his/her colleagues to high ups.

22 He/she keeps authorities informed of his/her colleagues’ performance.

23 He/she does not exchange views with his/her counterparts about the promotion of educational activities.

24 He/she lets his/her colleagues to seek information from every source.

25 He/she believes in free and frank discussions on every matter related to educational enterprise.

26 He/she minds when someone is communicating something to him/her.

27 He/she believe in providing fair chance of participation to every member in group discussion.