

# International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies

Research Paper

Available online at: [www.ijarcsms.com](http://www.ijarcsms.com)

## Study of employees Perception about Communication Processes in Indian Cooperative Society: A Case Study

**Dr. Shine David<sup>1</sup>**

Assistant Professor,  
IMS, DAVV  
Indore - India

**Manju Singh<sup>2</sup>**

Student  
IMS, DAVV  
Indore - India

*Abstract: The main purpose of the study is to identify the difference between the perceptions of supervisors and employees about the communication process at organization. The study also provides the ways to improve the communication patterns at organization. A total of 113 questionnaires were circulated, out of which only 91 get back, consist of 35 supervisors and 56 employees at organization. Questioner developed by down and hazen in 1977, called as communication satisfaction questionnaire. The questionnaire used to interpret the communication pattern at the organization, to satisfy the purpose we have considered only first seven factors of communication. The responses of supervisors and employees were categorized separately for those seven factors. Chi-square was employed to compare the responses of both the categories. The results show that there is significant difference between the perception of supervisors and employees regarding communication patterns in the organization. This attempt focused to provide organizations and researchers with a pragmatic and useful tool to evaluate the communication gaps between different groups of organization. This study will provide new ways for other organizations and researchers to do further studies in related issues.*

*Keywords: Communication patterns, perception, supervisors, employees, and organization.*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Communication is defined as, “the exchange of information between people, by means of speaking, writing, body language or using a common system of signs or behaviour” (O’Hair, Fredrick, & Dixon, 2005). Research on communication within the workplace can be traced to the early 1900’s (Carriere & Bourque, 2009) and has developed an extremely large and diverse body of work. This research has led to the development of various applications, theories, and various research opportunities. The research has changed through the years from an emphasis on what communication methods motivate employees to be more productive to how effective communication can influence employee satisfaction (Tompkins & Thibault-Wanca, 2001). Pandey and Garnett (2006) proposed that organizations should view communication as an indicator of the organization’s health. The primary function of communication in the professional environment is to transmit and exchange information to accomplish organizational goals and objectives (O’Hair et al., 2005; Lussier & Achua, 2004). Miller (2006) has defined the history of communication in three different approaches. Classical, human relations and human resources approaches. The classical approach was created in the early 20th century when organizations were mostly industrialized factories and characterized communication from managers to subordinates where the purpose was mainly to give information related to one’s job with the aim of increasing efficiency and productivity through systems and structure. The communication method used was primarily written or oral instructions and mostly related to peoples’ work. From the late 1930s through the 1960s, theorists began to draw attention to individual needs of employees, social interaction and individual achievement (Miller, 2006). Theorists like

Abraham Maslow (1943) and Frederick Herzberg (1959) represented the human relations approach. The human relations approach illustrates communication between people about both work and social topics.

The third approach, that is, the human resources approach indicates what we are most familiar with today, which are individual needs or “putting people first”. The researchers are not only conscious about the individual needs and social interactions but, they are also aware that employees are the organization’s most important resource and an essential resource in order to reach organizational objectives and future goals. Thus, it is concluded that although the emphasis has changed through the years, internal communication has always been linked to organizational profit and growth.

The landscape of the 21st century has changed and forced organizations to shift their focus from purely financial issues to a realization that their employees are their most important resources and therefore create the most profit (Grönfeldt & Strother, 2006). The competitive environment is also changing and organizations need to adapt more quickly to those changes where communication has a key role to play (Dunmore, 2002). However, through the years, organizations have aimed at external communication for making public relations and marketing activities where the aim has been to enhance organizational identity and image. Recently, boundaries between external and internal communication have slowly been disappearing where managers have begun to emphasize that the information they send to outside audiences is consistent and in line with their other organizational activities (Cheney & Christensen, 2001; Dunmore, 2002; Quirke, 2008).

Effective communication is one of the organizational key aspects since employees play a huge role in organizational success (J. Gray & Laidlaw, 2004) and can influence numerous factors, which concern organizational overall operation and competence. People seek communication with other people to satisfy their interpersonal needs in order to make them feel a part of the organization.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. *Communication as a Concept*

The exchange of information is the prerequisite for formal work organisations. However, communication in the workplace is more complex process than just the information disclosure (Bratton, et al. 2007). Numerous scholars have defined communication as the exchange of information between a sender and a receiver where the message flows from one point to another and the communicators are linked together by channels (Kalla, 2005; Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008; Krone, Jablin, & Putnam, 1987; B. E. Stuart, Sarow, & Stuart, 2007). Internal communication is a fundamental management activity in every organization since it is vital for employees to receive information regarding their job. However, many communication models with different highlights have been put forth to describe the nature of communication and how organizational communication works. According to Ackley (1997), any employee communication function that is not practicing strategic communication is dysfunctional. He claims that employee communication should be approached like every function that helps organisation earn money, save money, improve customer satisfaction, and demonstrate organisation’s people values. Ackley highlights that the employee communicators should be „painting the picture“ of organisation’s activities needed to accomplish its mission.

### B. *Process School*

According to the perspective of the “process” school, communication is concerned with how senders and receivers encode and decode how transmitters use the channels and media of communication. It examines communication for efficiency and accuracy. Communication is perceived as a process in which one person affects the behaviour or state of mind of another. From this perspective, communication failure occurs when the effect is different or smaller from the intended one. When such circumstances appear, the stages of communication are carefully investigated in order to find out where the failure occurred. The school makes use of the social sciences, psychology, and sociology. The acts of communication are of its main interest (Fiske 2011).

### C. Shannon and Weaver's Mathematical Model

Shannon and Weaver's Mathematical Theory of Communication is crucial as it contributed undoubtedly to the development of Communication Studies. The theory is the example of process school that perceives communication as the transmission of messages. Numerous scholars have supported the source – message – channel – receiver or the SMCR model, which was first put forth by Shannon and Weaver in 1949 (Adler & Elmhurst, 1996; Blundel, 2004; Bowditch & Buono, 2005; Downs & Adrian, 2004; B. E. Stuart et al., 2007). The SMCR model demonstrates the communication process, where it begins with a sender, a person who transmits the message. This activity is called encoding where the communicator is deciding what and how to communicate (Adler & Elmhurst, 1996). In a perfect world, the message will reach its intended receiver without any problems or hindrance. The message is then decoded, that is, the receiver interprets the message by attaching meaning to it. Receivers should always respond to the messages and the receivers' feedback to the message can both be verbal or nonverbal such as smiles, sighs or a written response (Blundel, 2004). One of the greatest sources of communication failure is noise which can disturb the messages from reaching the receiver, being understood and creating feedback (B. E. Stuart et al., 2007). Although numerous scholars have supported the SMCR model, communication scholars have different focus on different elements in the model that they claim are fundamental for the communication process. They may focus on the importance of clear messages, well organized media channels or the importance of the feedback from the receiver. Today, internal communication is seen as more multidimensional and is much more than message exchange, information flow or providing information about people's work. Internal communication is about relationships and creating a respected atmosphere for all the people within the organization (Argenti, 2009). Internal communication is furthermore the social glue that ties people within the organization together (Roberts & Euske, 1987). Concluded by Quirke (2008) who claims that the communication process within the organization should be seen as an ongoing process which has no beginning or ending and the goal should always be to share the thinking instead of announcing the conclusion.

The study taking consideration of seven factors of communication for assessing the perception of supervisors and employees about communication are:

1. **Communication Climate:** reflects communication on both the organizational and personal level. On one hand, it includes item such as the extent to which communication in the organization motivates and stimulates workers to meet organizational goals and the extent to which it makes them identify with the organization. Other than that, it includes estimates of people's attitudes towards communicating are healthy or not in this organization.
2. **Supervisory Communication:** includes both upward and downward aspect of communicating with supervisors. Three of the principal items include the extent to which superior is open to ideas, the extent to which a supervisor listens and pays attention toward problems, and the extent to which guidance is offered in solving job-related problems.
3. **Organizational Integration:** revolves around the degree to which individuals receive information about the immediate work environment. Items include the degree of satisfaction with information about departmental plans, their job description and job specification, and some personnel news.
4. **Media Quality:** deals with up to what extent meetings are well organized, written directives are short and clear, and the degree to which the amount of communication is about right.
5. **Co-Worker Communication:** concerns about horizontal and informal communication to provide accurate and free flowing information. This factor also includes the activeness of grapevine.
6. **Corporate Information:** deals with broadcast kind of information about the organization. It includes notification about changes, information about the organizations' financial standing, and about the over-all policies and goals of the organization.
7. **Personal Feedback:** is concerned towards the workers need to know how they are being judged and how their performance is being appraised.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### A. Sample

A questionnaire survey in organization was conducted with 91 samples from 113 (response rate was 80.5%). The responses consist of 35 supervisors and 56 employees. The questionnaire consists of 35 questions, based on communication perception. The 35 questions are divided in seven factors, each factor has five questions. The factors are as follows: communication climate, organisational perspective, relationship to superiors, media quality, organisational integration, horizontal and informal communication, and personal feedback. The Cronbach's Alpha for the 35 items is 0.967. Mainly two hypotheses were formed in this study:

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the perception of supervisors and employees regarding the communication processes in organization.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is significant difference in the perception of supervisors and employees regarding the communication processes in organization.

To identify the significant relationship between the perception of supervisors and employees about communication processes chi-square test was performed at 99% confidence level.

#### B. Limitations of the Research

There are a number of limitations to the research undertaken. The questionnaires represent the perceptions of employees and management team at a specific point in time. The time period of this dissertation constitutes another constraint on the research. The lack of opportunity for the employees to complete the questionnaires on the company's premises affected the research; time given to employees for the completion of questionnaires had to be extended. Communication perception will differ according to the age, experience and gender of the employee.

As shown in Table 1: The result of Cronbach's Alpha test for 35 items.

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.967	0.968	35

### IV. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The survey questionnaire was focused on responses of two groups i.e. supervisors and employees about communication at organization. Communication is an integral part of any organization, and communication satisfaction is very important in organization as helps to maintain or create the culture of organization. The matrix shown is explaining about the relationship between the perception of supervisors and employees about the communication patterns at the organization. The chi-square test was performed at 99% confidence level so the rejection criteria for H<sub>0</sub> will be 0.01 or less than 0.01. As it has already mentioned about the H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub>, the conditions will be applied to all the values presented in the matrix. The matrix is given at end of this study.

According to the results there are very few cases which are accepting the H<sub>0</sub> i.e. there are very less cases of supervisors and employees who are not having any significant difference regarding the communication patterns in organization. The cases which are rejecting the H<sub>0</sub> are more in number, so it is quite difficult to explain the reasons for each and every case for rejecting the H<sub>0</sub>. There may be chances, the reasons will overlap or chances of duplication are more. It is better to explain collectively, as the study is all about to determine the supervisors' and employees' perception about the communication processes. Both the groups are very different levels of an organization; due to that the information circulated to both the groups would be different. For example, supervisors are more engaged with the meetings and other management activities but, employees are not. Due that different information would be circulated to both the groups. In organizations the managers or supervisors of a department are

very much aware about the activities of other departments but, employees are least interested in the activities of other departments.

Secondly there may be differences in educational level of supervisors and employees. This also affects the level of understanding. Person with higher education would be able to analyse the situation more realistically than, person with lower educational level. With time passes supervisors are able to understand the information of other departments also while discussions in meetings. But in case of employees, don't take interest in activities of other departments, same is about the information.

Thirdly, differences can be due to the factors like, age, gender, experience, expectations from organization, family background, educational background, attitude of person, work culture of organization and many more. These are few, but very common reasons to create the perception differences. For example, expectations of a youth and an old man will be different, because of generation gap differences of thoughts is natural.

Fourthly there are some other factors like lack of feeling towards organization, grapevine, organizational structure, downsizing, increased workload, communication overload, and communication processes at work place, etc. For example, in present scenario every organization is working for reducing the cost of organization and for profit maximization. Organizations are interested in downsizing, that creates more work load on employees than before as well as create communication overload. These kinds of situations create confusions and communication gaps in department that leads to create differences of perception in supervisors and employees.

Fifth, as organizations are moving toward current trends of every aspect and walking on theme of go green. The same is followed by this organization like working on HRD Audits HRD Structures, Downsizing, and current trends of HR like HRMS, HR Accounting, Training and Development, etc. All the works are replaced by online works, all notices and information are circulated mail. Video conferencing is also used for general meetings. In these processes the employee are more engaged machines and have less time to communicate each other. This kind of culture is also affects the communication processes.

## V. CONCLUSION

Overall, this study attempted to investigate the significant difference between the supervisors and employees perception regarding communication processes at work place. As in findings we have already discussed that the null hypotheses has rejected in many cases, which describes the significant difference in perception between supervisors and employees regarding communication processes in organization. This attempt focused to provide organizations and researchers with a pragmatic and useful tool to evaluate the communication gaps between different groups of organization. This study is providing any possible solutions to fill those gaps. But it shows that, research organization is in the process of change. For effective change management it is important to provide feedback and fill communication gaps between different groups. Study shows that organization is moving towards new perspectives of growth. The organization is on the way to improve its culture and working processes, conducting HR Audits, using HRMS system for HR functions and maintaining the records about all the employees of organization. It shows the positive reinforcement in organization's culture working for environment is an intelligent step, by reducing paper work and relocating it toward online processes. It preserves time and as well as energy and resources of organization, to maintain the flow of knowledge, thoughts, creativity and innovation, they recruiting the employee from different ways to maintain the injection of fresh blood in the organization. This study will provide new ways for other organizations and researchers to do further studies in related issues.

var.	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
1	0.991	0.586	0.887	0.72	0.841	0.908	0.938	0.97	0.757	0.636	0.911	0.889	0.645
2	0.915	0.448	0.761	0.47	0.902	0.991	0.894	0.981	0.696	0.189	0.811	0.56	0.496
3	0.001	0.321	0.796	0.826	0.696	0.452	0.842	0.918	0.847	0.913	0.558	0.934	0.95
4	0.739	0.474	0.864	0.928	0.415	0.685	0.363	0.064	0.201	0.68	0.066	0.713	0.328
5	0.476	0.494	0.734	0.918	0.251	0.917	0.883	0.912	0.481	0.823	0.423	0.75	0.771
6	0.324	0.2	0.905	0.646	0.524	0.608	0.49	0.583	0.916	0.534	0.543	0.559	0.906
7	0.073	0.759	0.646	0.372	0.709	0.563	0.931	0.965	0.818	0.664	0.532	0.738	0.745
8	0.138	0.021	0.845	0.816	0.411	0.685	0.637	0.608	0.587	0.679	0.954	0.937	0.916
9	0.923	0.918	0.47	0.423	0.715	0.475	0.935	0.943	0.769	0.71	0.864	0.423	0.897
10	0.969	0.904	0.658	0.209	0.866	0.628	0.788	0.705	0.795	0.225	0.924	0.24	0.411
11	0.113	0.561	0.807	0.501	0.165	0.881	0.434	0.757	0.525	0.91	0.61	0.95	0.643
12	0.346	0.498	0.801	0.797	0.533	0.81	0.546	0.72	0.305	0.102	0.916	0.606	0.203
13	0.861	0.912	0.574	0.789	0.692	0.322	0.565	0.528	0.353	0.527	0.66	0.27	0.49
14	0.356	0.736	0.017	0.866	0.778	0.907	0.02	0.565	0.991	0.963	0.705	0.743	0.853
15	0.602	0.133	0.329	0.564	0.163	0.523	0.957	0.767	0.51	0.714	0.225	0.474	0.832
16	0.607	0.687	0.816	0.182	0.675	0.811	0.918	0.405	0.509	0.357	0.206	0.697	0.423
17	0.069	0	0.971	0.938	0.019	0.889	0.692	0.873	0.692	0.998	0	0.958	0.494
18	0.916	0.578	0.512	0.578	0.385	0.962	0.156	0.889	0.64	0.499	0.731	0.585	0.484
19	0.082	0.063	0.868	0.511	0.465	0.597	0.418	0.161	0.36	0.253	0.004	0.527	0.452
20	0.267	0.016	0.745	0.919	0.427	0.759	0.544	0.253	0.119	0.694	0.011	0.508	0.688
21	0.13	0.234	0.791	0.286	0.228	0.275	0.691	0.34	0.356	0.07	0.031	0.022	0.075
22	0	0	0.707	0.613	0.035	0.48	0.561	0.322	0.458	0.833	0	0.814	0.6
23	0.131	0.03	0.476	0.595	0.485	0.757	0.964	0.439	0.273	0.712	0.041	0.665	0.884
24	0.048	0	0.914	0.488	0.026	0.415	0.79	0.454	0.619	0.129	0	0.65	0.795
25	0.16	0.001	0.721	0.513	0.153	0.699	0.899	0.784	0.681	0.701	0.004	0.962	0.878
26	0.032	0.001	0.988	0.791	0.152	0.769	0.796	0.486	0.664	0.857	0.001	0.763	0.763
27	0.902	0.631	0.678	0.874	0.568	0.831	0.771	0.945	0.688	0.607	0.942	0.842	0.764
28	0.983	0.921	0.991	0.976	0.54	0.822	0.304	0.816	0.753	0.836	0.668	0.757	0.402
29	0.955	0.946	0.867	0.896	0.524	0.629	0.053	0.6	0.952	0.653	0.968	0.53	0.807
30	0.98	0.941	0.403	0.678	0.359	0.067	0.291	0.712	0.434	0.924	0.922	0.027	0.657
31	0.963	0.799	0.964	0.789	0.84	0.93	0.74	0.921	0.395	0.903	0.762	0.959	0.857
32	0.503	0.67	0.455	0.092	0.74	0.745	0.333	0.3	0.163	0.017	0.357	0.341	0.259
33	0.37	0.895	0.675	0.475	0.854	0.778	0.481	0.592	0.472	0.337	0.697	0.798	0.846
34	0.578	0.768	0.416	0.58	0.62	0.825	0.704	0.679	0.872	0.855	0.959	0.991	0.743
35	0.272	0.363	0.098	0.242	0.111	0.126	0.238	0.727	0.966	0.761	0.669	0.077	0.521

As shown that in Table 2. Matrix shows the results of chi- square test among variables:

var.	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
1	0.565	0.987	0.839	0.914	0.917	0.64	0.599	0.899	0.913	0.776	0.535	0.366
2	0.811	0.391	0.755	0.765	0.692	0.229	0.954	0.687	0.897	0.598	0.662	0.83
3	0.212	0.976	0.035	0.852	0.113	0.633	0.112	0.671	0.929	0.484	0.176	0.002
4	0.165	0.058	0.602	0.932	0.582	0.553	0.477	0.464	0.584	0.305	0.67	0
5	0.207	0.89	0.59	0.609	0.285	0.265	0.46	0.717	0.907	0.482	0.118	0.46
6	0.062	0.078	0.867	0.338	0.641	0.585	0.678	0.512	0.178	0.341	0.497	0.425
7	0.871	0.937	0.072	0.331	0.726	0.625	0.167	0	0.873	0.34	0.062	0.076
8	0.355	0.675	0.462	0.641	0.405	0.809	0.832	0.797	0.807	0.397	0.494	0.358
9	0.912	0.976	0.887	0.967	0.699	0.911	0.969	0.879	0.976	0.864	0.662	0.839
10	0.887	0.107	0.861	0.772	0.903	0.144	0.405	0.489	0.549	0.729	0.623	0.305
11	0.216	0.695	0.617	0.783	0.748	0.36	0.699	0.761	0.982	0.755	0.27	0.493
12	0.095	0.55	0.079	0.474	0.426	0.54	0.216	0.499	0.486	0.372	0.024	0.718
13	0.576	0.43	0.515	0.51	0.47	0.171	0.459	0.244	0.444	0.598	0.414	0.624
14	0.905	0.759	0.21	0.947	0.893	0.702	0.821	0.797	0.995	0.802	0.193	0.973
15	0.643	0.853	0.621	0.283	0.406	0.717	0.814	0.329	0.868	0.856	0.267	0.276
16	0.151	0.483	0.083	0.625	0.207	0.396	0.321	0.441	0.767	0.409	0.102	0.179
17	0	0.41	0.744	0.442	0.645	0.849	0.431	0.955	0.838	0.291	0.102	0.904
18	0.652	0.536	0.98	0.742	0.551	0.176	0.848	0.623	0.669	0.701	0.748	0.929
19	0.019	0.164	0.233	0.365	0.558	0.564	0.419	0.117	0.361	0.487	0.339	0.842
20	0.045	0.256	0.404	0.77	0.123	0.253	0.446	0.538	0.626	0.582	0.281	0.588
21	0.103	0.352	0.013	0.141	0.052	0.263	0.146	0.107	0.391	0.178	1	0.074
22	0	0.827	0.844	0.45	0.705	0.83	0.523	0.684	0.805	0.516	0.167	0.885
23	0.055	0.063	0.963	0.56	0.882	0.55	0.844	0.801	0.474	0.573	0.452	0.704
24	0	0.394	0.491	0.558	0.349	0.69	0.708	0.426	0.952	0.29	0.03	0.522
25	0	0.813	0.693	0.579	0.636	0.726	0.3	0.483	0.99	0.522	0.007	0.954
26	0.001	0.712	0.496	0.43	0.527	0.399	0.697	0.756	0.872	0.339	0.02	0.802
27	0.696	0.618	0.052	0.801	0.157	0.234	0.624	0.789	0.691	0.742	0.322	0.579
28	0.293	0.746	0.628	0.482	0.542	0.191	0.465	0.304	0.825	0.554	0.649	0.909
29	0.499	0.395	0.494	0.619	0.448	0.197	0.531	0.957	0.818	0.774	0.262	0.674
30	0.953	0.339	0.397	0.813	0.426	0.158	0.819	0.852	0.892	0.903	0.256	0.58
31	0.791	0.98	0.838	0.944	0.779	0.844	0.557	0.91	0.992	0.918	0.588	0.762
32	0.173	0.532	0.383	0.14	0.74	0.144	0.394	0.396	0.285	0.067	0.432	0.409
33	0.652	0.395	0.018	0.161	0.247	0.074	0.539	0.864	0.566	0.577	0.237	0.329
34	0.763	0.138	0.79	0.672	0.29	0.349	0.93	0.777	0.845	0.733	0.639	0.753
35	0.656	0.938	0.296	0.262	0.029	0.149	0.591	0.34	0.571	0.608	0.656	0.141

As shown that in Table 3. Matrix shows the results of chi- square test among variables:

var.	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
1	0.715	0.457	0.906	0.459	0.719	0.731	0.839	0.715	0.746	0.934
2	0.8	0.541	0.383	0.674	0.66	0.727	0.807	0.45	0.481	0.594
3	0.833	0.451	0.061	0.343	0.257	0.733	0.846	0.801	0.772	0.829
4	0.456	0.451	0.874	0.224	0.508	0.673	0.577	0.617	0.537	0.453
5	0.725	0.481	0.769	0.466	0.702	0.748	0.697	0.692	0.488	0.189
6	0.72	0.144	0.5	0.047	0.631	0.666	0.806	0.728	0.537	0.645
7	0.879	0.642	0.219	0.901	0.513	0.968	0.742	0.715	0.639	0.633
8	0.822	0.661	0.646	0.25	0.823	0.855	0.88	0.941	0.719	0.817
9	0.483	0.505	0.985	0.968	0.773	0.96	0.57	0.962	0.934	0.929
10	0.219	0.565	0.728	0.606	0.145	0.437	0.315	0.462	0.456	0.261
11	0.767	0.316	0.779	0.738	0.626	0.423	0.929	0.241	0.342	0.868
12	0.373	0.436	0.194	0.3	0.491	0.546	0.449	0.332	0.147	0.189
13	0.185	0.246	0.42	0.331	0.587	0.594	0.183	0.428	0.4	0.586
14	0.911	0.21	0.832	0.492	0.927	1	0.879	0.837	0.447	0.555
15	0.71	0.315	0.539	0.16	0.744	0.439	0.844	0.537	0.466	0.91
16	0.626	0.495	0.445	0.803	0.379	0.962	0.702	0.594	0.401	0.578
17	0.784	0.891	0.856	0.71	0.633	0	0.917	0.394	0	0.015
18	0.918	0.445	0.207	0.849	0.127	0.915	0.632	0.165	0.219	0.549
19	0.176	0.858	0.434	0.177	0.414	0.003	0.665	0.08	0.002	0.018
20	0.644	0.791	0.411	0.329	0.656	0.058	0.56	0.21	0.015	0.055
21	0.205	0.243	0.044	0.199	0.218	0.885	0.118	0.16	0.274	0.376
22	0.81	0.893	0.956	0.817	0.78	0	0.744	0.638	0	0.013
23	0.776	0.164	0.191	0.176	0.492	0.064	0.387	0.653	0.025	0.186
24	0.734	0.225	0.486	0.262	0.539	0.001	0.546	0.531	0	0.043
25	0.838	0.573	0.735	0.426	0.827	0.003	0.78	0.722	0.001	0.016
26	0.567	0.309	0.433	0.343	0.699	0.002	0.69	0.265	0	0.026
27	0.592	0.44	0.455	0.47	0.324	0.949	0.406	0.486	0.308	0.137
28	0.437	0.244	0.451	0.277	0.666	0.41	0.875	0.801	0.172	0.164
29	0.162	0.156	0.458	0.523	0.861	0.739	0.238	0.828	0.079	0.063
30	0.062	0.037	0.95	0.692	0.629	0.905	0.06	0.909	0.797	0.732
31	0.815	0.743	0.596	0.762	0.795	0.952	0.952	0.689	0.8	0.786
32	0.486	0.139	0.167	0.041	0.119	0.648	0.145	0.3	0.306	0.518
33	0.563	0.169	0.09	0.08	0.581	0.606	0.502	0.443	0.116	0.202
34	0.487	0.64	0.745	0.335	0.959	0.253	0.848	0.656	0.77	0.309
35	0.149	0.058	0.471	0.26	0.024	0.806	0.119	0.3	0.622	0.361

As shown that in Table 4. Matrix shows the results of chi- square test among variables:



**References**

1. Ackley, D.R. 1997, "Strategic Communication: Full-time Function or Dysfunctional Concept?" *Communication World*, vol. 14, issue 7.
2. Adler, R., & Elmhurst, J. M., (1996) *Communicating at Work: Principles and Practices for Business and the Professions* (5th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Co.
3. Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995a) Why Employees Speak to Coworkers and Bosses: Motives, Gender, and Organizational Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 32(3), 249 -265.
4. Argenti, P. A. (2006). How Technology Has Influenced the Field of Corporate Communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 20(3), 357-370.
5. Atchison, T. J. , & Lefferts, E. A. (1972) The Prediction of Turnover Using Herzberg's Job Satisfaction Technique, *Personnel Psychology*, 25(1), 53-64.
6. Bente, F.M. 2009, „Guidelines Regarding Efficient Communication Within Modern Organizations” , *Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Science Series*, vol. 18, issue 4, pp. 591-594.
7. Bratton, J., Callinan, M., Forshaw, C. & Sawchuk, P., *Work and Organizational Behaviour*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
8. Burke, R.J. & Wilcox, D.S., 1969, "Effects of different Patterns and Degrees of Openness in Superior-Subordinate Communication on Subordinate Job Satisfaction", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 12, issue 3, pp. 319-326.
9. CIPD 2011, „Employee Communication” accessed 23 Jan 2011, from <http://www.cipd.co.uk>
10. CIPD 2011, „Harnessing the power of employee communication” , accessed 23 Jan 2011, from <http://www.cipd.co.uk>
11. Collis, J. & Hussey, R., 2009. *Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students* 3rd ed., Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Company website, accessed 2nd June, 2013, from <http://www.iffco.in>
13. Clampitt, P.G. & Downs, C.W., 1993, "Employee Perceptions of the Relationship between Communication and Productivity: A Field Study", *Journal of Business Communication*, vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 5-28.
14. Creswell, J.W. 2009, *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Sage Publications, London.
15. DeConinck, J., Johnson, J., Busbin, J. & Lockwood, F. 2008, "An Examination of the validity of the Downs and Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire", *Marketing Management Journal*, vol. 18, issue 2, pp. 145-153.
16. Downs, C.W. & Adrian, A.D., 2005, „Assessing Organizational Communication: Strategic Communication Audits” , *Corporate Reputation Review*, vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 81-85.
17. Downs, C. W., & Hazen, M. (1977) A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, 14, 63-73.
18. Fiske, J. 2011, *Introduction to Communication Studies*, Routledge, London.
19. Guirdham, M. 1999, *Communicating across Cultures*, Macmillan Press Ltd., London.
20. Hargie, O. & Tourish, D., 2009, *Auditing Organizational Communication. A Handbook of Research, Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London.
21. Harvard Business Review 1999, *Harvard Business Review on Effective Communication*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
22. Kalla, H.K. 2005, „Integrated internal communications: a multidisciplinary perspective” , *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, vol.10, issue 4, pp. 302-314.
23. Korkosz M., 2010, "Cultural diversity, A study of Polish migrant workers in Irish-owned company", NCI.
24. Likert, R. 1967, *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*, McGraw-Hill, London.
25. McGraw-Hill Companies 2009, *Organizational Behavior: [Essentials]*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York.
26. Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R.W., 2010, *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*, South-Western Cengage Learning.
27. Pincus, J.D. & Knipp, J., 1990, "Internal Communication and Job Satisfaction Revisited: The Impact of Organizational Trust and Influence on Commercial Bank Supervisors", *Public Relations Research Annual*, vol. 2, pp. 173-191.
28. Raina, R. 2010, "Timely, Continuous & Credible Communication & Perceived Organizational Effectiveness", *The Indian Journal of Industrial Effectiveness*, vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 345-359.
29. Schonfelder, V. 1998, „Organisational communication: Fad, fiction or fact, *Communication World*, vol. 15, issue 6, June/July, pp. 52-54.

30. Smith, L. & Mounter, P., 2005, Effective Internal Communication, CIPR, London.
31. Schonfelder, V. 1998, „Organisational communication: Fad, fiction or fact? Communication World, vol. 15, issue 6, June/July, pp. 52-54.
32. Tiernan, S., Morley, M.J. & Foley, E., 2006, Modern Management, Theory and Practice for Irish Students, Gill & Macmillan, Dublin.
33. Yates, K. 2006, “Internal Communication Effectiveness Enhances Bottom-Line Results”, Journal of Organizational Excellence, Summer 2006, pp. 71-79.

#### AUTHOR(S) PROFILE



**Dr. Shine David**, Assistant Professor, IMS, Devi Ahilya University, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India. His area of interest includes Human Resource Management, Human Resource Information System, Strategic Management, Knowledge Management and Organization Behaviour). He completed his Ph.D. from Devi Ahilya University, Indore (2010) in “Human Resource Information Systems” which is first of its kind in INDIA. His Ph.D. work is acquired by NASSDOC, Ministry for HRD, New Delhi, India. He has also conducted MDP on “Team Building Exercises” for various middle level and senior level executives in Industrial belt of Dewas region. He has almost 20 publications in national and international journals under his credit.



**Manju Singh**, Student from MBA(Human Resource), IMS, Devi Ahilya University, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India. Her area of interest includes Human Resource Management, Human Resource Information System, Human Resource Accounting, Reward Management and Labour Laws. She completed her graduation from Choithram Hospital and Research Centre (2010).