

Chapter 4: Data analysis and interpretation of communication practices: Insights from employee perceptions.

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, responses will be classified according to demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, length of service in the organization, present working department, and other relevant variables addressed in the questionnaire (Creswell, 2014; Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). One hundred and fifteen (115) questionnaires were distributed to respondents across various departments of the case study organization (UBA Plc). Of these, seventy-five (75) were duly completed and returned, with a response rate of approximately 65%. This high response rate suggests a significant level of interest in the topic among the respondents. Consequently, the data collected will be analyzed, as the response rate is considered adequate for the purposes of this research. Additionally, responses to the research questions will be systematically categorized and analyzed.

4.2 Presentation, Classification and Analysis of Data

As shown in Table 4.1, 31 respondents (41.3%) were male, while 44 respondents (58.7%) were female. This indicates that the sample included more female than male participants. Regarding age distribution, 24 respondents (32.0%) fall within the age range of 21–30 years, 36 respondents (48.0%) are between 31–40 years, 14 respondents (18.7%) are within the 41–50 years range, and 1 respondent (1.3%) is aged 51 years and This indicates most respondents are within the active working-age demographic.

In terms of marital status, 20 respondents (26.7%) are single, while 52 respondents (69.3%) are married.

TABLE 4.1 Respondents' Biodata

Variable		Frequency	Percentage %
Gender	Male	31	41.3
	Female	44	58.7
	Total	75	100
Age (Years)	(21-30)	24	32.0
	(31-40)	36	48.0
	(41-50)	14	18.7
	50 & above	1	1.3
	Total	75	100
Marital Status	Single	20	26.7
	Married	52	69.3
	Divorced	3	4.0
	Total	75	100
Educational Qualification	HND/BSC.	45	60.0
	MBA/ACIB/CISA	27	36.0
	Others	3	4.0
	Total	75	100
Years with Organization	(6months-1)	30	40.0
	(1-5)	11	14.7
	(6-10)	20	26.7
	(10 & above)	14	18.7
	Total	75	100
Department	Operations	16	21.3
	Marketing	39	52.0
	Administration	15	20.0
	Others	5	6.7
	Total	75	100

Source: Field Survey Data Collection, 2017

Three respondents (4.0%) indicated that they are divorced. This suggests that most respondents are married.

Table 4.1 also shows that 45 respondents (60.0%) hold HND/B.Sc. degrees, 27 respondents (36.0%) possess MBA/ACIB/CISA qualifications, while 3 respondents (4.0%) hold other types of qualifications. This implies that most respondents have at least a B.Sc. or equivalent postgraduate degree, indicating they are well-educated and capable of providing informed opinions, which enhances the credibility and robustness of the study's findings.

In addition, Table 4.1 presents data on the respondents' work experience. Thirty respondents (40.0%) have been with their organization for less than one year, 11 respondents (14.7%) for 1–5 years, 20 respondents (26.7%) for 6–10 years, and 14 respondents (18.7%) for over 10 years. This suggests that the majority of the information provided comes from respondents who have been with the organization for less than one year, although a significant portion have longer tenures as well.

Finally, **Table 4.1** shows the distribution of respondents across departments. Sixteen respondents (21.3%) work in the operations department, 39 respondents (52.0%) are in the marketing department, 15 respondents (20.0%) work in the administration department, and 5 respondents (6.7%) are from other departments. This indicates that the majority of respondents are from the marketing department.

Table 4.2. Communication And Knowledge Sharing

In this study, a 4-point Likert scale was used with the following response options: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree (Likert, 1932)

			1	2	3	4	Total	
7	Important information is often treated as a scarce resource within the organization.	F	26	35	10	4	75	
		%	34.7	46.7	13.3	5.3	100	
8	In most cases, I receive the necessary information to perform my job effectively.	F	1	4	54	16	75	
		%	1.3	5.3	72.0	21.3	100	
9	My colleagues and I actively exchange critical information that contributes to our collective success.	F	3	5	46	21	75	
		%	4.0	6.7	61.3	28.0	100	
10	I obtain a significant portion of the information I need through informal communication channels.	F	5	6.7	17	38	15	75
		%		22.7	50.7	20.0	100	
11	Our department consistently shares important information with other departments.	F	3	10	49	13	75	
		%	4	13.3	65.3	17.3	100	

Source: Field survey data Collection, 2017

Table 4.2 shows that 26 respondents, representing 34.7% of the sample, strongly disagreed that important information is a scarce resource in the organization, while 35 respondents (46.7%) disagreed. However, 10 respondents (13.3%) agreed, and 4 respondents (5.3%) strongly agreed. This suggests that most respondents do not perceive information to be scarce.

Regarding access to job-related information, 1 respondent (1.3%) strongly disagreed, 4 respondents (5.3%) disagreed, 54 respondents (72.0%) agreed, and 16 respondents (21.3%) strongly agreed that they receive the information needed to effectively perform their jobs. This indicates a generally positive perception of internal communication effectiveness.

Furthermore, 3 respondents (4.0%) strongly disagreed, 5 (6.7%) disagreed, 46 (61.3%) agreed, and 21 (28.0%) strongly agreed that they and their co-workers Share important information critical to success, indicating a healthy culture of knowledge sharing among employees.

With respect to informal communication channels, 5 respondents (6.7%) strongly disagreed, 17 (22.7%) disagreed, 38 (50.7%) agreed, and 15 (20.0%) strongly agreed that they receive most of their information informally. This suggests that while formal channels may exist, informal communication plays a significant role.

Finally, 3 respondents (4.0%) strongly disagreed, 10 (13.3%) disagreed, 49 (65.3%) agreed, and 13 (17.3%) strongly agreed that their departments actively exchange essential information with other units, indicating the presence of an open and cooperative organizational environment thus suggesting that inter-departmental communication is relatively strong.

Overall, the findings suggest the presence of a functional and effective communication and knowledge-sharing system within the organization.

Table 4.3.: Barriers To Effective Communication

As indicated in 4.2, a 4-point Likert scale was used to capture the below information.

			1	2	3	4	Total
12	Communication with top management typically requires going through one’s immediate supervisor.	F	2	9	50	14	75
		%	2.6	12.0	66.7	18.7	100
13	In several departments, a small number of individuals tend to withhold critical information from others.	F	5	53	12	5	75
		%	6.7	70.7	16	6.7	100
14	Senior executives often appear reluctant to share organizational updates with lower-level employees.	F	4	56	12	3	75
		%	5.3	74.7	16.0	4.0	100
15	Certain groups within the organization seem to control the distribution of key information.	F	5	50	13	7	75
		%	6.7	66.7	17.3	9.3	100
16	An excessive number of gatekeepers exist within the organization, impeding the efficient flow of important information.	F	7	55	7	6	75
		%	9.3	73.3	9.3	8.0	100

Source: Field survey data collection, 2017

Table 4.3 shows that 2 respondents (2.6%) strongly disagreed with the statement that employees must go through their immediate manager to share ideas or information with top management. Meanwhile, 9 respondents (12.0%) disagreed, 50 respondents (66.7%) agreed, and 14 respondents (18.6%) strongly agreed. This suggests that the majority of employees feel a hierarchical filter exists when communicating with top management.

In addition, 5 respondents (6.7%) strongly disagreed that in most departments, one or two individuals tend to hoard important information. A significant majority—53 respondents (70.7%)—disagreed with this statement, while 12 respondents (16.0%) agreed and 5 respondents (6.7%) strongly agreed. This indicates that information hoarding is not perceived as a major issue by most employees.

Furthermore, 4 respondents (5.3%) strongly disagreed with the assertion that top executives are often hesitant to communicate organizational news to lower-level employees. Most respondents—56 (74.7%)—disagreed, while 12 (16.0%) agreed and 3 (4.0%) strongly agreed. This suggests that upward and downward communication flows are generally open.

Similarly, 5 respondents (6.7%) strongly disagreed that cliques exist in the organization that control the flow of important information. Half of the respondents (50

or 66.7%) disagreed, 13 (17.3%) agreed, and 7 (9.3%) strongly agreed. This implies that while a small portion of employees perceive gatekeeping behavior, most do not see it as a serious concern.

Lastly, 7 respondents (9.3%) strongly disagreed that there are too many “gatekeepers” within the organization. A large majority—55 respondents (73.3%)—disagreed, while 7 (9.3%) agreed and 6 (8.0%) strongly agreed.

Overall, the findings suggest that barriers to effective communication in the organization are minimal, with most employees reporting open access to information and limited gatekeeping behaviors.

Table 4.4: EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION

As indicated in 4.2, a 4-point Likert scale was used to capture the below information.

			1	2	3	4	Total
17	Most of the information I receive daily is both detailed and accurate.	F	0	1	53	21	75
		%	0	1.3	70.7	28.0	100
18	The information I receive from my manager is generally detailed and accurate.	F	0	3	59	13	75
		%	0	4.0	78.7	17.3	100
19	The information I receive from my co-workers is typically detailed and accurate.	F	0	7	58	10	75
		%	0	9.3	77.3	13.3	100
20	Communication from other departments is usually clear, detailed, and accurate..	F	0	3	51	21	75
		%	0	4.0	68.0	28.0	100
21	Effective communication has impacted positively on the bank's overall performance	F	0	3	46	26	75
		%	0	4.0	61.3	34.7	100

Source: Field survey data collection, 2017

Table 4.4: Accuracy and Effectiveness of Information Received

Table 4.4 shows that no respondent strongly disagreed with the statement that the majority of the information they receive on a daily basis is detailed and accurate. Only 1 respondent (1.3%) disagreed, while the majority—53 respondents (70.7%)—agreed, and 21 respondents (28.0%) strongly agreed. Similarly, no respondents strongly

disagreed that the information they receive from their managers is detailed and accurate. Three respondents (4.0%) disagreed, 59 respondents (78.7%) agreed, and 13 respondents (17.3%) strongly agreed.

Furthermore, no respondents strongly disagreed that information received from co-workers is detailed and accurate. Seven respondents (9.3%) disagreed, 58 respondents (77.3%) agreed, and 10 respondents (13.3%) strongly agreed.

Additionally, no respondents strongly disagreed that communication received from other departments is generally detailed and accurate. Three respondents (4.0%) disagreed, 51 respondents (68.0%) agreed, and 21 respondents (28.0%) strongly agreed.

Lastly, none of the respondents strongly disagreed that effective communication greatly enhances the organization's overall performance. Three respondents (4.0%) disagreed, 46 respondents (61.3%) agreed, and 26 respondents (34.7%) strongly agreed.

In summary, these results indicate that communication within the organization is not only effective but also perceived as detailed and accurate, thereby contributing positively to overall organizational performance.

4.3. TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

The hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis, with a significance level of 0.7% ($\alpha = 0.007$) was applied where applicable, with the degrees of freedom specified as $(n - 1)$.

Regression Model Specification:

$$OP=f(Mc+Cc+Ic)+U$$

Where:

- **OP** = Organizational Performance (Dependent Variable)
- **Mc** = Manager–Employee Communication
- **Cc** = Communication with Co-workers
- **Ic** = Interdepartmental Communication
- **U** = Stochastic/Random Error Term

4.4 Results

The results obtained from the analysis done using the Statistical Package for Social Science is presented briefly below:

Table 4.6 Summary of Regression Results

Model	Independent Variables	B	T	Sig.	R	R ²	R ² Adj.	F	Sig
	K	1.725	2.815	.006					
	Mc	.458	3.297	.002					
					.395	.156	.120	4.365	.007
	Cc	.083	0.651	.517					
	Ic	-.033	-.283	.778					

4.4.1 Model Estimation

The model as estimated from the regression analysis is as follows:

$$OP = f(1.725 + .458Mc + .083Cc + (-.033Ic)) + U$$

The study's single hypothesis was examined using multiple regression analysis (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003), as presented in Table 4.6. The overall regression model was statistically significant ($F = 4.365$, $p = .007$), indicating that the model provides a good fit for predicting the effectiveness of Manager–Employee Communication, Communication with Co-workers, and Interdepartmental Communication on Organizational Performance.

4.5 Discussion of Findings

Based on the analysis presented in Table 4.6, the R^2 value is 0.156, indicating that 15.6% of the variance in organizational performance is explained by the effectiveness of Manager–Employee Communication, Communication with Co-workers, and Interdepartmental Communication. Although statistically significant, this value is relatively low, suggesting that there are other important aspects of effective communication not captured in the current study, which may have contributed to the low R^2 value.

Nonetheless, the findings suggest that effective communication has a significant impact on organizational performance. The analysis demonstrates that communication plays an important role in Nigerian organizations. These findings are consistent with those of Inedegbor et al. (2012), who concluded that effective business communication positively influences the performance of companies surveyed in Nigeria. Similarly, Neves (2012) found a positive relationship between management communication and the temporal variation in employees' Perceived Organizational Support (POS), further highlighting that communication from management signals organizational care and appreciation of employee contributions—both of which influence performance.

Among the three independent variables, **Manager–Employee Communication (Mc)** emerged as the most significant predictor of organizational performance ($\beta = .458$, $p = .002$). While the other two variables contributed to the overall significance of the regression model, they were not individually significant.

This finding reinforces the conclusion that Manager–Employee Communication is the most critical driver of organizational performance. This is particularly true when managers possess strong interpersonal communication skills and practice clear and effective information dissemination. In such environments, organizational performance is likely to improve. This conclusion aligns with the perspectives of Nwanwene (2007) and Hahn (2007), who emphasized “that communication is a crucial process in every organization”. When communication flows smoothly and accurately, organizational operations are more efficient and effective.

In addition, the regression analysis showed that **Communication with Co-workers (Cc)** had a positive but statistically insignificant contribution to organizational performance ($\beta = .083$, $p = .519$). This result is consistent with Ayatse (2005), who argued that communication is essential for establishing and disseminating organizational goals. The skills and competencies of co-workers, when effectively communicated, can promote behaviors that enhance job performance.

Finally, **Interdepartmental Communication (IC)** was found to have a negative but statistically insignificant relationship with organizational performance ($\beta = -.033$, $p = .778$). While this variable did not significantly contribute to the overall regression model, the result still highlights the importance of maintaining an effective flow of information across departments to support favorable organizational performance.

References

- Ayatse, F. A. (2005). *Management information system: A global perspective*. Makurdi, Nigeria: Oracle.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hahn, M. (2007). Overcoming communication barriers between people. *EzineArticles*. Retrieved October 5, 2008, from <http://ezinearticles.com>
- Inedegbor, M. U., Ahmed, K. O., Ganiyat, O. A., & Rashidat. (2012). Impact of business communication on organizational performance in Nigerian companies. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 2(1), 16–26.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1–55.
- Neves, P., & Eisenberger, R. (2012). Management communication and employee performance: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Human Performance*, 25(5), 452–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2012.721834>
- Nwanwene, T. A. M. (2007). Communication and sustainable development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Communication: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Communication Studies*, 6(2), 433–442.
- Osuagwu, L. C. (2002). *Business research methods: Principles and practice* (2nd ed.). Lagos, Nigeria: Grey Resources Limited.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach* (7th ed.). Wiley.