Journal of Positive School Psychology http://journalppw.com
2022, Vol. 6, No. 8, 9469-9482

Probing The Level Of Job Productivity Of Faculty Members In Public Universities

SUSAN R. BUTAC

PhD, San Beda University Manila Philippines.

Abstract

The degree of productivity achieved by the faculty members can be evaluated based on how successfully they carry out the tasks assigned to them in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. This study aims to probe how productive faculty members are in their jobs at public universities. Quantitative research was the approach taken for this particular study of research methods. In particular, the correlational method was applied in this study. For this study, the quantitative research approach was chosen because it is the one that places the most emphasis on quantitative data. Specifically, this research topic was the job productivity of regular faculty members at public universities in the National Capital Region, Philippines, regarding instruction, facilities, and faculty development. The conclusion is that for faculty members to be effective and efficient in their teaching, they should have extremely high output rates, aside from experiencing an effective communication system.On the other hand, it was found that it had the lowest degree of work productivity in terms of rising tuition prices and the effect that this had on the teaching staff and students. It was found to have the lowest level of job productivity when it comes to the information from the administration on cost-saving initiatives that can take place inside the classroom. This was discovered. It is suggested that a promotion team be constituted to devise plans for the advancement and growth of the faculty. The government or universities should consider scholarship grants, financial assistance for conferences, seminars, training, and other forms of educational support.

Introduction

Establishing trust through communication boosts the morale of an organization's workforce. When this mode of communication operates in reality, it allows sufficient dedication to employees' performance on the job, their difficulties relating to the job, their comprehension of the already established organizational policies and practices, and the processes for the tasks themselves.

The faculty members' level of productivity can be measured by how well they accomplish their jobs in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Simply put, it refers to the effectiveness with which a corporation or economy can convert resources into goods, potentially producing more with fewer resources (Boundless, 2016) since the productivity of an organization's workforce is the primary factor determining the success of that firm. Indeed, its significance cannot be overstated.

According to Sharma and Sharma (2014), better productivity levels lead to increased economic growth, profitability, and social advancement. If productivity levels are enhanced, employees can only have better earnings and incomes, better working conditions, and broader job prospects. This is the only way for these things to happen. The production quality is improved due to lower costs and fewer expenditures, which are reduced due to better productivity and the competitive advantage.

It was mentioned by Hanaysha (2016) in his study that improving employee productivity through work engagement: Evidence from the higher education sector is one of the essential management policies in enhancing organizational success. The study was titled improving employee productivity through work engagement: Evidence from the higher education sector. It ensures the organization's performance for the course of its whole existence.

A higher level of productivity results in a greater output level while requiring the same input level. This aspect is a value-added process that has the potential to effectively enhance living standards by reducing the required monetary investment in day-to-day essentials (and indulgences), so making consumers wealthier (in a relative sense) and businesses more profitable (Boundless, 2016). This instills the idea that if a person's standard of living has risen, there is a good chance that they have experienced job satisfaction. In addition, the degree of productivity is the most essential and primary factor in determining a standard of life. People can get what they want sooner or receive more of what they wish to simultaneously if productivity levels are raised Ross (2016). The individual's total efficiency will grow as a direct result of their increased productivity.

In his post, Core (2015) stated that any productive and successful company is aware of the significance of maintaining a high level of productivity in the workplace. The capacity of the company's existing human resources can be increased and utilized more effectively if the company is productive. The key to a successful business has contented and healthy personnel who contribute their full potential to the company's overall output. If they enjoy their work and are in good health, employees will eventually experience increased effectiveness and efficiency in their work.

Additionally, job productivity is regarded as a dependent variable because it determines how efficient and productive the faculty members perform their duties. When evaluating the presence of productivity, it takes into account not only the instructions and facilities but also the growth of the teaching staff. This process becomes apparent in the workplace if there is proper compliance with prescribed rules, fewer complaints from students, amicable relationships with administrations and colleagues, and other factors of a similar nature through communication. If workers are motivated and content, these items will be available. Even though this study does not directly assess the relationship between communication and productivity, it is inferred that the two are intertwined. It also found the implication of the connection corresponding with Herzberg. For these reasons, the study's fundamental purpose is to probe the level of job productivity of faculty members of some public universities in the Philippines.

Statement of the Problem

This study described the communication satisfaction of faculty members in public universities in the National Capital Region, Philippines, as a factor in their job productivity.

It intended to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of job productivity of s faculty members in terms of:

1.1 Instructions;

1. 2 Facilities; and

1. 3 Faculty Development?

2. Is there a significant relationship between the communication satisfaction indicators to faculty productivity?

Research Methodology

The method of research that was used for the study was quantitative. In particular, it used the correlational approach. This study used the quantitative method because it is the one that focuses on quantitative data, which is the level of job productivity of regular faculty members of public universities in the NCR in terms of instruction, facilities, and faculty development. The researcher chose this method because it was deemed the most appropriate.

In this study, respondents were chosen using a method known as Simple Random Sampling. Out of the total number of students at each institution, twenty-five percent (25%) were randomly selected. The researcher provided each institution dean with the official number of questionnaires depending on the sample. She gave them particular instructions on who will respond to the questionnaire and how many permanent faculty members will participate in the study (the sample size). Since the participants in the survey had ordered the researcher to leave the questionnaires with them and recover them after a week or two, the researcher had to clarify that the participants in the study had to be full-time faculty members to qualify for participation. The dean chose the random selection.

The sample size, which was 25% of the total population at each institution, was proportional to that population. After doing the math, it looked like it would be possible to do it. The researcher used the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaires (CSQ) developed by Downs and Hazen and made some adjustments (1977). Adopted was three-fourths of the original questionnaire, including information about respondents' satisfaction levels with their job productivity. Since the original questionnaire covered only three questions relating to productivity, the only section of the questionnaire that was changed was the Job Productivity part. As a result, it was expanded into 34 elements to meet the required information for optimal work productivity.

Discussion of Results and Findings

I. Level of Job Productivity of Public Universities Faculty Members

Table 1 Level of Job Productivity of Public Universities Faculty Members in terms of Instructions

Job Productivity in terms of Instructions	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q74. Information on course content	3.67	Moderately Productive
Q75. Information on classroom methodology and computer-based learning.	3.49	Productive
Q76. Information on the manner of student grade computation.	3.47	Productive
Q83. Information from Administration on cost-saving actions inside the classroom.	3.34	Productive
Q89. Information and allowance on the deadline of student grades.	3.42	Productive
Q99. Information on class interruptions due to rallies or natural calamities.	3.41	Productive
Q100. Information on school activity	3.47	Productive

practices on student deadline of projects.		
Q101. Information on school practices regarding special exams or projects.	3.49	Productive
Q102. Information on school practices regarding make-up classes.	3.43	Productive
Q104. Information on school practices regarding make-up class schedules.	3.36	Productive
Grand Mean	**3.46**	**Productive**

Note: 4.51-5.00 – "Highly Productive," 3.51-4.50 – "Moderately Productive," 2.51-3.50 – "Productive," 1.51-2.50 – "Fairly Productive," 1.00-1.50 – "Highly Unproductive"

This section presents the Level of Productivity that public universities Faculty Members have expressed concerning Instructions. According to Table 1, the level of Productivity among Faculty Members of public universities' Experience with Instructions is Productive. The overall mean score for the instructions was 3.46. It is provided here. The answers to nine of the questions (Q75, Q76, Q83, Q89, Q99, Q100, Q101, Q102, and Q104) were productive, whereas the answer to one of the questions (Q74) was only "moderately productive." It was determined that the instructors at public universities scored 3.67 out of 5 for Productivity regarding the Information on Syllabus-Based Course Content that they Teach to their Students. However, it was discovered to have the lowest degree of job productivity when it comes to the information from the administration on cost-saving actions that can take inside the classroom, and it received a score of 3.34.

Nevertheless, one of the responses from a member of the teaching staff indicates that the degree of job productivity was "Moderately productive." The implication is that faculty members ought to have very high productivity rates to be effective and efficient in their teaching. This finding lends credence to Core's (2015) assertion that workers are more likely to experience feelings of Productivity and contentment if financial incentives and concerns, such as pay raises, bonuses, and other similar perks, are included as part of their responsibilities to instruct. On the other hand, Education 4.0 considers the significance of readily available resources to meet the demand of the digital age. The supply of financial distribution among public universities in the NCR should be transparent and effective for educators to experience a sense of safety and be driven on a moral level.

Table 2 Level of Job Productivity of Public Universities Faculty Members in terms of Facilities

Job Productivity in terms of Facilities	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q84. Information on tuition fee increase and its repercussion to faculty and students.	3.33	Productive

Q85. Information on cost-saving measures in the entire school.	3.38	Productive
Q86. Information on room assignments of the subject-courses.	3.41	Productive
Q87. Information on availability and access to school facilities.	3.40	Productive
Q88. Information and comfort of the faculty room.	3.46	Productive
Q97. Information on availability and access of faculty scholarships, or grants-in-aid.	3.47	Productive
Q98. Information and access to school loans and study leaves.	3.37	Productive
Grand Mean	**3.40**	**Productive**

Note 4.51-5.00 – "Highly Productive," 3.51-4.50 – "Moderately Productive," 2.51-3.50 – "Productive," 1.51-2.50 – "Fairly Productive," 1.00-1.50 – "Highly Unproductive"

This table illustrates the job productivity public university faculty members achieve concerning the university's facilities. According to Table 2, the "Productive" level of job productivity exhibited by public university faculty members in terms of facilities may be seen in their work. In general, it is anticipated that the facilities will receive a mean score of 3.40. The productive response was obtained by seven factors (Q84, Q85, Q86, Q87, and Q88, as well as Q97 and Q98). It demonstrated that public university faculty members are productive, as evidenced by the value of 3.47 in terms of information on the availability and access to faculty scholarships or grants-in-aid. However, it is discovered to have the lowest level of job productivity in terms of increased tuition fees and its impact on the teaching staff and the students. The score of 3.33 indicates that careful planning and strategic timing of any rise in tuition fees and other related costs is required, given that these increases affect the quality of instruction for both teachers and students.

The findings provide credence to the theory put forth by Amilia et al. (2016), which states that the facilities and resources of a school, including tuition costs, play a significant part in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning that leads to the education of sufficient caliber. Teachers should stay current with the most recent educational developments and avoid becoming complacent in their work to increase their workforce's overall productivity. This is made possible by the administration's provision of scholarship grants and other forms of financial help from time to time. Allowing educators to succeed through scholarships (scholarship awards) is the same as giving them the chance to succeed (Herzberg, 1968). According to Herzberg, one of the higher-level forms of gratification that an employee searches for to feel driven and productive simultaneously is to achieve something. The motivation that they have will allow them to establish initiatives that will contribute to the accomplishment of the goals that have been set for their schools. Then, their educational institutions will provide the technology and power necessary to meet the challenges posed by the fourth wave of the industrial revolution.

Table 3 Level of Job Productivity of Public Universities Faculty Members in terms of Faculty Development

Job Productivity in terms of Faculty Development	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Q77. Information on my performance evaluation from the Dean/Administration.	3.51	Productive
Q78. Information on my performance evaluation from my students.	3.52	Moderately Productive
Q79. Information and feedback on my performance from co-faculty.	3.43	Productive
Q80. Information and compliance with the school calendar.	3.47	Productive
Q81. Information from dean/ administration on how to improve my productivity.	3.38	Productive
Q82. Information from Administration on class interruptions due to school activities.	3.49	Productive
Q90. Information on faculty absences and tardiness.	3.39	Productive
Q91. Information on administration support to faculty problems.	3.33	Productive
Q92. Information on faculty support from administration regarding student complaints.	3.39	Productive
Q93. Information on the schedule of faculty training and conferences.	3.48	Productive
Q94. Information on faculty promotional possibilities.	3.32	Productive
Q95. Information on faculty engagement in school activities.	3.42	Productive
Q96. Information to assist and engage in administration work.	3.42	Productive
Q103. Information on administration sanctions on faculty violations.	3.45	Productive
Q105. Information on school assistance to faculty's physical wellness.	3.43	Productive
Q106. Information on developing faculty peer support at work.	3.46	Productive

Q107. Information on ways on developing harmonious faculty-student relationship.	3.46	Productive
Grand Mean	**3.43**	**Productive**

Note: 4.51-5.00 – "Highly Productive," 3.51-4.50 – "Moderately Productive," 2.51-3.50 – "Productive," 1.51-2.50 – "Fairly Productive," 1.00-1.50 – "Highly Unproductive"

Here, the job productivity of faculty members working at public universities is in terms of overall faculty development. Table 3 reveals that the level of Job Productivity of public universities' Faculty members in terms of Faculty development is "Productive." A mean value of 3.43 is reported for the overall attribute of faculty development. One factor (Q78) received a response that was classified as moderately productive, while sixteen other factors (Q77, Q79, Q80, Q81, Q82, Q90, Q91, Q92, Q93, Q94, Q95, Q96, Q103, Q105, and Q106) received a response that was classified as "Productive." It shows that the faculty members of SUCs are "Moderately productive," with a value of 3.52 in terms of the information on their performance evaluation provided by their respective pupils. On the other hand, research indicates that it has the lowest possible work productivity level regarding the information on the opportunities for faculty promotion. The achieved score of 3.32 indicates that the administration needs to address the growth and progress of the faculty members through a development program so that they can feel like they are both effective and efficient in executing their job.

It is recommended that a promotion team be established to make programs for the progression and development of the faculty. The government should consider scholarship grants, financial aid for conferences, seminars, and training, and other forms of educational funding. The conclusion is consistent with the argument made by Watson (2018) that increasing staff participation in a professional development program leads to greater skill and cultural sensitivity on the job. Because of this program, their instructional capacity will improve, strengthening the institution's overall efficacy. In addition, faculty development makes it possible for instructors to deliver the appropriate education that their students require to become valuable members of the workforce and to be able to deal with the complex problems that come with living in a world that is driven by technology. In addition, advancements help teachers become more motivated and committed to their work, both of which are benefits that accrue from their employment. Therefore, a promotion team should be developed to regularly give the required advancement among workers, particularly among educators.

2. Significant Relationship among the Communication Satisfaction Indicators to Faculty Productivity

Table 4 Spearman Rank Correlation: Relationship among the Communication Satisfaction Indicators to Instructions under Faculty Productivity

Communication Satisfaction	Instructions				
	Spearman Rank Correlation	Verbal Interpretation	p-value	Decision	Remarks

Interpersonal Communication	0.675	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Group Communication	0.694	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Organizational Communication	0.757	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant

Note: If the p-value is less than or equal to the significance level, which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis; otherwise, it fails to reject Ho.

This section presents the Spearman Rank Correlation, which examines the relationship between the Communication Satisfaction Indicators and Instructions within Faculty Productivity. The data presented in Table 4 demonstrates that Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, and Organizational Communication all substantially correlate with the amount of instruction that public university professors produce. When looking at the nature of the relationship between the three aspects of communication satisfaction, it is possible to deduce that the relationship is positive. The result demonstrates that when there is an increase in communication satisfaction among the faculty members of public universities, there is also an increase in the production level. The fact that all of the obtained values for the three variables are going up, the strengths of the association that they have are very strong.

The findings lend credence to Aziri's (2011) assertion that the degree of an individual's motivation can affect their output. Having the drive to do one's work effectively requires careful consideration. Quarstein et al. (1992) investigated the influence of different circumstances on the amount of work that employees produce. Pay, promotions, opportunities, working conditions, company policies, and supervision are all components of this category. In addition, he underlined the significance of happenings in one's environment, which can also serve as a source of motivation. "Time off due to exceptional work" and "rude remarks from a coworker" are examples of events that are regarded as unfavorable and should be avoided. This is something that might take happening in the workplace.

On the other hand, the notion that underpins Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene factor theory lends support to the idea that people require motivation to be productive. For employees to be motivated and productive, the administration needs to pay attention to the variables that motivate employees. These aspects include achievement, acknowledgment, the actual work itself, and responsibility.

Table 5 Spearman Rank Correlation: Relationship among the Communication Satisfaction Indicators to Facilities under Faculty Productivity

Communication Satisfaction	Facilities				
	Spearman Rank Correlation	**Verbal Interpretation**	**p-value**	**Decision**	**Remarks**
Interpersonal Communication	0.610	Moderately Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Group Communication	0.677	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant

Organizational Communication	0.751	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant

Note: If the p-value is less than or equal to the significance level, which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis; otherwise, it fails to reject Ho.

This section presents the Spearman Rank Correlation, which analyzes the relationship between the Communication Satisfaction Indicators and Facilities in Faculty Productivity. Table 5 shows a substantial correlation between public university faculty productivity in terms of facilities and the competencies of interpersonal communication, group communication, and organizational communication. When looking at the nature of the relationship between the three aspects of communication satisfaction, it is possible to deduce that the relationship is positive. It suggests that when there is a rise in the degree of production among public university faculty members, there is also an increase in the level of satisfaction with communication. Their strengths relationship is strong because the values of job satisfaction, communication satisfaction, and job productivity are improving.

The finding lends credence to the theory by Aziri (2011), which states that workers' motivation level is directly proportional to their output level. Suppose employees are communicatively satisfied in terms of the amount of information provided. In that case, its correctness and clarity, the appropriateness of the communication media, the presence of recognition, trust, guidance, rewards, available supervision, and other factors of this nature, employees tend to be motivated and committed. And with these, their productivity in doing their job grows, raising their total efficiency as people while increasing the organization's efficiency.

Table 6 Spearman Rank Correlation: Relationship among the Communication Satisfaction Indicators to Faculty Development under Faculty Productivity

Communication Satisfaction	Faculty Development				
	Spearman Rank Correlation	**Verbal Interpretation**	**p-value**	**Decision**	**Remarks**
Interpersonal Communication	0.722	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Group Communication	0.741	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Organizational Communication	0.799	Strong positive relationship	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant

Note: If the p-value is less than or equal to the significance level, which is 0.05, reject the null hypothesis; otherwise, it fails to reject Ho.

The Spearman Rank Correlation: Relationship among the Communication Satisfaction Indicators to Faculty Development under Faculty Productivity is projected here. Table 6 shows that Interpersonal Communication, Group Communication, and Organizational Communication significantly correlate with public universities' faculty productivity in terms of faculty development. One can glean that a positive relationship exists by looking at the type

of relationship among the three dimensions of communication satisfaction. It is seen that when the level of communication satisfaction increases, the productivity level among public universities and faculty members also increases. Since their values are all increasing, their strengths relationship is strong.

The yielded result is advanced by Aziri (2011) in claiming that productivity is the by-product of the level of motivation an employee has in doing his job. According to Core (2015), being productive can help the firm increase and utilize the human resources capacity it has. Productive schools and other organizations have happy and healthy employees who are ready to work for hand and hand with the administration in fulfilling all the set goals of the group.

Combining the importance of communication satisfaction and job productivity, teachers, students, administrators, and all the parts of the workforce, an organization will have the power to meet the demand of Education 4.0., the challenge of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the Digital world.

Conclusion

Therefore, we can conclude that Communication Satisfaction improves and enhances Job Productivity. The degree to which an individual is content with their communications is one of the factors that can influence productivity. They cooperate well since they are intricately entwined with one another.

In conclusion, given the findings of this study, which suggested that job productivity and communication satisfaction are all correlated, the first step toward increasing job productivity is to set up an effective communication system. When workers' needs are met, management has a better chance of guiding people toward jobs that fulfill them to the point where they are happy to carry out the obligations and responsibilities associated with their positions. When workers are content with their work, they are more likely to be intrinsically driven to perform their jobs efficiently and successfully. Additionally, they will have the initiative to assist the administration in accomplishing their respective schools' vision, mission, goals, and objectives. If something like this were to occur, educational institutions would be equipped with the resources necessary to meet the difficulties posed by the fourth industrial revolution, also known as the technology-driven society.

Recommendations

1) The administration ought to raise the salaries and compensation of educators to raise both their level of contentment and output. They need to get them to a competitive level. For the sake of the teachers in our society, we need to ensure that they have stable employment.

2) State and local governments should uphold transparency and do away with excessive bureaucracy. It's possible that making expenditures and operations transparent to subordinates will have a positive effect on teachers' morale. They finally feel fulfilled in their work and productive because they devote their efforts toward achieving the group's objectives.

3) The current administration ought to revise ineffective and cumbersome policies and regulations. These loopholes undermine faith in employers and employees' dedication to their work.

4) For the faculty member to have high productivity levels, the school's administration should provide possibilities for progress and achievements. Educators must have access to scholarship funds subsidized through a competitive budget.

5) The administration should publish and examine policies on the effective communication system and job productivity of faculty members to correct communication gaps and finally address issues related to the instructors' jobs.

References

1. Amato, N. (2015). A lack of resources for many classrooms. https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2015/03/26/is-improving-schools-all-about-money/a-lack-of-resources-for-many-classrooms
2. Aziri, B (2011).Job satisfaction. A literature review hllps//www.researchgatenet/publication./222103547
3. Baskerville, P. (2013) Informal meeting. http://www.skillmaker.edu.au/informal-meeting/
4. Boundless. (2016) The importance of productivity. Boundless economics://www.boundless.com/economics/ textbooks/boundless-economics-textbook/economic-growth-20/productivity98/the-importance-of-productivity-368-12465/
5. Brenneman, G. (1997). Right away and all at once: How we saved continental. https://hbr.org/1998/09/right-away-and-all-at-once-how-we-saved-continental
6. Bryrne Z.S&Lemay E.(2006). Different media for organizational communication: Perception of quality and satisfaction, Journal of Business and Psychology.
7. Carrera, F. (2019). Communicate 2.0: The art of communicating in the 21st century. https://filipecarrera.com/en/books/commu
8. Covey, S. (2018). The importance of trust in your organization. http://inservice.ascd.org/the-importance-of-trust-in-your-organization/
9. Crockett , L.W. (2018). 7 ways to achieve high levels of classroom productivity. https://www.wabisabilearning.com/blog/7-tips-classroom-productivity
10. Dickson, G. (2019). 20 Simple ways to increase motivation in the workplace. https://blog.bonus.ly/20-simple-ways-to-increase-motivation-in-the-workplace/
11. Downs, CW & Adrian, AD. (2004). Assessing organizational communication:Strategic communication audits. New York: The Guilford Press.
12. Down C.W. & Hazen M.D. (1977). A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. Journal of Business Communication, 14 (3), 63-73
13. Dubrin, A. (2014). Fundamentals of management: Philippine Edition. Pasig City Philippines: PCP, Cengage Learn\ing Asia Pte.Ltd.(Philippine Branch)
14. Fay M.J. (2002). Informal communication of co-workers: a thematic analysis of messages. https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/17465641111188394?fullSc=1&journalCode=qrom
15. Fedena (2018). How education 4.0 can Transform the schools' stakeholders experience. https://fedena.com/blog/2018/10/how-education-4-0-can-transform-the-schools-stakeholders-experience.html
16. Hammond, et al.(2017).Effective teacher professional development. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Effective_Teacher_Professional_Development_REPORT.pdf
17. Hanaysha J. (2016). Improving employee productivity through work

engagement: Evidence from higher education sector. International Journal of Industrial Engineering Computation. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289298896_Improving_employee_productivity_through_work_engagement_Evidence_from_higher_education_sector

18. Hasbullah, A. et al. (2011). A framework study of school facilities performance in the public primary school of Batubara district in Indonesia. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.360Get right and content
19. Helie, J. (2014) Communication assessment: Promising practice for meeting management. from http://www. Mediate .com/articles/helie4.cfm
20. Hennings, D. (2013) Communication in action: Teaching literature –Based Language Arts: 7th Edition
21. Herzberg F. (1968). Herzberg's motivators and hygiene factors https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/herzberg-motivators-hygiene-factors.htm
22. Hill, B. (2016) What are the factors affecting job satisfaction? http://smallbusiness.chron.com./factors-affecting-job-satisfcation-20114.html
23. Intelitek. (2010). What is education 4.0?://www.intelitek.com/what-is-education-4-0/
24. Jaupi, F. & Llaci, S. (2015). The impact of communication satisfaction and demographic variables on employee engagement. Journal of Service Science and Management, 8, 191-200.
25. Johlke M.C&Durhan D.F (2000). Supervision communication practices and service. Employee Job outcomes, Journal of Service Research
26. Jones, G.R. (2010). Essentials of contemporary management. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
27. Jooste, K. (2010). The principles and practice of nursing and health care. Van Schaik Publisher, Pretoria
28. Kamel, A. (2016). Role of faculty development programs in improving teaching and learning. http://www.saudijos.org/text.asp?2016/3/2/61/188073
29. Kemp (2018). Top 5 skills teachers need to continue to flourish in the fourth industrial revolution. https://www.ge.com/reports/ethical-underbelly-fourth-indstrial-revolution
30. Kreitner, R. (2007). Management. The U.S.A. George T. Hoffman
31. Manahan, et.al. (2014) Principles of management: Simplified. Mandaluyong City: MC, National Book Store
32. Manual operations for state universities and colleges-The Western Philippine University. https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=sucs+operation+amnual
33. Maxwell, J (2005) TEAM: The 17 indisputable laws of teamwork- Winning with people. Nashville, Tennessee, NT: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
34. May, Steve & Mumby, Dennis K. (2005) Engaging organizational communication theory and research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
35. McGinnis, D. (2018). What is the fourth industrial revolution? https://www.salesforce.com/blog/2018/what-is-the-fourth-industrial-revolution-4IR.html
36. Mueller, BH & Lee, J. (2002). Leader-member exchange and organizational communication satisfaction in multiple contexts. Journal of Business Communication 39(2):220-244.
37. Muller, M.E. et al. (2006). Health care service management, Juta, cape town.

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jonm.12243
38. Oiga, A.(2007). Factors affecting job satisfaction of selected employees of PCSO main office. San Beda College, graduate School of Business
39. Okay, A (2009). An analytic study of communication satisfaction in the turbise portal service. http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/177854
40. Quarstein, V. et al. (1992), the situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679204500806
41. Robbins, S. (2001). Organizational behavior. http://bba12.weebly.com/uploads/9/4/2/8/9428277/organizational_behavior_15e_-_stephen_p_robbins__timothy_a_judge_pdf_qwerty.pdf
42. Rollins, G. (2011). Professional development: How to get started, how to keep growing. http://bok.ahima.org/doc?oid=104780#.XK8IdNIRfLU
43. Professional Learning Board. (2019). Importance of standard-based instruction. https://k12teacherstaffdevelopment.com/tlb/importance-of-a-standards-based-instruction
44. Ross, S.(2016) Why is productivity an important concept in economics? http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/040615/why-productivity-important-concept-economics.asp
45. Sadia, a. et al.(2017). International review of management and marketing communication satisfaction among academic staff in Malaysia public universities. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319090212_International_Review_of_Management_and_Marketing_Communication_Satisfaction_among_Academic_Staff_in_Malaysian_Public_Universities
46. Schneider, M. (2002). Just how important are a school's facilities. https://www.tsc.nsw.edu.au/tscnews/just-how-important-are-a-schools-facilities
47. Shahu & Gole (2008). Effects of job stress and job satisfaction on performance; an empirical study. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254087145_Effect_of_Job_Stress_and_Job_Satisfaction_on_Performance_An_Empirical_Study
48. Sharma, M.S. & Sharma, M.V. (2004). Employee engagement to enhance productivity in current scenario. International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management, 3 (4), 595-604.
49. Sharma, P. (2015). Organizational communication: Perceptions of staff members' level of communication satisfaction and job satisfaction. https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=organizational+communication%3A+perceptions+of+staff+members%27+level+of+communication+satisfaction+and+job+productivity+by+Sharma+Priti
50. Siregar, H.B. (2008) Job satisfaction and employees OCB (organizational citizenship behavior) at the security and risk management department, PT Freeport Indonesia. San Beda College, graduate School of Business.
51. Spector, P.E.(1997). Job satisfaction: application, assessment, causes and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA, sage Publication, Inc.
52. Wagner J.D. (2013). Communication satisfaction of professional nurses

working in selected public health care services in the city of Johannesburg. http://uir.unisa.ac.za/handle/10500/11959

53. Wan, Z. L.E. Leightley. (2006) Job satisfaction and workforce demographics: A longitudinal study of the U.S. forest products industry. Forest and Wildlife Research Center, research Bulletin FP 362, Mississippi State University.
54. Watson, W. (2018). Collaborative impact and professional development: Effective student services for immigrant populations amid growing inequality https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2018.1448727
55. Writing, A. (2016). The effects of poor communication in business. http://smallbusiness.chron.com/effects-
56. poor-communication-business-345.html
57. Zidle, M. (2011). Employee communication: Are you getting the word out http://www.corporate blogging organizational communication